

AGENDA
University of Nevada, Reno
2005-06 Faculty Senate
May 10, 2006, 1:30 p.m.
RSJ 304

- | | | | |
|-----------|----|--|-------------------------|
| 1:30-1:35 | 1. | Roll Call and Introductions | |
| 1:35-1:40 | 2. | Request to Approve the April 20, 2006 Meeting Minutes | Action/Enclosure |
| 1:40-2:05 | 3. | Year-End Committee Report: <i>Mary Wilson</i> , Bylaws & Code Committee | Action/Enclosure |
| 2:05-2:30 | 4. | Year-End Committee Report: <i>Jane Bessette</i> , Campus Affairs Committee | Action/Enclosure |
| 2:30-2:55 | 5. | Year-End Committee Report: <i>Bourne Morris</i> , Morale Task Force | Action/Enclosure |
| 2:55-3:00 | 6. | Year-End Committee Report: Academic Standards | Action/Enclosure |
| 3:00-3:15 | 7. | Chair's Report | Information/ Discussion |
| 3:15 | 8. | Adjourn | |

AGENDA
University of Nevada, Reno
2006-07 Faculty Senate
May 10, 2006, 3:15 p.m.
RSJ 304

- | | | | |
|-----------|----|---|------------------------|
| 3:15-3:20 | 1. | Roll Call | |
| 3:20-3:30 | 2. | Election of 2006-07 Officers | Action |
| 3:30-4:45 | 3. | Senate Welcome and Orientation
<i>President Joseph Crowley</i>
<i>Guy Hoelzer, 2006-07 Faculty Senate Chair</i> | Information/Discussion |
| 4:45-5:00 | 6. | New Business | Information |
| 5:00 | 5. | Adjourn | |

Future Senate Meetings

[UNR Faculty Senate Website](#)

June 1, 2006 at 1:30pm
RSJ 304

August 31, 2006 at 1:30pm
RSJ 304

Future Board of Regents Meetings

[NSHE Website](#)

June 8 & 9, 2006, TMCC, Reno

August 17 & 18, 2006, Great Basin
College, Elko

University of Nevada, Reno
2005-06 Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes April 20, 2006

RSJ 304

Meeting 13

1. Roll Call and Introductions

Denise Baclawski (Provost's), Rafik Beekun (COBA), Cynthia Birk (COBA), Pam Cantrell (COE), Arthur Chenin (Administration and Finance), Amy Childress (Engineering), Joe DeLappe (CLA), Joe DeLappe for Mary Stewart (CLA), Rita Escher for Maureen Cronin (Student Services), Johanna Fricke (SOM), Greg Gardella (IT), Michelle Gardner (President's Division), Howard Goldbaum (Journalism), Guy Hoelzer (Science), Steve Oberg (Research), Ron Phaneuf (Science), Mark Pinsky (Science), Steve Rock (Education), Nelson Rojas (CLA), Stefanie Scoppettone (Development), Amy Shannon (Library), JoAnne Skelly (COOP), Patricia Swager (Medicine), Debra Vigil (Medicine), Debra Vigil for Barbara Scott (Medicine), Leah Wilds (CLA), Mark Waldo (CLA), Esmail Zanjani (CABNR),
Absent: Frank Baglin (Science), Terry Henner (SOM), Denise McKee (Medicine), Judith Sugar

Guests: Melisa Choroszy (SS), Stacy Colwell (Davidson Academy), Bob Davidson (Davidson Academy), Jan Davidson (Davidson Academy), John Frederick (Provost), Gena Jones (HR), Tommy Lean (SOM), Tim McFarling (HR).

