2010-2011 Faculty Senate Special Meeting – March 29, 2011
This meeting was attended by nearly 200 Senators, faculty, staff, guests and media.

Present:  Peter Bayer, Andrew Bell, Amy Bouchard, Gregory Brown, Elaine Bunker, Patrick Carlton, Chris Cochran, Margot Mink Colbert, Jennifer Fabbi, John Farley, John Filler, Bernard Fried, Liam Frink, Jeff Gelfer, David Hatchett, Carolyn Hensley, Clemens Heske, Al Izzolo, Peter Jakubowski, Fred Krauss, Gary Larson, Nancy Lough, Cecilia Maldonado, Rebecca McDonald, Sally Miller, Sue Mueller, Michael Nussbaum, George Pales, William Ramsey, Eduardo Robleto, Clint Richards, Bill Robinson, Lori Slinn, Jay Souza, Bryan Spangelo, Eva Stowers, Shannon Sumpter, An-Pyng Sun, Paul Traudt, Mike Wilde.

Single Meeting Proxies:  Chuck Regin for Greg Ginn; Peter Bayer for Sara Gordon; Margot Mink Colbert for Peter Jakubowski; Mike Wilde for Pat LaPutt; Michael Nussbaum for Rebecca Nathanson (long term proxy); Bill Robinson for Mary Riddel; Pat Alpert for Susan VanBeuge; George Pales for Dan Young; Cory Lampert for Caroline Smith.  Absent:  Wolf Bein, Marcia Ditmyer, Matt Pedersen, Aly Said.

+++++++++++++

Colleagues:

Consistent with Section 3.0, Article 3, Paragraph 3.1.1 of the UNLV Faculty Senate Bylaws, I am calling a special meeting of the Faculty Senate for Tuesday, March 29th, 2011.

We will convene at 11:00 a.m. in SU 208-ABC and adjourn at 1:00 p.m.  The entire agenda will consist of a discussion of anticipated budget cuts and proposed departmental closures and eliminations.

Please plan to attend if at all possible.  As always, every effort will be made to give each Senator an opportunity to ask questions and to express the opinion(s) of their constituents.  If time allows, comments from those in the audience will be heard.

+++++++++++++

Thank you,
Cecilia Maldonado

Opening Statement read by Chair Maldonado:

Faculty Senate Special Meeting on the Budget – March 29, 2011

I am calling this Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order. Thank you, Senators and guests for making this your priority today.

Today’s meeting was called to discuss the budget, specifically to discuss the process and our dissatisfaction with it thus far.  I am seriously concerned with the lack of criteria by which programs and departments have been identified; the lack of faculty senate and overall faculty involvement and consultation in the process; and, appropriate human resource processes and sensitivities during this round of cuts. These cuts hurt!!! While I understand and acknowledge
the demands and the time constraints under which this administration has had to work, and the
fact that we’ve never had to do this before; I am very uncomfortable and unhappy with the list
which was generated and made public without consistent faculty input. This, I believe, is very
dangerous and chaotic for our university. It is imperative that our bylaws be followed - as there
are two distinct processes outlined [financial exigency and curriculum review] and each the
potential to impact people in very different ways. I ask that as we move forward with these cuts
that:

1. We are involved in this process earlier and more often. Since no clear direction has
   yet been identified by the Chancellor or the Board of Regents, the bylaws clearly state
   that the Faculty Advisory Committee is the appropriate group with whom
   consultation should occur.
2. As you receive requests to produce additional plans, the Faculty Advisory Committee
   should be advised of that request within 24 hours. We will respond appropriately.
3. We request that you make the process open and transparent and include as much input
   from faculty and impacted units as possible.

I hope that you realize that as Faculty Senate leader, I have been and will continue to be as
cooperative as possible in this process. I trust that my concerns will be taken seriously and that
our efforts to move through this process minimize the impact on morale at our university.

Ground rules:

a. Wait to be recognized; use the microphone.

b. May only speak for two minutes and two times on a topic.

Chair Maldonado recognized members of the Executive Committee who wished to make
statements, then President Neal Smatresk, Senators and finally members of the audience.

Senator Spangelo: reiterated that the Executive Committee was available on a 24 hour notice;
the Faculty Advisory Committee on a 48 hour notice; and a Special Session of the senate can be
held within 72 hour notice if the administration needs the faculty to meet on any issue. Faculty
at the present does not have any confidence in the plan or procedures to eliminate programs or
reorganize. There has been a lack of faculty involvement. He also recommended that a rep sit
on the cabinet.

