Called to Order: Chair Shannon Sumpter

Location: Stan Fulton Bldg. Conference Room
Times: 9:00 am to 12:18 pm

Present: Peter Bayer, Caryn Bellomo, Satish Bhatnagar, Bill Culbreth, Marcia Ditmyer, John Farley, John Filler, Shaun Franklin-Sewell, Karen Harry, Deborah Hart, Kendall Hartley, Cory Lampert, Gary Larson, Mike Lawrence, Scott Loe, Nancy Lough, Cecilia Maldonado, Eugene Moehring, Sue Mueller, Gillian Naylor, Michael Pravica, Rebecca Pugh, Bill Robinson, Vicki Rosser, Sean Saxon, Lori Slinn, Bryan Spangelo, Shannon Sumpter, Denise Tillery, Susan VanBeuge, Kara Wada, Paul Werth, Mike Wilde, Dana Williams, Joel Wisner, Matthew Wright.

Single Meeting Proxy: Bill Culbreth for Neil Opfer; Tod Fitzpatrick for Janis McKay; Marianne Beuhler for Silvia Southwick; Maile Chapman for Douglas Unger; Marcia Ditmyer for Dan Young.


Welcome remarks made by Chair Sumpter.

This was followed by introduction of:
- Faculty Senators from the various colleges and units
- Senate Committee Chairs
- Deans of various colleges and units.
- Special visitors and members of the president’s cabinet
- Faculty Senate Executive Committee
- Faculty Senate Student Services Coordinator and Program Officer

In Memoriam: Chair Sumpter called for a moment of silence in memory of those who passed in the past year. Special words in memoriam were provided by Senator Filler remembering Dr. Nasser Daneshvary. Nasser was a Professor of Economics in the Lee School of Business, former Chair of the Faculty Senate, and continued to serve the senate through the years by chairing several committees: Priority and New Program Review, Tenure and Promotion, and Fiscal Affairs. He also served for several years as the Associate Dean of the College of Business and
more recently as Director of the Lied Institute for Real Estate Studies. As a leader in faculty governance, Nasser epitomized the very essence of faculty excellence. He will be sorely missed.

Chair’s Report: Chair Sumpter spoke of Shared Governance: history of and its meaning. Chair Sumpter spoke of the report of American Federation of Teachers report on Shared Governance in Colleges and Universities. The key resolutions from the report are summarized below:

1. Faculty and professional staff set academic standards and curriculum
2. Faculty and professional staff require academic freedom. Question on Tenure?
3. Faculty and professional staff should have primary in decisions on academic personnel and status
4. Participants in shared governance should be expanded
5. Representative assemblies and faculty senates can have significant roles in shared governance
6. Accrediting agencies should support fully the concept of shared governance in their standards

The full report can be found at [http://www.aft.org/about/resolution_detail.cfm?articleid=217](http://www.aft.org/about/resolution_detail.cfm?articleid=217)

A survey was distributed to all present. The survey was designed by the American Association of University Professors. The questions in the survey were designed to allow for a quick evaluation of the perceived state of shared government at institutions of higher education. The questions are largely drawn from a short monograph by Keetjie Ramo entitled *Assessing the Faculty’s Role in Shared Governance: Implications of AAUP Standards* (1998). The results will be presented at a later meeting.

The faculty senate meeting schedule was briefly discussed along with the openings that are remaining within the Executive Committee and the Senate Committees.

Comments by President Neal Smatresk
- Provided a brief state of the university. He confirmed his commitment to shared governance.
- Achievements through difficult budget times: 1) reinvestment in the infrastructure; and 2) hired approximately 70 faculty.
- How UNLV will move forward? To plan in a transparent fashion includes the engagement and collaboration of new initiatives moving forward.
- Reaffirmed that the budget situation is stable and may improve incrementally. Have to look ahead at how UNLV will support the community, young faculty, nurture diversity, and treat our students.
- Made progress on graduate student funding; concrete change on how PhD students are funded.
- Kicked off the new General Education program and the first year experiences are beginning this fall. This is viewed as an experiment in progress.
- Implementation of the new Integrate System;
- Working on the Master Plan. The planning session was conducted in early August. The majority of the Special Priority goals remain same goals and that concrete
progress was made this past year. The goals are ambitious, but real, concrete and measurable. Reviewed the required items:

1) Integrate 2
2) Legislative session priorities
   a) PEBP benefits
   b) Restoration of pay, COLA and merit
   c) Mega-event center – to share the cost with the city or the state
goal is to not spend any of our current revenue;
3) Commitment to General Education and 1st year experience;
4) Accreditation visit April of 2013.
5) Programs/Income at the Thomas and Mack. Renovations for the future and to ensure major events are maintained. Commitment to keep the rodeo for the next 25 years regardless of any other projects in the local area.