2. Update: The Davidson Academy: Jan and Bob Davidson & John Frederick, Executive Vice President and Provost

Jan Davidson summarized how the idea for the Davidson Academy began. The Davidson's started the Davidson Institute for Talent Development in 1999, a non-profit foundation to improve the education in the nation. Their first program, Davidson Young Scholars, offered support services for profoundly gifted students and which served approximately 1,000 of these students throughout the United States. The Davidson's created the Davidson Fellows which awarded scholarships in the amount of 50,000, 25,000 and 10,000 dollars to outstanding students. The THINK Summer Institute enabled students (ages 12-15) to earn up to 7 college credits, during the 3 week session. The Davidson's also have an Educators Guild for educators who want to learn more about working with profoundly gifted students. In 2004 they published the book *Genius Denied: How to Stop Wasting Our Brightest Young Minds*. Jan and Bob Davidson had many requests through out the years to open a school for profoundly gifted and talented students. The Davidson Academy was scheduled to open fall of 2006 at UNR and would have space on the 2nd floor of the KNPB building to start. Expected enrollment for the first year would be around 30 students. Some families would relocate to Reno so their children could attend the Davidson Academy. The students would range from 9 – 16 and must be able to perform at a 6th grade level or higher. The programs would be constructed based on each individual student's needs. The Academy would hire professors to teach the classes and work with student projects. When students are ready they would matriculate to regular college classes. The academy would work with university professors and parents regarding what class content the children would be ready for prior to signing them up in a particular class. Stacey Colwell, Program Director of the academy said that most of these children have been reading

since they were three and read at a much higher grade level, so they have been exposed to topics at higher maturity level. Bob Davidson said that these students would provide an interesting, highly talented, and motivated group of students to the university environment. These students would increase the pool of National Merit Scholars and put UNR at the top of the list. Also, having these students attending the university would increase the ranking and grading of the university on research. Most students would probably continue on at the university for their college degrees, and their families would be a good core of supporters of the university. Tom Nickles (Recipient of the Regent; Distinguished Teachers Award) taught at the THINK Summer Institute and was awed by the students that took his course, the first day; they had already read all of the materials and were ready to begin discussion. The Academy would provide a strong socio-emotional cooperative learning environment and would deal with issues that are particular to this group of students. The staff of the academy would conduct regular meetings with the students and their families to keep on track with their studies. Senators asked about testing, both neuro-psychological and outcome measures. Testing would not be conducted except for entrance testing. DeLappe asked about testing skills for writing or composing. This is not an area where the academy has had any involvement yet. Wilds thanked the members of the academy for speaking at the senate meeting. Link to their website: <http://www.davidsonacademy.unr.edu/>

3. Year-End Committee Report: Kent Ervin: Salary and Benefits Committee:

Kent Ervin thanked the committee, Linda Nichols, Benefits Coordinator; Tim McFarling, Director Human Resources; Gena Jones, Vice President Human Resources.

The committee made the following recommendations:

1. That steps be taken to collect, verify, and use years of relevant experience and relevant educational degrees instead of age in the future.
2. That salary equity surveys and adjustments be performed on a regular biennial schedule. The assessments should be done on a schedule to support legislative requests for salary equity funding, then again to adjust salaries when funded.
3. Those salary equity adjustments be included in the regular annual salary information letter to each faculty member, along with cost-of-living and merit adjustments. In years where salary adjustments are funded, each faculty member should be informed of his/her equity adjustment amount (zero or non-zero).
4. That the administration clarify procedures for individual appeals of salary adjustment amounts.
5. That UNR and NSHE make funding for biennial salary equity adjustments a legislative funding priority along with annual cost-of-living adjustments and merit awards.
6. That Faculty Senate request to the two state-wide advisory committees that they (1) broaden the options to include a vendor specializing in high-quality low-expense-ratio mutual funds, (2) require that vendors provide uniform investment performance data both for individuals and in aggregate reports, and (3) establish Roth plan options.

Some of the questions asked by senators were: why couldn't faculty go on social security or at least have the option to choose between SS and the state retirement plan. Why could a person of a certain age, take money out of a personal IRA, but not their university IRS? Could a list of frequently asked questions be listed on the website?

