I. Called to order 12:15


Single Meeting Proxy: Abbie Kirkendall for Cecilia Maldonado; Fred Krauss for Kara Wada, Peter Bayer for Matthew Wright, and George Pales for Dan Young.

II. Approval of Minutes – Senator Opfer moved to approve meeting minutes from the August 20, 2013 retreat without change; it was approved unanimously.

III. DRC Representation on the Admissions Committee

Admissions Committee Chair, Senator Wisner, made a statement recommending FS representation from the DRC to the admissions committee, which would allow a voice from their perspective. He indicated this would be another person to help with the process of who is admitted and where they go.

Chair Werth – Materials have been distributed and it has been delayed long enough, so we need to vote on this. We are asking for a change to the by-laws to include a non-voting representative from the DRC to the admissions committee. Motion made to approve, hand vote unanimously passed.

Faculty Senate Bylaws: Section 5 Article 5: Committees 5.1

Admissions
1 Academic faculty from each undergraduate degree granting college and school
1 Director, Academic Enrichment & Outreach or designee (ex-officio, non-voting)
1 Director, Undergraduate Recruitment or designee (ex-officio, non-voting)
1 Dean, Academic Success Center or designee (ex-officio, non-voting)
1 Director, Student Athlete Academic Services or designee (ex-officio, non voting)
1 Director, Disabilities Resource Center or designee (ex-officio, non voting)
IV. Chair’s Report and Announcements

Because there are some new people to the senate this year, I would like to provide a brief overview of what I do as the chair and with whom I meet. Chair Werth provided an overview of what he does and with whom he meets. Below is a brief summary of that overview:

The full body of the Senate consults BROADLY with your constituents (not just your friends & immediate comrades). We want to include the widest possible range of voices in our discussions & deliberations. We need to allow everyone to speak during the meetings. Sometimes enthusiasm to articulate an opinion may be preventing someone else from doing so. We want to give every senator a voice.

Question on the distribution of materials for the Senate: Would senators prefer ATTACHMENTS or a LINK to the FS Website? Do Senators wish to have materials printed in hard copy and distributed at the Senate meeting OR do Senators prefer to print themselves and then mark up prior to the meeting? Please provide feedback on this issue.

Committees
Committees are charged with addressing particular issues and making recommendations to the larger Senate (or in some cases the administration) A full list is available on the FS web site.

Senior Senators (SS)
SS organize elections and perform other important essential functions. There is a meeting with Chair Werth and the SS once per month in order to test certain ideas and to get a better sense of faculty concerns. This is a critical group that has been tasked with consulting with constituents as broadly as possible before our meetings. [Note: The “SS” here should not be confused with the Schutzstaffel of Nazi Germany.]

The Executive Committee
This subunit of the Senate works directly with Chair on a regular basis. There is a twice monthly a month, once just with the EC and a second with the President and Provost.

The Chair:
- Attempts to stay on top of all that goes on in the university and system.
- Have several regularized interactions with other entities and instances.
- Meets with committee chairs to charge them with duties and hear their views on issues that require attention.
- Attends all Board of Regents meetings & represents UNLV faculty there.
- Hopes to establish more direct contact with certain regents for particular purposes.
- Represents UNLV at video conferences among all the system’s senate chairs, including those attended by the system’s chancellor or his deputy.
- Has established monthly meetings, individually, with the provost and both vice-provosts, with the goal of maintaining more open lines of communication.
• Senate office staff keeps it all running smoothly. We should always be open to thinking about how we can make the Senate function better.