Past Chair Filler: Referenced a memo from NSHE counsel Bart Patterson stating that budget
concerns should not trump cooperation and collaboration subject to a department being
reorganized.
**Vice Chair-elect Brown:** admonished that it may take a full generation to recover from exigency and the damage to the institution. Units must be engaged in the process of reorganization.

**President Smatresk:** a new proposal will be released today. There was not time to consult with the faculty due to time constraints and deadlines to meet with the Board of Regents. Cuts are only proposals, nothing will be decided until June budgets. We have to decide and support our core values, commitment and learning outcomes. We do not have resources to sustain all programs. Mergers, consolidating and closures do a better job of saving tenure faculty. We may end up a smaller, but more selective university. Vertical cuts are easier to administer. Horizontal cuts are easier to administer for hiring, freezes and retirements. There is no curricular review process yet. We will follow the bylaws, and that will also be in the letter that is going out today.

**Statement read by Senator Lough:**

Faculty Senators,

As many of you know, the Dept. I represent was targeted for elimination last year. To this day, I have never seen valid data-driven evidence that supports elimination of my program over others. Yet, I willingly agreed to be re-assigned to a different academic unit where my expertise was valued. However, the second unit has now been included in the new list. Again, I have not seen data-driven evidence to validate selection of the Higher Education graduate degree program. The CRITERIA for elimination of programs and therefore faculty has yet to be made clear. In reflection upon the Faculty Senate meeting last year, in which I spoke regarding the eliminations, President Smatresk’s response after the meeting to myself and my Dept. colleagues was “If not you, then who?”

I share this with you now, not because of the emotional turmoil I, my colleagues and our students have been enduring, but because any of you who feel staying quiet and submissive is the best course of action to protect yourself from potential elimination, are quite simply wrong. It is time for your voices to be heard, and it is time for TRANSPARENT leadership, from university administration as well as the Faculty Senate Chair.

The CRITERIA for program elimination should be made clear to all. The data that drives such decisions should be the most up to date data, not 2008 or more convenient data.

I believe we need to ask and INSIST that the CRITERIA being used for these decisions are made clear to the entire academic community, faculty and students.

Similarly, the awarding of PhD programs needs to be more transparent and data driven. I came to UNLV having chaired 11 dissertations at an R1 institution. I was recruited by a colleague with a similar record who also came to UNLV from an R1 institution. Yet the PhD program we built
over the past 5 years, was handed off to the Kinesiology department. What evidence was provided that the faculty in this unit are prepared to mentor doctoral students through the process. It is my understanding that many who were influential in this decision have never chaired a doctoral dissertation. Thus, my sense is that these decisions again were not DATA driven.

Doctoral programs should be led by faculty equipped and experienced in doctoral advisement and mentorship, not simply faculty who once lived through the process.

Lastly, there is no question that women are over-represented in the cuts that are proposed. Discrimination should not be tolerated at any time, and certainly is not justified by budget shortfalls, as Title IX has demonstrated time and time again when utilized in court.

In closing, my colleagues requested I ask these final questions:

Why was a new PhD approved in Workforce Education (the faculty senate chair’s discipline) the same week other PhD programs were slated for elimination? In particular, while the entire Educational Leadership Dept. was slated for elimination by the PRC, Work Force Ed. was clearly a program within this greater unit. The faculty committee did not recommend the Work Force Educ. Program be teased out, given a PhD and sent to another unit while eliminating all others.

Second, if a program is slated for elimination are all program faculty slated for non-reappointment as well? There seems to be one case (Sport Education to be specific) where one faculty member may be retained in a new unit….and my colleagues in the COE would like to know why.

Respectfully,

Dr. Nancy Lough
Associate Professor
Faculty Senator – College of Education

Statement by Prostaff Proxy Shaun Franklin-Sewell: The prostaff will continue to be consultative with the President, Senate and all committees. Noted that Reno did not make a commitment to tenure faculty.

Senator Carlton Comments:

Colleagues, I struggled mightily last evening, trying to decide what to say today. Finally sleep overcame me and I dreamed. In that dream I was visited by several notables, each of whom provided ideas of potential use at today’s meeting. The first of these, William, suggested an opening statement which addresses the current plight of our university and which I have shamelessly adapted for my own purposes. It goes like this.
Friends, Nevadans, and colleagues, lend me your ears
I come to bury UNLV, not to praise her
The evil that universities do lives after them
The good is oft interred with their bones
So let it be with UNLV
The legislature hath said that UNLV was ambitious
if it were so it was a grievous fault,
And grievously hath UNLV answered it…

Bear with me friends. My heart is in the coffin there with UNLV, and I must pause till it come back to me. ...