Recommendations by the committee for the next year's charges:

- Monitor the implementation of regular salary equity studies, in particular the elimination of age as a factor for Administrative Faculty salary equity surveys.
- Monitor the selection of investment vendors by the NSHE Retirement Plan Advisory Committee and the State of Nevada Deferred Benefits Committee. Review the feasibility of a study on actual performance of these plans.
- Review the possibility of establishing an educational program on retirement investment strategies for faculty.
- NSHE plans to issue a new Request for Proposals in the next year for voluntary ancillary insurance and benefit program vendors (e.g., additional life insurance, long-term-care insurance). The committee has concerns whether faculty who buy ancillary insurance with a current vendor will be able to continue that plan or transfer without penalties to a new vendor. The committee should review and make recommendations regarding the Request for Proposal

MOTION: Gardella/Baclawski. To Approve Report and Recommendations of the Committee

ACTION: Passed, 1 abstention.

4. Request to Approve March 13, 2006 Meeting Minutes

MOTION: Zanjani/Rojas. To approve the minutes as written

ACTION: Passed Unanimously

5. Chair's Report – Leah Wilds

Chair Leah Wilds encouraged senators to attend the open fora and receptions for the presidential candidates. To date, the regents have voted to approve all the recommendations of the advisory committee. Wilds talked about items that would be on next years agendas for the senate, they would continue to look at the code and bylaws and would work with system counsel and administration regarding the code and bylaws issues, the senate would be working on allowing evaluations to be grieved again, housing issues, sick leave accrual, reviving the Institutional Budget and Planning committee (107), and developing charges for the senate standing committees. Wilds also asked that the outgoing senators stay for the 2nd part of the May 10, 2006 meeting to participate in it, and impart their wisdom and experiences to the new senators. Senators requested that parking issues be added to the agenda for next year. Wilds asked for senators to bring their ideas forward for other agenda items and topics that they would like discussed next year. At the May meeting, Wilds requested that all senators stay through the changing of the guard and pass their tips and information to the new senators.

6. Year-End Committee Report: Kelly Corrigan, Administrative Faculty Personnel Policies & Procedures Committee

Kelly Corrigan thanked her committee members for their service and the senate for allowing committee travel funds to members.

The committee made the following recommendations:

- In evaluating its findings, the Committee developed a two-fold recommendation. First, the Committee feels that there is no need for an administrative personnel committee to exist within every department or college within the University. In order to address administrative personnel questions, issues, research new processes, obtain feedback, etc. we recommend the creation of a single administrative faculty personnel committee. We recommend that it fall within the jurisdiction of Human Resources but would include 2 members of this Committee (AFPPP). This global

committee would act as a resource to administrative faculty on an individual basis as well as to department heads and Deans who have administrative faculty within their areas. If a College or department wants to pursue the use of peer review for administrative faculty within its area(s), this committee could assist in defining true peers across the different colleges and departments within the University. If this recommendation is not acceptable, a smaller step of surveying administrative faculty themselves regarding the need for a "personnel committee" may be conducted. The second component of this recommendation involves addressing the annual evaluation process and form used for administrative faculty since this seems to be the role of the "personnel/peer review committees" that exist. This Committee is aware that the Faculty Senate's Morale Task Force has also been considering this issue. In meeting with Patty Charles of the Task Force, this Committee originally discussed assuming responsibility for addressing these issues however, in very recent developments, Human Resources has convened an Administrative Faculty Evaluation Task Force. After having the AFPPP Chair attend the first meeting held March 29th, the Committee recommends having one representative sit on this Task Force to address the administrative faculty evaluation form and process.

- The AFPPP supports Salary and Benefits Committee recommendations including "we strongly recommend that steps be taken to collect, verify, and use years of relevant experience and relevant educational degrees instead of age in the future. This process would require allocation of sufficient administrative resources and time to complete. The relevancy of experience and educational degrees should be established according to approved position descriptions." The AFPPP agrees that since degrees and years of experience are on the PDQs that they also be considered in any salary assessments. The AFPPP feels that it is critical for a Salary and Benefits Committee member represent their findings and recommendations to HR.
- Continue to host brown bag luncheons. Next year consider a Human Resources "panel". Highlight the specialty of each panel member in the promotion of the luncheon in order for administrative faculty to understand the extent of the questions that may be answered. Consider surveying administrative faculty for future topics of interest.

