I. Call to order [12:15 p.m.]


Single Meeting Proxy: Peter Bayer for Matthew Wright; Michelle Robinette for Carryn Bellomo; Scott Loe for Kendall Hartley; Lori Slinn for Michael Hammer;

Long term Proxy: Abbie Kirkendall for Cecilia Maldonado; Fred Krauss for Kara Wada. Excused: Rhonda Montgomery

II. Approval of Minutes
The meeting minutes from the September 17, 2013 meeting were not voted on. The version submitted to the Senators was not the final copy with corrections in typographical errors, etc. The fully edited version will be voted on during the November meeting along with the meeting minutes from the current meeting.

III. Action Items / Old Business –
1. Approval of the 2016-2017 Academic Calendar
Senator Filler – I would like to know how this [spring break] fits with the Clark County School District. The concern is that the breaks be at the same time. We have a great number of students [graduate] and faculty who have children in the CCSD, and it can put an undue burden on them if the breaks are not at the same time.

Senator Spangelo – CSN keeps their Spring Break the same time each year.
Senator Robinson - There is a Senate policy [typed at the bottom of the calendar] that states if there is three or fewer weeks following the spring break of CCSD, then our spring break will be mid-semester. Otherwise our spring break is the same time as CCSD.
Senator Bein – Does it makes sense to use this rule? Can’t we work around it?
Senator Werth – Would the senate like the EC to look into this matter?
Senator Filler, Yes, I think we can vote on the calendar while the EC looks into this matter.

**MOTION**
A motion was made by Senator Opfer, seconded by Senator Williams, to approve the 2016-2017 academic calendar.

**DISCUSSION**
Senator Bein – is the motion about approving the calendar now?
Senator Robinson – Remember one is for 2015-2016. We need to get these approved because the students need to get their schedules set.
Senator Harry – We have the internet; can’t we access and find out when CCSD has their spring break? [Past Chair Sumpter agreed to search the internet.]
Senator Robinson - March 27, 2016 is the spring break CCSD for 2016 and it matches – but April 16, 2017 CCSD is the spring break for 2017 and that doesn’t match. That is because we wouldn’t come back until April 20th and the end of the semester is May 6th – only have 3 weeks.
Senator Unger – That means students only have 2 weeks really. We have to think of our students – they should probably have their break mid-semester. Aren’t we being a bit selfish?
Senator Filler - Our point is that our graduate students have kids who are students that go to CCSD. In the College of Education many work at CCSD. Is that fair to them?
Senator Wisner – I find that students tend to be asleep two weeks after the break. It is unfortunate that it won’t coincide with the public schools. I think we should consider for our students and have it at mid-semester.
Senator Baronet – I think two weeks at the end is pedagogically disruptive.
Senator Williams – Are we looking at the end of March 21-26th – is not two weeks at the end of the semester? In the calendar it is in the mid semester.
Senator Robinson – It is mid-semester now but if we put it at Easter it would not be, that is the point we are making.

**RESTATEMENT OF MOTION**
A motion to approve the 2016-2017 calendar by Senator Opfer, seconded by Senator McKay.

**MORE DISCUSSION**
Senator Harry – This should not be controversial – are we assuming that nobody considered any of this and simply didn’t look it up. If our Senate guidelines state the policy, I am sure someone checked that.
Past Chair Sumpter – The registrar knows to do this. We have to assume they check.
Chair Werth called for a vote. 36 for approving the calendar, 0 against and 6 abstentions. MOTION CARRIES.

**MOTION**
Senator Robinson – Made a motion that we ask the Senior Senators to query about the dates of the spring break – should we continue the policy [of the faculty
senate] or do we have spring break the same as CCSD regardless of the timing. This was seconded by Senator Bayer.

Senator Filler – What exactly we are asking? I would like to amend the motion that specifically the primary motion focus on the appropriateness of the current senate policy on spring break. Senator Spangelo seconded amendment.

Chair Werth called for a vote on the amendment – Approve: 14, Oppose: 3, Abstain: 21. Motion Carries.

Chair Werth Called for a vote on the amended motion. Approve: 20 – Oppose: 12, Abstain: 10. Motion carries.

COMMENT
Senator Wilde – May I make a suggestion that we invite the registrar to this discussion next time?
Chair Werth – Good idea. Let’s.