Having determined to capture your attention with this soliloquy, I consulted William further about the fear and anger confronting those faculty members who face the challenges of continued employment at UNLV in today’s uncertain times and decided to state the following about the motivation one might feel to either leave the campus at this time or, instead, to stay and to give voice to one’s feelings.

Who would academic burdens bear,
To grunt and sweat under a weary life,
But that the dread of something after dismissal,
The undiscover'd country from whose status
No faculty member returns, puzzles the will
And makes us rather bear those ills we have
Than fly to others that we know not of?
Thus fear of penury doth make cowards of us all;...
And enterprises of great pitch and moment
With this regard their currents turn awry,
And lose the name of action.

I was then visited in my dream by Albert Hirschman, the author of the 1970 volume called Exit, Voice, and Loyalty. Hirschman addresses the dilemma of employees about whether to leave an undesirable situation; to protest loudly while remaining in place; or to quietly behave in a loyal fashion like good soldiers. There is precedent for each of these approaches.

In deciding to exercise "voice" today, I found myself the recipient of multiple requests from departmental colleagues anxious to learn the answers to the following questions but who wished others to represent them:

1-How did UNLV President Smatresk arrive at the criteria he employed to develop the list of programs to be eliminated?
2-How did he identify individual faculty members for potential separation from UNLV?

3-In what way did the criteria employed connect directly to the University's strategic mission?

4-What stance have the members of the Senate taken concerning the process or, as one colleague stated, the lack of appropriate process?

5-Who is taking responsibility for communicating with affected faculty members about their future with UNLV-- Or lack thereof?

Having awakened from last night's dream, I am confident that the areas mentioned will be addressed today. Thank you for your attention.

A statement read by Senator Sun on behalf of the School of Social Work, Bachelor of Social Work program was unsubmitted for print.

Senator Nussbaum: Program elimination rational discussions cannot wait or there won’t be time for decisions. Departments need to make their case. He is concerned that the Senate and administration have not had more discussions through Deans and administration. Time to exert ourselves and insist on due process.

Senator Ramsey: How can there be a university without core courses? There has to be core value, core mission, core courses. Any cuts to those will hurt our reputation.

President Smatresk totally agreed with Senator Ramsey’s remarks. He stated that we have lobbyists in Carson City who are trying to work in the university’s interest. But it will take more than that. We need more revenue and to reorganize or we will be vulnerable. We are all fatigued, but must focus on what is best for the university.

Senator Frink: Higher Ed is under attack; the President is not to blame for the public’s lack of value in education.

Senator Richards: asked – if the cuts are, as assumed in the proposal, is the proposal final?”

(President said he thought he had already answered this question, apparently referring to the deans presently revising proposals.)

2nd comment:

Senator Richards responded that “I would like to clarify my question. When I said final, I wasn’t asking whether the deans and the administration would be messing with the proposal more, but whether faculty would have input into this process.”
(The President stated that deans would be gathering input from faculty in their units for another review that would be more thoughtful, detailed and transparent.)

**Senator Robinson:** We have known this was coming since at least 2006. The Senator distributed a cost comparison by institution / FTE, also indicating declining general fund revenues over the next few years.

**Senator Spangelo:**

PEC recommendations for program eliminations from January 2009. These committee recommendations are the criteria that the administration is currently not using.

I was approached by more than one faculty asking for a copy of this committee report. It is linked on the Provost web page: [PEC Recommendations.pdf](PEC%20Recommendations.pdf)

**Senator Cochran:**

I liked Bryan's comments. There were two important questions that I should have asked but didn't. In the president's first budget cuts proposed earlier, his office plans on eliminating $255,000 from the presidential contingency. What is the presidential contingency and how much remains in the presidential contingency? That contingency cut alone would have paid for some lines this year. Other administrative departments stipulate that many of their cuts will be moved to self-funded (e.g. VP office of Finance and Business, VP for Student Affairs, VP for Advancement). Is this self-funded from indirect fees from grants that others have brought in or do they have their own income producing resources?

As time allowed, public comment was accepted…

Several members of the audience approached the microphone to speak. Many spoke on behalf of their programs (Women’s Studies, Workforce Education, graduate students, and staff in general).

The consensus being that more needs to be done to make the legislature aware of our plight; that students are upset; that they are on an emotional “roller coaster” ride not knowing whether they will have a program or not; whether to change majors or not; whether they will have a future or not; how can there be a discussion about anything without knowing what the budget will be?

Senator Frink moved to adjourn the meeting at 1:00 p.m.