The committee recommended the following new charges for next year:

- Assign two committee members to sit on a Human Resources Administrative Faculty Personnel Committee. As per our first recommendation in Charge #1, this global committee would act as a resource to administrative faculty on an individual basis as well as to department heads and Deans who have administrative faculty within their areas. If a College or department wants to pursue the use of peer review for administrative faculty within its area(s), this committee could assist in defining true peers across the different colleges and departments within the University.
- Assign one committee member to sit on the Human Resources Administrative Faculty Evaluation Task Force to address the administrative faculty evaluation form and process. The AFPPP can then provide input into the form and process.
- Work with HR to assess the composition of the faculty at the University to determine whether more emphasis needs to be placed on administrative faculty

issues. Investigate the ratio of academic faculty to administrative faculty for the past 5-10 years.

MOTION: Gardella/Beekun. To approve and accept the report and recommendations of the committee

ACTION: Passed unanimously

7. Year-End Committee Report: Howard Goldbaum, Technology Committee:

Howard Goldbaum thanked the committee members for their hard work. The committee's main recommendation was to have the senate and the executive board request more funding for the software acquisition program. Last year they could only fund approximately 1/3 of the requests. The IT survey should roll out on Monday, which was designed by Shannon Rahming. The university was participating in a trial of SMARTTHINKING a new web based "remote tutoring" service. If faculty would like to participate please contact Goldbaum. The committee also looked at issues regarding: Cable access, email storage size, the new phone system, and SPAM issues.

Senators were concerned about the number of new software programs that faculty had to learn. Some of the software issues were Digital Measures, and the new search software, some senators would like to see more expertise from IT on niche software.

Gardella suggested that the Niche software concerns should be considered for the committees next years charges.

MOTION: Shannon/Chenin. To approve the report and recommendations with the suggestion from Gardella.

ACTION: Passed unanimously

8. Year-End Committee Report: Steve Hayes, Academic Standards Committee:

The report was approximately 50 pages so an executive summary was sent out with the packet, the committee conducted a survey, and 332 faculty participated in the survey and reported approximately 1,030 instances of academic dishonesty over the last 3 years. The recommendations of the committee were as follows:

1. To increase visibility –

- The President and/or Provost should make clear to the University community the importance of the issue of academic dishonesty to the integrity of the University.

2. Education and Resources –

- A faculty workshop designed to help discourage academic dishonesty should be created and made available to faculty on a voluntary basis. The procedures to be followed in such cases should be included in this training. Faculty should learn about proactive strategies to prevent academic dishonesty (e.g., creating multiple tests, Turnitin.com), not just the methods to address it once it has occurred.
- Faculty and student Web sites on academic dishonesty issues, resources, and an online tutorial defining plagiarism and how to avoid it, should be established.
- New faculty orientation should thoroughly address these issues.
- Students should be made aware of the University policies on academic dishonesty and the resources available to understand and avoid it in a pamphlet to be handed out at new-student orientation.

- Faculty should be made aware of the current University policies on academic dishonesty (e.g., the need to report cases of dishonesty to SJA).
- The university should make available standard language for course syllabi concerning the definition of academic dishonesty/plagiarism and the academic and disciplinary sanctions that will be imposed should it occur. We suggest that SJA be tasked with generating that language.
- Additional resources should be provided to SJA and other units tasked with the additional prevention, training and enforcement activities envisioned in this report in order to enable practical application of the increased campus importance being placed on dealing effectively with academic dishonesty.

3. Detection –

- The campus should buy a license to Turnitin.com adequate to cover faculty wishing to use it. The nature and of this software program will be described in more detail in the main body of the report, but in brief it allows faculty to require that papers submitted for courses be submitted to a web portal and screened for possible plagiarism.