2. 2015-2016 Academic Calendar
MOTION
Senator Opfer made a motion to approve the calendar, seconded by Senator Moehring. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Special Hearing Election
Chair Werth: We need to identify 35 of the 39 nominees on the ballot for the Special Hearing Committee.

DISCUSSION
Senator Bayer – Would it be okay to cross off 4 names – thereby leaving 35?
Chair Werth - Given that it would be a negative act to strike them off – it would be best to follow the directions on the ballot itself [i.e., to vote for 35 people].

The vote was conducted; winners will be announced at a later date once the ballots are counted.

4. Parking Advisory Board Election
Chair Werth: Matt Pedersen from Engineering was gracious enough to agree to be nominated for the committee. We still need a second person.
Senator Williams volunteered.
Chair Werth: Shall we have a vote by acclimation

MOTION
Motion made by Senator Robinson, seconded by Senator Brown. Motion carried unanimously.

5. Senator election to University Bylaws Committee
Chair Werth – We need a senator to serve on the Bylaws committee. Senator Opfer has agreed to be nominated.

MOTION
Motion was made by Senator Filler to approve by acclimation Senator Opfer as FS representative on the Bylaws Committee, seconded by Senator Larson. Motion carried unanimously.

6. **Resolution on pay restoration, merit, and the formula**
Chair Werth – You will all recall a possible resolution on the pay restoration, merit, etc. run through the formula. I have been working with our colleagues at UNR and they made a few modifications. I am wondering if any comment on the resolution or a motion to approve.

**MOTION**
Senator Filler – I will make a motion to approve the resolution so we can discuss, seconded by Senator Culbreth,

**DISCUSSION**
Senator Spangelo - The principles listed in the last sentence, does that refer to the first sentence – that specific set of principles or are they referring to a different set of principles.
Chair Werth – Yes, it refers to the set of principle listed in the first sentence.
Just an FYI, Gerry Bomotti reviewed the resolution and agreed that it is factually accurate.
Senator Barone – What is the definition of “fairly” or “fairly rewarding”?
Chair Werth – Fairness not at the level of individuals, but the institution. The concern is that each institution receives the appropriate funding.
Senator Barone – I would advocate for that specifically.

**MOTION TO AMEND**
Senator Bayer – I would recommend changes the word “fairly” to “appropriately.” Would that have the same meaning? I make motion to amend – to strike the word “fairly” and then replace with “appropriately.”
Senator Unger – We have to remember this is a political document – if we substitute “appropriately” for “fairly,” it gives them [Board of regents, legislators] more wiggle room, in my opinion. So I think politically that it should remain as such, to mean that the funds would not be unfairly awarded to us and our sister institution if it were run through the formula.
Senator Wilde – Some observations – the end of second paragraph – fewer resources – that makes the inference that the system got it wrong, as it pertains to the intent of the legislators.
Senator Unger – I presume you are asking to not go against the motion to amend.
Senator Wilde - Yes
Senator Filler – Does this resolution have to go back through UNR?
Chair Werth – Yes, this isn’t the absolutely final version; we can send back to them with changes.
Senator Filler – Has the UNR FS Chair approved the original wording?
Chair Werth – Yes, but we can take it back with changes if we feel we need to. So do we have a second on amending the resolution?
Senator Filler – Yes
Chair Werth called for a vote to amend the resolution – to change “fairly” to “appropriately” - Approved: 2, Opposed: 16  Abstain: 6. Motion does not carry.
Chair Werth: Any more discussion on the resolution?
Senator Larson – The motion is that we vote to accept and it is given back to you to finalize with UNR and if there is any expansion on the meaning, you bring it back then. Is that correct?
Chair Werth: Yes, I would bring back to you any substantive changes. But if we accept this version, that is less likely to occur.
Motion passed unanimously.

IV. Chair’s Report and Announcements
Next meeting in just a couple short weeks mostly due to room availability – (November 5, 2013).

1. Benefit Changes. There are changes to the NSHE retirement plan – frequently asked questions. TIAA-CREF will have a set of transition meetings and will occur on the 12-13 Nov and the 2, 3, 11. And 12 of December. Have asked Gerry Bomotti and Pat LaPutt to discuss this issue at the next meeting. Michelle Kelley from the system will also be at the next meeting.