- **Key Commitments for 2012/2013**
  1) Enrollment management, recruitment and retention of students. Challenges around scholarship, enrollment and personnel flux. For the sake of solid fiscal future, need to promote and enroll students UNLV can be proud of.
  2) Master planning and how campus and community can be involved
  3) How disruptive technology will be integrated on campus now and in the future.
  4) Commitment to the Faculty Development Project
  5) Graduate Assistant Funding
  6) Filling Interim Positions
  7) Work on minority serving institution status
  8) Applications that make UNLV more efficient and effective
  9) Building better collaboration across the campus and with public and private entities.

- Two searches (EVP& Provost and the VPR).
  1) Spoke briefly as to the handling the EVP & Provost search. President Smatresk felt that there was a need for immediate action, because of the illness of the VPR and the vacancy of the Provost’s position. President Smatresk has stated he will shoulder the decision to ask for the internal candidates to apply and feels the decision made was for the best interest to the University.
  2) Committed to hire a new VPR and will ask the search committee to work differently. Rather than having the more traditional approach, the idea would be to find highly qualified candidates and reach out to them regarding their interest in UNLV. The search committee must be assembled and ready to consider and vet by campus as quickly as possible in order to not lose highly qualified candidates.
  3) Looking to move the graduate college under the Provost purview. Departmental function more than central function. So there will be some changes in this regard.

Comments by Senator Horsford (Majority Leader; Chair of the Funding Formula Committee)
• The final meeting will be next Wednesday, August 29, 2012. Discussed where he felt that everyone is in agreement and where inconsistencies and disagreements still remain. Goal to create more fair formula that will guide the system as we move forward.

• Agreements
  1) Abandoning the old formula – not modifying. Not trying to make a bad system better
  2) Student fees will remain at universities and CC’s
  3) Formula based on residential students only
  4) Based on completed student credit hours rather than enrollments.
  5) Data driven by weights
  6) Adequate support for the research mission
  7) Equity based on student credit hours and not FTE
  8) Outcome based component – State strategic plan includes 7 key areas aligned with those sectors.
  9) Performance pool…on top of the base support – should be funded as carve out of the state funding.
  10) Phased in – and may stop-loss measures to mitigate immediate loses. Provide stop-loss funding

• Disagreement
  1) Whether to use the weights provided by NSHE and just apply to Nevada or the weights provided by SRI who was hired by the legislative committee. SRI uses the Texas Model which is data driven or use the model presented by the NSHE (NCHEMS) which cannot present specifics on how the weights were derived, or a totally different model.
  2) Small institution or space carve-out – should that be a part of the formula or stop-loss measure
  3) Funding for Community Colleges, if locally supported then the governance structure will need to be changed to have a voice
  4) Whether the committee should define the data parameters or take what NSHE currently uses. Does the system office have the capacity to collect the data that will be required?
  5) How the new funding formula should be phased in.

• Final committee next week has been moved to UNLV campus. Encourage all to come and show support.

• Q&A
  1) How many people on the committee? About 15 comprised of members of the Board of Regents, legislators, and private sector.
  2) In terms of areas of disagreement – what areas do you feel there are ways to change to agree? The weights are very important – that is where the money will go. Areas of the chancellor’s program favor one over the other. The Texas model does shift that to more fair and equitable. “I hope we will walk in and say this is our joint proposal. Then the committee will vote and whatever that is will be adopted.”
  3) Historically, the higher the minority, the lower the state funding. Can you comment on that? Yes, on the funding formula and the performance side as
The National Governors Association (NGA) selected Nevada to do Complete College America – which ensures that first generation and minority students graduate. Matrix minority, first generation at every level of the system. That will be part of the final recommendation.

4) Won’t the stop-loss component prevent that from happening? Yes, but the political reality is that they won’t allow something to get approved without a means to prevent harm to those areas. Get them to agree to adopt that and a short stop-gap means to help them in the short term to allow them to catch up.

5) Where is the State Strategic Plan? Located online at leg.state.nv.us – it is focused on envisioning Nevada’s future – written by SRI/Brookings. First strategic plan ever.