4. Reporting –

- A streamlined, web-based reporting system should be put into place that would allow instructors to inform the Office of Student Judicial Affairs easily of cases of academic dishonesty.
- The time frame for faculty to report on incident of academic dishonesty should be extended to 15 working days

5. Sanctions –

- The campus should adopt a policy successful pioneered at the State University of New York – Stony Brook: Students should receive a “Q” for courses in which there has been significant academic dishonesty indicating that this has occurred. For purposes of the student’s grade point average, a Q is treated as an F. Upon successful completion of a non-credit course on academic dishonesty, its social costs, and methods for avoiding it, the Q would be changed to the grade determined by the original instructor, for a non-egregious first time offender. These sanctions are in addition to any other disciplinary and academic sanctions provided through normal processes. In the case of egregious offences or in the case of a repeat offences the potential for deletion of the Q grade from a student’s record would not normally be possible.
- If a student retakes a course with an existing poor grade received due to academic dishonesty, the original grade should not be removed from the transcript.
- While the limit of an academic sanction assigned by the instructor is an F in the course, as part of judicial review, instructors themselves should have the right to request additional sanctions as part of the judicial process of determining additional administrative sanctions (such as the right to refuse re-admission to the course section taught by them).
- A mechanism should be developed for noting on the student’s transcript actions taken regarding academic dishonesty that do not involve a specific course (e.g., research

projects; TA work; etc). The permanence of this notation should be treated the same as the Q grade for in class dishonesty.

- A student's home department should be informed of incidents of academic dishonesty, so that advisors and other key parties will be informed of the student's situation
 - UNR should develop sanctioning guidelines and case studies to guide faculty in the academic sanction area. Normally, the minimum penalty should be at least a grade of "F" on the assignment; in many cases, a grade of "F" in the course should be the appropriate penalty. We recommended offering a 1 or 2 step grade reduction for the entire course in addition to the current choices. It should be a very exceptional situation in which students would be permitted to rewrite plagiarized essays, retake exams on which cheating has occurred, or withdraw without penalty from courses in which an accusation of academic dishonesty has been made.
6. Policy Clarity and Future Directions –
- We recommend that the University Code of Conduct and Policies (section IV, "Academic Standards") should in separate sections lay out explicitly the nature of possible academic and administrative sanctions, and distinguish these two types of sanctions clearly.
 - Beyond our specific recommendations in this area, a more comprehensive and consistent set of guidelines for disciplinary action in both the academic and administrative sanction area should continue to be developed and implemented. These should involve progressively more severe disciplinary actions based on the degree of academic dishonesty. In the administrative sanction area, repeated instances should be treated very seriously.

The committee recommended that the next year's committee draft an honor code. There was discussion regarding the Q grade and if it would create legal issues and grade point averages. The Q grade would only stay on the student's record if the student did not take the course on academic dishonesty, or if it was a repeat or an egregious offense. Senators questioned what a significant or egregious offense would be. They also discussed how important it was to educate the student as to what academic dishonesty consisted of and to educate faculty on the policies. Melisa Choroszy spoke about the Q grade and that it would have to go through NSHE. NSHE has a grading system, so a change such as this would need to be agreed upon by all of the colleges in the system and then approved by the Board of Regents. More discussion ensued on these topics

MOTION: Phaneuf/Beekun. To approve the recommendations of the committee

ACTION: Passed, 1 opposed 3 abstentions.

9. New Business:

None

Meeting Adjourned 5:05 pm

Faculty Senate
Faculty Senate Bylaws and Code Committee
2005-06 Final Report
Submitted by: Mary Wilson
April 28, 2006

Committee Membership

Duncan Aldrich, John Davis, Fred DeRafols, Robin Gonzalez, Susan Lentz, Carol Ort, Vicki Toy-Smith, and Mary Wilson.