2. Conflict of Interest Form. The new forms are completed and ready to roll out. The policy is the same; the procedure has been posted. Safe to say that Provost White has been mindful of the FS – We have to be mindful of the law and that we haven’t been compliant in all cases. Also hopefully common sense will prevail. Also we should try to stress to the faculty that disclosure of potential COI provides them some protection: and they will done due diligence. There will be an expanded COI committee that will deal with appeals of those that have denied. One representative be from the FS and would have to go through some amount of training and would then sign on for a 2-4 year term. There is necessary training, which makes the longer term desirable. If you can imagine someone that might perhaps be willing to be put up for nomination.

DISCUSSION
Senator Filler – Will this be an elected position?
Chair Werth – We will have to decide that. I will review the bylaws.
Senator Robinson – What is the determination of one day a week; what does that mean? My faculty is still confused? What about summer; how does it play into this? There needs to be more of this defined.
Chair Werth – There is a good deal of documentation; direct faculty to the policies and procedures for some of that. We have to assume that faculty will work with their chairs on this.
Senator Filler – The chairs have to be trained in this.
Chair Werth – They are indeed being trained.
Senator Robinson – How, if these questions are not yet answered?  
Chair Werth – Since the Chair is the best position to make those kinds of determination.  
Senator Robinson – There are those that don’t do it fairly while there are those that get hammered. We can avoid the winking of the favorite sons. They cannot make up the policy individually, since then the possibility of abuse is limited.  
Chair Werth – Greg do you have anything to add to this?  
Vice Provost Brown – I don’t have anything to add.

3. **Digital Measures Initiative.** We are moving to finalize the digital measures initiative. This will help improve the tracking of publications and awards. Making a real effort to make digital measures better and more useful in complying with annual reports. It should help faculty identify what others in various colleges are doing in hopes to share research and other scholarly activities. The hope is to roll out in 2014 so that it can be used in 2105 for things such as work reports. FS has a small taskforce to help identify those elements that would be helpful. Those people are Abbie Kirkendall, Susan VanBeuge, Janis McKay, Michael Pravivca, and Anjala Krishen.

4. **Clinical Faculty Taskforce.** Based on the question posed by Dean Yucha from the School of Nursing regarding the use of “clinical faculty designation.” This category was thought to be solely for use in the Medical School. After clarification from the system office, a taskforce is being created to work on the appropriate use of this designation at UNLV. The taskforce will consist of Dean West from the School of Dental Medicine, Dean Yucha from the School of Nursing, along with other key administrators of UNLV. Chair Werth and Senator Ditmyer will represent the FS on the taskforce.

5. **Medical School.** The Lincy Institute is expected to release its report this upcoming Thursday. It is expected that this will be favorable toward UNLV. The report will show the return of investment of creating the Medical School in southern Nevada. This report will be made available as soon as we receive it. There will be a public roll out on the morning of the November 5th. We expect to connect with a couple of the regents and invite them to the December or January meeting. My own inclination to see what comes out of this and then perhaps begin to have a conversation regents and create a resolution that will help further support this initiative.

**DISCUSSION**

President Smatresk – **Tripp Umbach**, a top national health care consulting firm, is the firm that examines various medical school models for their economic impact. They are the group that is completing the report on the economic impact of a Medical School for Southern Nevada.  
Senator Culbreth – Would like to see the draft in the future, which might be very helpful.
President Smatresk – We will make sure that you all receive a copy of the report.

6. **Faculty Forum** – The EC has been discussing the idea of putting together a way to help mentor faculty. Our faculty have a great deal of expertise, along with a deep and unquenched thirst for both mentorship & fellowship. We feel that a faculty forum would be a good effort. The EC would like to propose faculty forums that would be by and for the faculty, allow for conversation for exchange, and draw on faculty expertise. The idea is to be more informal. We were thinking light snacks and civilized conversation. In the absence of a faculty club, this might be very good alternative. In the absence of the faculty club, we could hold this once a month where we could get together and develop connections. The EC and the administration looked favorably to this. Since the work reports are due in January, it was thought that it might be good to do a forum on how to complete the annual work report. We can do the first one in early December. EC hopes that you might look at this as a good initiative. Rhonda Montgomery and Liam Frank both thought would be great to do, and they offered very valuable ideas.

V. **New Business**

1. **Program Review** – Speakers: Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Carl Reiber and Program Review Committee Chair John Farley. The idea of this committee is to review and improve the Program Review process. The current review process is more perfunctory and less meaningful than it could be. What the committee is working on now is a plan for streamlining and simplifying the process. Currently there were 19 reports that are due. Many reports are based on much of the same data but different formats. So the thought is to use the same form and only change the necessary data.