Comments by EVP and Provost John White

- Blend what talked about at Planning Retreat and questions from Chair Sumpter.
  1) Long term theme will have to focus on academic mission of the school – then what UNLV is doing about the academic mission – excellence. Committed to pursuing excellence.
  2) Improving the functioning of the office – Integrate 2 and business officers in each college – then enrollment management. Those processes are holding UNLV back and have to do better in those areas.
  3) Academic component…have to improve UNLV’s reputation within the community. Need a culture of academic excellence. A challenging mission, one that focuses on urban research. Need to be committed to a diverse student body prepared for the workforce.
  4) Climate. One that is nurturing and supportive. Focus on race and gender equity. Change the campus climate – how we talk to one another and deal with issues in a respectful way. Fair to say we need to focus on these climate issues.
  5) Philosophy – Set example on job and high achievement – so expect that of everyone. Support those who wish to achieve. How to build on the support structures and how to be helpful to make sure that is happening. Expand the mentoring program for the untenured faculty. Nurturing support from colleague-to-colleague, and with deans and chairs.
  6) Dean’s appointments – over the next 2-3 years will fill the interim appointments. Prioritization is critical. The timing of the search: Law School and the Business College first. Will discuss with faculty of the other colleges before setting the priority of the remaining seats. Hope to complete four searches this year, one problem is UNLV is short of Deans to chair the committees as the bylaws requires.
  7) Continue as in the past with the addition to overseeing the General Education program. The other Vice Provost will focus on policy, faculty issues and Promotion and Tenure issues. The Provost’s office should focus on the scholarship activity – however will provide assistance with moving Vice Provost Positions. Filled 2 positions. Vice Provost of Academic Affairs will research/scholarship
8) Disruptive technologies. Need to focus on what, how much and when it will be implemented on campus.

- Q&A
  1) P&T – annual evaluation of faculty for every group – who is going to deal with that? If an annual evaluation is corrupted – then the P&T process will also be corrupted. So will have to examine the policy.
  2) Why don’t we develop other forms of rewarding system – the only has been merit? We need to do that. But in the mean time we need to look at merit if we see a return in the funding. If we lump in 4 years, there is going to be a substantial leveling effect. We need to have something that rewards people of substantial accomplishments. There will be some issues regarding the inequities…they exaggerated the inequities…so this has to be addressed.

Presentation: Gerry Bomotti, Vice President of Finance and Business

- Major capitol priorities.
  1) Hotel college academic building (ESL (English is a Second Language Option)
  2) Nursing/PT Building at the SLC
  3) Grant Hall Replacement
  4) Instruction lab and classroom – Phase 1

- Near term projects
  1) Phase 1 campus transit center
  2) Tropicana wash enclosure
  3) Prepare for TMC renovations, if funding is available
  4) NV energy rebates: PV’s RAJ and Ham
  5) Other opportunities, as they arise.

- PEBP and Benefits
  1) Review the health care options with consultant. Consider legislative initiatives if appropriate.
  2) Defined contribution retirement program. Systems review and discussion this fall. Option for state discussion next session (along with PERS rate).

- Salary
  1) 4.8% and 2.5% salary cut – 2.3% furlough
  2) Support options for COLA/Merit/Steps Return

- Campus infrastructure
  1) Integrate 2 project – business process consultant
  2) Campus housing – including graduate students, (AVS, Vegas Grand; existing campus facilities UNLVNow)
  3) College Level Business Offices
  4) Purchasing/Contracting
  5) IT infrastructure Master Plan – including security
  6) Optimizing classroom and lab utilization (and other office space excess)
  7) Funding formula
- Campus Master Plan Update:
  1) Integration with Academic plans/goals. Review CIP targets
  2) Included Midtown Vision
  3) How to meet existing targets and accommodate UNLVNow Vision – work with County
  4) Process will start up again early September
- The buildings that have been added – Science and Engineering, Greenspun, parking garage, Student Services, Wright Hall, Student Rec and Wellness Center, Bldg. D - Advanced Education Center, etc. 20-25% of the facilities over the past 12 years.
- In 2011 UNLVNow
  1) Mega-event Center
  2) Notion of a student village…services or dining that might typically be on or around the campus.
  3) Student and faculty housing.
  4) How do we weave together the academic research core/village and campus recreation/mega-event center, academic space and facilities?
- Areas to focus on
  1) Research space
  2) Support and operations space
  3) Recreation and athletics
  4) Open and outdoor space
  5) Events facilities
  6) Campus housing and related facilities
  7) Campus connectivity and quality
  8) Parking traffic access
  9) Institutional image
- Meeting dates
  1) Had meetings April – August 2012 campus outreach, input, technical working process
  2) Sept 6-7 update to Board of Regents,
  3) Mid-Late Sept and October: Open houses
  4) November 29-30 present to the Board of Regents
- Information
  1) Review materials on campus mater plan update at: http://www.unlv.edu/masterplan
  2) Provide feedback and input through link or contact David Frommer at david.frommer@unlv.edu
  3) Attend campus open houses
  4) Provide questions and comment to FS
- Q&A
  1) Problem of classroom space – wait list. Carl Rieber response: in terms of scheduling working on that problem – so we should work on both side of house – the scheduling issues and how they schedule the rooms. Neal Smatresk’s response: bottle-neck courses…the reasons/excuses around availability and current labs. Need to resolve those issues asap.
No comments from Senators.
No public comments.

Reminder by Chair Sumpter: Flash drives contain various bylaws, NSHE and Red Book references. Please review. Looking to create an acronym list dictionary; please send examples to Chair Sumpter.

At 12:18 pm the retreat was adjourned. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 18, 2012, SU 208-BC @ 12:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Marcia Ditmyer,
Faculty Senate Secretary
August 24, 2012