Committee Annual and Standing Charges

2005-06 Charges

1. Reexamine the procedures for initiating a grievance as well as composition and duties of the University Grievance Committee.
2. Revisit the proposed Bylaws changes that were rejected by the 2004-05 Faculty Senate. Identify the issues that led to rejection and consider alternatives that resolve those issues. Recommend new or revised Code language where the Code conflicts with the UNR Bylaws and where the committee believes that it is in the best interest of the faculty for the Code to come into compliance with the UNR Bylaws.

Standing Charges

3. Chair serves on the Administrative Policy Review Board. Report as necessary to give senators an opportunity to provide input on proposed changes.
4. In consultation with the executive board, review all proposed revisions to the NSHE Code and analyze the potential impact of such revisions on faculty. In the event that those revisions are implemented at the system level, make recommendations regarding whether affected sections of the UNR Bylaws should be reconciled with the Code revisions. In instances where the committee finds a discrepancy between the UNR Bylaws and the Code, and believes that the position taken in the UNR Bylaws is preferable to the position taken in the Code, make recommendations for modifying the Code.
5. In consultation with the executive board, review and make recommendations on new or revised unit and department bylaws. The following units have submitted bylaws for review:
 - a. School of Social Work
 - b. Managerial Sciences
 - c. College of Liberal Arts

Detailed Committee Activity
(For Each Annual and Standing Charge)

- Research and findings
None required
- Actions taken

- Charge 1 - the grievance sections of the UNR Bylaws were revised and approved by the Faculty Senate January 20, 2006.
 Charge 2 - changes to the remaining sections of the UNR Bylaws which were rejected by the 2004-05 Faculty Senate were reviewed, revised and presented to the 2005-06 Faculty Senate at their November 17th meeting. These sections were modified and approved by the Senate. All UNR bylaws revisions were submitted to the UNR faculty for a vote and were approved March 9, 2006.
 Charge 3 - the committee chair has participated in the monthly Administrative Manual Policy Review Board meetings via compressed video. She has submitted several policies to the Senate executive board to review for feedback regarding the impact on faculty.
 Charge 4 - to date, there have been no Code changes to review.
 Charge 5 - the committee completed the reviews of the College of Liberal Arts bylaws, the Managerial Sciences bylaws, and the School of Social Work bylaws and the comments have been submitted to the Faculty Senate chair.

- Recommendations (if applicable)
 1. The committee recommends that the bylaws model developed by the 2001-2002 Bylaws and Code committee be updated and implemented to promote consistency, clarity, and equity among bylaws throughout the campus.

 2. After reviewing the School of Social Work's bylaws and the Department of Managerial Sciences bylaws, the committee discussed the difficulty of the task of reviewing bylaws since many campus bylaws lacked consistency and clarity. Since it is a standing charge of this committee to review and make recommendations on new or revised unit and department bylaws, the committee believes there is need for change in this process in order to be more consistent and accurate with the reviews it conducts. To avoid inconsistencies, contradictions, and inequities across campus, we recommend that all unit and department bylaws be rewritten to follow the new model suggested above, adding to the model to fit their situations as needed. This would provide more consistency, clarity, and equity among the many bylaws on campus and reduce one factor identified as contributing to low morale. It would increase confidence from the faculty and administration in the committee's ability to review bylaws with accuracy and efficiency. The new model would answer many questions for unit and department bylaw committees about what should and should not be included, streamlining and reducing the difficulty involved with the process. Such a method would make it easier to have an objective third party offer interpretations of bylaws either as a formal or informal opinion if disagreements arise.

 3. The committee recommends the development of a bylaws review procedure that tracks the progress of bylaws as they proceed through the approval process. The committee also suggests that the committee comments become part of the bylaws approval submission, that the respective unit and department committees respond to the comments, and that the committee receive feedback from the units and colleges so that they can evaluate the usefulness of the comments.

**Faculty Senate
Campus Affairs Committee
2005-06 Year End Report
Submitted by: Jane Bessette, Chair
April 10, 2006**

Committee Membership

Jane Bessette, Linda Brunson, Donnelly Curtis, Ted Oleson, Ann Tyler, Dhanesh Chandra, Tom King, Carley Ries, Jaime Leanos, Steven Oberg.