**DISCUSSION**

Senator Filler – Do our bylaws say this is a university role?

John Farley. Not sure, but our hope is to create a central location; this repository will then house the format of the particular report. Then as stated before, the only information that would be changed would be things that are actual updates. If no updates, no changes.

Vice Provost Carl Reiber – What we are trying to do is reduce the number of reports from the chairs. This is going a long way to get the chairs to run their departments rather than fill out forms and reports.

2. **Merit:** Drafted a concrete proposal – the full document went to the campus. Proposed to you a couple other questions – we can hold off of those for a moment. Are there any comments on the concrete proposal

**DISCUSSION**

Senator Opfer – From some of the faculty from college of engineering – faculty member that has been working very hard over the years would be
eligible – they would be at the top step. One of the thoughts would be that you stagger the pool – you count a couple of years and then use some years now and some years later so that would be one thing. The other thing is that it wouldn’t be fair for those that received retention offers, and they should not get merit.

Senator Spangelo – You can count up to 3 years – rolling 3 years – the units have done all kinds of things. With respect to the first proposal, the units would have the ability to do that

Senator Werth - This proposal here would not preclude us from doing what you [Senator Opfer] are asking; but that would be some other time.

Senator Bayer – The second proposal seems to expressly state that the unit must take into account the previous 6 years, and that from that point forward that is accounted and not used. Wondering if, based on what Bryan said, we could allow each unit to determine how many years to be accorded? Or do we need to have unified approach? Do the legislators require us to use all six years – or can we add from Proposal 4 to unit 2 – each unit can do that to any of them

Senator Spangelo – A friendly amendment – the word “shall” says that you will do it that way; replace “shall” with “may” – so that we can consider counting a different number of years.

Chair Werth - If we do that – then it might mean schools can only use one year rather than six years.

Senator Spangelo – if we use “may”- it would allow flexibility

Senator Moehring – I think the last six years should be taken in account. We would want to do that the next time – we don’t want any colleges to reduce it. I think it is flexible enough.

Senator Bayer – What are the EC or general senate concerns about allowing each unit to make its own determination – if at all? In my years of the senate, sometimes at the unit level there has been some mischief. Is it the sense that we do not trust the units to make their own good faith to use the last six years?

Senator Filler – We all need to remember that we only have one year here to divide. This is really peanuts – we need to get it off the table and do it in the most equitable manner – we have already endorsed the existing bylaws.

Senator Unger – There are 5 new deans who have never given out merit – and this will give them the guidelines. If we change from “shall” to “may,” that they have a lot more flexibility – and that might actually go counter to what is fair.

Senator Robinson – Faculty approval. Should it be in here?

Senator Filler – It is in the bylaws already.

Chair Werth – On not trusting the units. How much authority is appropriate at lower levels? We are kicking the can down to colleges already. This is a discussion we already had. To judge from earlier discussion, we don’t want too wide of divergence among colleges & depts. I think we want to have a certain degree of flexibility– but we don’t want too much divergence.
Senator Barone – I will disagree with Senator Bayer: The wording of point number 2 to compel all units to use all six years. That would be overridden by what Senator Bayer is suggesting.
Chair Werth – It was clear and designed – based on conversations earlier – to include 6 years for everyone.
Senator Filler – Going to the next years – it allows them to do that.
Senator Werth – We can look at that later.
Senator Filler - Are you asking for a motion?
Senator Bayer – I am sorry to grab the microphone – I agree with John Filler – I can see a lot of potential grievances – assuming that there is money in subsequent years – then the unit will decide that. I will go along with the general consensus.
Senator Werth – This is the hand we have been held. We have to work with what we received from the legislature.
Senator Filler – I move we endorse this, seconded by Senator Williams.
Senator Bayer – I like the idea that we put in the information from bylaws – do we want statement that we use this for equalization – almost everyone will account for some to get it – what we want to make a statement – this isn’t proxy for equity – but rather a simply makes sense that everyone would have earned it.
Senator Moehring – So the math – a lot of people are not going to get merit.
Senator Culbreth – In the past 20% at the high end and 20% of the low end.
Chair Werth – You have not raised that earlier, and it is not part of the proposal here.
Vote was taken – endorse and send forward the proposal. Vote passed unanimously.