Announcements.
• Sabbatical and Faculty Development Leave Applications due 3 Oct at noon.
• Open house combined major capital project and one-time project process on Sept 19th 1-2 in SU209
• New senators (just elected) from SCI: Zhonghai Ding & Hongtao Yang
• Asking for nominations for the parking committee.
• **VPR Search. The search for a Vice-president for research is proceeding**
  ▪ Senior senators met with our two FS reps, Connie Mobley and Bo Bernhard, to provide input
  ▪ Senior senators expressed concern over the lack of faculty representation from Sciences & Engineering on the committee
  ▪ Pleased to report that President Smatresk proved very open to the idea of making a couple of other appointments to address this issue and has appointed **Martin Schiller** (Life Sciences) and **Kwang Kim** (Mechanical Engineering). BOTH have accepted and are joining the committee.
  ▪ We’ll ask our FS reps to report on this in future meetings
• **Five deans are slated for three-year evaluations this year (2013-14)**
  ▪ Those include Tim Porter (Sciences), Rama Venkat (Engineering), Jeff Koep (Fine Arts), Karen West (Dental), and Carolyn Yucha (Nursing)
  ▪ Provost White hopes to oversee evaluations of Koep and West this semester. Porter and Yucha would be next semester. Venkat will probably be delayed because of the dean search in that college
• Q&A
  Senator Spangelo. What is the timeline for that search?
  Provost White – They are working with the search firm to see the timeline; maybe see candidates in the spring and will have more detailed timeline soon.
  Senator Bayer – asked them to produce a statement and will report in due course.
• **Board of Regents Chair Kevin Page’s call for input from campuses on problems and issues, especially those for which System policy plays a negative role**
  ▪ Need to consider how to address this systematically in order to provide the Board with useful information
  ▪ Please consult with constituents and help to identify the bottlenecks and problems that the BOR might help us to address
  ▪ Would like FS to submit a systematic report of some kind to Chair Page
• **Peter Bayer of the Academic Freedom & Ethics Committee has asked for the task to compose “a short but thorough statement explaining the role of universities, the vital importance of the ‘life of the mind’ and the links with promoting the betterment of Nevada.”**
• **Our own Mark Fink (Director of Online Education) has been made chair of chancellor’s committee on e-learning**
DISCUSSION
Senator Filler: Chancellor made reference to moving forward to make recommendations of implementing the contractor’s report. Is that correct?
Senator Hartley: The charge is something along that line – but let’s say it this way – because they accept the report and it doesn’t mean we are
Senator Filler: would like to know the things they will be moving forward with and what they aren’t going to be moving forward with.
Chair Werth: will get that out to you – I don’t have it here.

- Senate chairs throughout the system have been quite vocal in pushing on the question of PEBP
  - We have been asking about surpluses, alternatives, future possibilities
  - I hope to be able to assemble that information soon for your benefit

- Issue of Search Process & Diversity Hiring Initiative
  - Searches this year are mostly going forward under new procedures
  - These have considerable implications about how searches are being run, including questions about the authority of search committee chairs and the timing of the review of applications—perhaps implications for faculty governance
  - Senate needs to be informed of how this process is proceeding
  - Please investigate the searches that are occurring in your college & begin ask chairs and search committees how they are experiencing the new processes.

DISCUSSION
Senator Spangelo – one question that came up – new procedure is it for faculty hires or for everyone search?
Provost White – now we have it focused on faculty and administrative hires, but not to the others at this time.
Chair Werth: The interesting thing is that search committees don’t get to see certain documents to later in the process

- Number of sabbaticals announced by System
  - 18 for UNLV
  - Looking into whether this is the appropriate number, though our approach this year will depend in part on how many applications we get

- The BOR earlier authorized the creation of “entrepreneurial leave,” and our Faculty Development Leave chair Yingtao Jiang is working with me and Vice-Provost Greg Brown to get that going.

Board of Regent meeting – Elko a couple of weeks ago

The Future of Medical Education in Nevada
Important developments in Health Sciences Committee. Recall our resolution last year on desirability of Medical School for UNLV. Chancellor has been saying explicitly that south is insufficiently served in this regard and that something needs to be done. In Elko, Dean Schwenk of UNSOM asserted likelihood of
eventual separate medical school in south. In meantime: build out a fully functioning, but not fully independent, track for Medical Education in the South. UNLV to be deeply involved. This seems to be a vision around which diverse constituencies can unify. Regents Leavitt and Doubrava have expressed interest in meeting with our Senate to discuss these issues. That should occur at the October or November meeting.

DISCUSSION
Senator Spangelo – are they looking at extension or free standing? Chair Werth – I think this is where we have to discuss and make sure we address this issue specifically
Provost White - Dean Schwenk was presenting his vision and that was all that was on the agenda – but it was broadened. In the Health Sciences Committee, Dean of the current UNR Medical School said a fully independent would be too costly and he pitched that UNR should launch the medical school in the south and then switched over to UNLV. They authorized us to meet regarding this issue. Not to be confused – Schwenk said they would build and run it – and so we need to make sure that we don’t let this go. Right now is the time to talk about the future before they build anything. The committee itself pushed about the timetable and when it would be ours. It made sense that we have someone equivalent to meet – so in essence that we could hire someone to launch a UNLV medical school.
Senator Filler – what is the support by the regents.
Provost White – Dean Schwenk was presenting his vision and that was all that was on the agenda – but it was broadened. In the Health Sciences Committee, Dean of the current UNR Medical School said a fully independent school would be too costly and he pitched that UNR should launch the medical school in the south and then have it be switched over to UNLV. They authorized us to meet regarding this issue. Not to be confused – Schwenk said they would build and run it – and so we need to make sure that we don’t let this go. Right now is the time to talk about the future before they build anything. The committee itself pushed about the timetable and when it would be ours. It made sense that we have someone equivalent to meet – so in essence that we could hire someone to launch a UNLV medical school.
Senator Filler: What is the level of support by the regents?
Provost White: There are 3 in support, 3 won over, and then 2 who are southerners that would not support his idea. They seem to be supporting Rogers’ Health Science Center
Senator Culbreth: Does the fact that we should have a vote that says it would be important to have another vote in this regard?
Chair Werth: It could be very helpful to have this vote – the Lincy institute to come out with its report, and we could use this for our vote.
Senator Culbreth: Could this be a separate vote in the future?
Chair Werth: The 2 regents are waiting for the Lincy report; when that appears, we can discuss with them. Then we can create a sense of the senate and make that a resolution.
MOTION
A motion was made by Senator Culbreth, seconded by Senator Opfer, to draft a Senate Resolution regarding support for a medical school in the south. *Faculty senate at UNLV resolves to support an independent medical school being formed at UNLV for the purpose of serving the citizens of southern Nevada.* Discussion continued and the resolution was not called for a vote because it was deemed incomplete.

Senator Pravica – Cost effectiveness – if we had locally trained doctors.
Senator Filler – either full form resolution or a sense of the senate and EC put together that and we act on that at the next meeting.
Senator Culbreth – Advocate withdrawing and bring the resolution back to the senate with better language.
Senator Bayer – Was there a thorough discussion for the second part of that? We can list the specificity as to why it would benefit. Put in specific concrete reasons for this.
Chair Werth – Can I get a motion?
Senator Filler – I move that we as a body of the senate come forth with a well-stated resolution that we have free standing medical school housed at UNLV – which can include economic benefits from the Lincy report.
Senator Williams – seconded
Vote on the motion – motion carries unanimously.

15-to-Finish
Crystal Abba is the vice chancellor of NSHE promoting the “15” campaign, which is based on data suggesting that students taking 15 credits or equivalent graduate more often and are more successful. Developed by University of Hawaii, it’s about promoting more engagement. The senate chairs were concerned about those who are part-time and are part-time for a good reason. Abba and company will be visiting in the fall and we can relay any concerns when she is here.

Operating Pool of Reserve
This is money at the system which involves the funds that are not spent – generates revenue and UNLV pushed for a release – we get $7.6 million of the $15 million that the Board of Regents released. These will be used for things like deferred maintenance.

V. New Business
A. Discussion of Merit – earlier discussions were basis for a memorandum that captured the concerns expressed earlier. Not sure if it captured all of the concerns. We can then discuss and come back with comments from constituents. Are there things not addressed in this? Concrete proposal – a set of principles I seemed to be hearing from people –
Chair Werth: You all received a memorandum from me on this—so let’s move forward. I hope that we can have a more formal vote on something next time, in October.