3. **Tier One** – Speaker: President Neal Smatresk
President Smatresk discussed the topic of Tier I. We are down $73 million dollars. We raised the tuition that put money back into the system – so down $43 million when you consider the general fund is $143 million dollars. How do we get the funds back? I don’t think there is a legislator that would just give them back because we ask for restoration. However, what they want to know is what are the plans and how will we build a better Nevada and graduate more students. That is in the minds of our legislators and community members. It makes sense to you – in that you have made those personal sacrifices, but not to them. Tier I is a means to the end. If the state restores that money [$73 million] we can produce a better product – we will graduate more, we will do more research – we hope to build a medical school. The stadium, medical school, building student population—all of that is how we achieve national prominence and provide a return on the investment. I am 100% assured we will not receive money back just by asking, unless we have a plan, and that is Tier I. It is the best approach – it doesn’t hamstring us. It is a thoughtful approach making sure when we build it will help do it equally – so we improve compensation if we need to keep faculty – increase faculty to meet the student increases. If we need to bring in research dollars – we need to
make sure that we need to ensure we can match the capacity of our infrastructure. All of these are very much on our mind. What we need to do is host some town halls; the last of the year. One on campus master planning and research master planning. We will have one on CoRE and then one on Tier I. We will also have one on the topic of the medical school and one on the international efforts. What it is we do to engage students internationally. Those are all topics we want your input on. Along the way we see and hear what faculty have regarding compensation – we will begin restoring the 5 years of inequities. We don’t have a lot of concrete evidence of general across the board inequities – we have anecdotal evidence. You have heard us talk about a thoughtful approach on how we will deal with these – we are committed to this path. That said, we are talking a lot about faculty structure and faculty count – PT and FIRS and full-time faculty and tenure. We are looking at moving the PT to FIRS while we ask full-time to continue their research efforts.

I don’t know about you all – PT instruction has been a very human issue to me. Some are extremely talented and some not so much. We would like to develop a more thoughtful career path maybe from one salary level to another salary level – and from there to a more complete FIR. That way we can bring them into our family. It doesn’t cost too much to build the ranks of the FIR where it is needed. An area-by-area investment. The more full-time, retain good faculty, bring in more full-time will help in the Tier I status. Another area would be PhD graduates – so we need to bring in more. Turns out in the new formula – PhD are rewarded 8.8 times the regular formula – so raising the stipends to get more to increase money would be helpful in moving toward Tier I.

Whenever administration starts an initiative there is always skepticism – that is typical. But I really believe it is the best way to move toward what we all want.

DISCUSSION
Senator Filler – I agree with you – all faculty in education using graduate and doctoral – the issue is strategy and tactics. FIR – that would be great – if we can teach the doctoral-level faculty.
President Smatresk – This is not an argument – we are in agreement with that – we need to encourage upper level faculty to help relieve them. Where are the gaps and the weak points so we can get to all those things.
Senator Krishen – More of a cultural issue here – that should be part of the roll-out. There is already a perception that there are “regressives” – people who are often position in power that don’t want change
President Smatresk – If that is the case – then we need new leadership.
4. **Equity**

Provost White – We mentioned that we cannot do global equity – we are doing 4-part approach: First, assistant professors – and then reducing the compression - $60,000. Then Associates and then Full-professors and then circle back to instructors. We have done preliminary adjustments to see if we can do category 2. In the process of doing that – there are a couple of colleges to move people up – addressing assistants forces us to move a few other people up. Also gave an opportunity to fix inversions – leapfrogging efforts – it doesn’t totally solve that problem but it does go a long way to resolve that problem.

We are attempting to move the instructors up. We are able to address 2 burning issues – that is those that came in that disrupted it – and moving those up to where there were low levels of salary to $60,000 or above. While not a complete solution – but hopefully will release some of the compression levels. We are hoping to see this in this month’s payroll and if not this month – but will be retroactive.

**DISCUSSION**

Senator Spangelo – where did the $60,000 come from?
Senators Smatresk – We can’t teach the world where they are teach - $60,000 is not enough to live on.
Senator Spangelo – this is the lowest level to be at.
Provost White – Yes that is true. There are many departments who do not hire that low. There is a degree of arbitrariness – but a step that we address the overall.

VI. **Future Action Items:** None

VII. **Public Comment:** None

VIII. **Adjournment** at 2:15 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Marcia Ditmyer, Secretary