1. Are there any major issues that are NOT addressed in one way or another in that memo?
2. Are there any comments on the principles that I have labeled “broadly accepted”? Do these indeed seem reflective, on balance, of the concerns that you have heard from your constituents?
3. To take the “concrete proposal,” I constructed, can we vote on the individual items of it?
4. What about remaining questions? Let’s vote on those as well

DISCUSSION

Senator Wilde: I heard that the merit pool isn’t fully funded. What would this affect this discussion?

Chair Werth – We will address this issue shortly, but the short version: it is not fully funded.

Provost White – Merit money from state never applies to those above the chairs level – so we have always made that up, the second is the run through the pool which gives us a deficient amount. We have some assurances to get the pool funded and we think it is important and the right thing to do. What should be considered – if we are keeping the 7 levels and over 6 years – is how to allocate? In other words have 10 people with books rather than 3 – it might be difficult to give the top level of 10 people.

Chair Werth – In effect, any accomplishment is reduced by factor of 6, in effect, because 6 years have elapsed.

Senator McKay – Are increases one-time or do they go into salary base?

Chair Werth – Merit is increase to base. Goes into base and goes forward forever. [Provost White confirms.]

Senator Montgomery – Is there something that precludes the $7.6 million [from the operating pool reserve] for being used for merit?

Gerry Bomotti – The $7.6 is one-time money, so after 1 year it would no longer be available to be in the base for anything. We won’t have it for future use.

Senator Bayer [referring to chair’s memo to Senate of 16 September 2013]: I have no problem with point 1 – in minority with 2 – might give better opportunity for equity. In favor of 3 – to clarify, Provost’s concern of the traditional 7 levels, perhaps we should consider eliminating the top level.

Senator Moehring [Referring to memo for senior senators’ meeting of 3 September 2013]: I sent out for option 1, 2, 3. The greatest support for option 1 – but many for option 2 – there was a strong sentiment to do something that we want money beyond this. So we have to send a message to the regents and the legislature – so we realize there might not be money to make this work – but we need to send a message.

Senator Filler: I support all of these now – and sticking to process of the colleges. Our unit has clear bylaws that don’t give 7 levels. Not all have. Support for #2 – give those who have done good work over the last 6 years and should be rewarded for these. If I retire, won’t get rewarded for those years.
Senator Harry: Been a long time since we have merit – seemed like the gap between the top level [$4500] – maybe the gap shouldn’t be so large.

Senator Culbreth: When merit was allocated – there was direction on how many can be in each of these categories.

Chair Werth: What I propose makes no specific recommendations on that score.

Provost White: These are unusual times and we’re looking for the recommendations so we have not made any decisions yet.

Senator Spangelo: I contacted 3 options in faculty science – one thing they kept talking about was not having the 7 steps. And making the one much higher than the other two.

Chair Werth: It seems that there might be space for colleges to discuss this within their departments and colleges. That is why we combine flexibility at unit and department level each might do it differently.

Senator Robinson: My opinion: merit has been mishandled in past, so flexibility is the best – but if you run it out into the next six years and make it dependent to the legislature and BoR on something, the money might not be there.

Senator Williams: Agree with the concrete proposals – and agree with Senator Filler – that perhaps the seven tiers that is not applicable to all the colleges. I wouldn’t support the 1st of the “remaining questions” [memo of 16 September 2013]. The third remaining question is based on the presumption that salaries were inflated, but that isn’t true in our department.

Senator Brown: I agree on the point that there are not inflated salaries.

Senator Williams: I was hired in 2009 with the promise that I would get merit.

Senator Unger: We [the EC] have discussed that this will likely be an unfair procedure, regardless, to someone. The other comment in our discussions is the very uncertain nature of our legislature – whether they will continue to fund. The “clean slate” option [idea that achievements in 2008-13 would not be taken into account in future merit allocations] makes the argument that it would be the best to keep fighting for more. The nature of our conversations produced this memo.

Senator Krishen: I wish to add on to what Senator Williams said: nos. 1 and 3 [of remaining questions] contain a fallacy; idea is that that we should punish them [people who received retention offers or who were hired in 2008-13]. Merit should have nothing to do with existing salary – if I am meritorious in the last 6 years, then I should be eligible. It should simply be merit.

Senator Harry: I want to reiterate – if that is a salary issue [a matter of inequity] – they should deal with it – but not by merit.

Chair Werth: Entertain a motion to send out a modified memo to all faculty and then gather information and come back on a concrete proposal. Come forward with these and ask us to adopt them.

Senator Filler – Entered a motion, seconded by Senator Moehring, to ask for faculty input then come forward with a concrete proposal. Motion was approved unanimously.

B. Pay Restoration, Merit and Formula
We have this new funding formula that covers 2013 to 2015 – that allocates money on student weighted credit hours. Pay restoration and merit have been run through the formula.
DISCUSSION
Gerry Bomotti: address percentage and dollar terms. Highlight – reinforced what the provost said. There will be a 2.5% increase [restoration] there won’t be a shortage –and we fund for it. The money and salary and benefits on weighted student credit hours in each of the institutions and salaries and benefits. Some who have higher salary and benefits and get less money to fund these and some will get more. In fiscal year 14 – the state allocated 2.5% salary restoration. That 2.5% made up of 2 components: roughly ½ of funds from the furloughs – ½ the money to fund the restoration of furlough. The legislature – funded 1.35% together with 1.15% to make up the 2.5% - that 1.35 didn’t go through the funding formula. But they did allocate the merit through the funding formula and the restoration of steps. This institution came up ½ million dollars short. The funding formula brought us some new resources. We have made it priority – nobody should be worried that we won’t have the money for merit in the FY 2015. This has to be tweaked in the next legislative session – should not be run through the formula. This should be resolved in the next legislative session. Something would have to be done during that period. The system has identified this is a problem and indicated that they are planning to fix this.

DISCUSSION
Senator Filler: Did it not used to be that the merit was based on a percentage of salary?
Gerry Bomotti: That is true. The tweaking that we’re talking about is precisely NOT running it through the formula.
Senator Filler: So all they need to do is just return this to the way and not run it through the formula.
Chair Werth: So I propose that I prepare a resolution on this issue with Bomotti and UNR Faculty Senate chair Swatee Naik. Idea: that we need to see this problem resolved in the next legislative session.
Senator Filler: Would it be possible to get the council of chairs [i.e., all chairs of NSHE faculty senates] to support it?
Chair Werth: My read is that UNR and us only since we two (UNLV & UNR) are the ones adversely affected.

MOTION
A motion was made by Senator McKay, seconded by Senator Hart that the chair work with the Executive Committee to prepare a resolution that the Council of Chairs may support. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

C. Conflict of Interest – Greg Brown, Monica Lounsbery, Lori Olafson:
1. Presented an overview of the new forms and procedures for conflict of interest. The COI are not due by the October deadline: timing and what it covers are being fixed. Primarily for government reporting, the NSHE code and state law requires review and approval. In the past we used both for the same – so there was confusing on what was reported using the same form.
2. Shift to the calendar year – both the feds and NSHE want it to be done annually. Along the way approvals will be a separate form with the new form based on the same questions. This will be introduced in November. This form is
in your packet, take a look to see if any points of confusion. The yellow material.

3. The first is the annual disclosure form and the other is outside activity request form.

4. Presentation – CAN WE GET COPY OF THIS

DISCUSSION
Senator Culbreth: research and government – on the annual...it is confusing
Senator VanBeuge: coming from the clinical areas – we have to work to maintain our licensures. How is this reflected on these? My own is required by the state.
Not only am I doing my clinical practice but doing presentations...
VP Brown: it is a good thing that we are having these discussions.
Senator Bill Robinson: hope we get a chance to review it. We don’t understand and we think it is detrimental.
VP Brown – look at the current form – and help us understand what we need do to fix the problem. We need to do this.
Provost White – we are trying to make this clear, but we must get this done.
Chair Werth – they are open to get further input on the wording, etc. and then training for supervisors – done annually and get better information to the supervisors.

VI. Public Comment.
There was no public comment.

VII. Meeting adjourned by motion/second from Senators Bein/Wilde at 12:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marcia Ditmyer, Secretary UNLV Faculty Senate