Committee Annual & Standing Charges

Charge 1. Review, evaluate & report on the hiring, termination, and reassignment actions for deans and above from 1995 - 2005.

Charge 2. Review the current Professional Development Leave guidelines and process, especially the criteria and method used to evaluate applications. Gather information about other institutions' guidelines. Ask faculty who have served on the committee over the past 10 or so years for their input about the guidelines, criteria and process. Consider whether the committee guidelines and process should be modified. If yes, draft a proposal for recommendation to the senate.

Charge 3. Appoint one each liaison to the following committees; Status of Women; Work and Family Task Force; Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Advocacy Committee; Multiethnic coalition; Intercultural Collaborative; University Disabilities Resource Coalition.

Detailed Committee Activity

Research & Findings:

Charge 1. Researched code and bylaws regarding hiring practices. Invited Michael Coray and Gena Jones to meet the committee and discuss concerns/actions in our charge. Learned that the President may "waive" a search. Other conditions that might cause an appointment outside of the search procedures include, failed searches and conditions of interim appointments. Lack of communication regarding process used in interim appointments as well as reassignments may lead to misunderstandings. Due to pending legal processes, individuals involved in reassignments are not willing to discuss matters.

Charge 2. Gathered names of past Leave Committee Chairs and talked with the two past chairs. They reported that the condition of the applications was not consistent and in fact some applicants had not followed directions which resulted in denial. A

workshop including a power point presentation for applicants has been created and offered, as well as videotaped for future use.

Recommendations from past Sabbatical/Faculty Development Leave Committees does not appear to have been implemented, i.e. succession planning in the chair position, committee members not allowed to submit applications for leave, documentation of the process.

Requested and received a list of number of leaves requested/approved by department. Analyzed leaves requested/approved/denied and determined there are no clear patterns of denial, with most departments having very high success rates. The major observation is that it seems like a majority of the faculty in the English department are usually on sabbatical! The other observation is that sabbaticals are not widely used and many departments have had no applicants or only one or two over the last decade.

Actions Taken:

Charge 1.

- a) Requested Human Resources to provide the committee with the list of Presidential Search Waivers and the justifications if any.
- b) Prepared a listing of the code/bylaws hierarchy governing the search process.
- c) Prepared a timeline of individuals who have served in executive level positions to document history and compare to HR information.
- d) . Have requested information regarding reasons individuals vacated their positions and if there is a designated time when the search waivers are reported to the Board of Regents. **STILL PENDING.**

Charge 2.

- a) Analyzed approval/denials for trends, none found.
- b) Reviewed application documentation and presentation information. Found that a video presentation is also available.
- c) Prepared a list of questions regarding the process and committee and forwarded them to Audrey Casey for answers or forwarding to the committee chair. **ANSWERS STILL PENDING.**

- How many people are on the leave committee?
- What is its make-up between admin and academic faculty, is there an ideal or is it just who happened to be interested?
- Is the criteria scoring sheet actually used by everyone on the committee?
- Are the scores added or averaged?
- What kind of feedback if any, is given to those individuals who are not approved?
- Can an application be submitted without letters of support recognizing they would be missing 10 points?
- Why can't external letters of support be accepted?
- What is an individuals alternative if they and their supervisor & or dean don't get along?
- Are past applications for leave available for review by new applicants?
- What is the process?
- Would it be possible to post "stellar" proposal examples on the web or in the library?
- Have past concerns been brought to the committee that need to be looked at?

Charge 3. Appointed the following committee members as liaisons -
Donnelyn Curtis - Status of Women;
Ann Tyler - Work and Family Task Force;
Jane Bessette- Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Advocacy Committee;
Jaimie Leanos - Multiethnic Coalition;
Carley Ries - Intercultural Collaborative;
Tom King - University Disabilities Resource Coalition.

Recommendations:

Charge 1 - Create a communication process around the search and appointment process so that the university community is informed. Determine what form of governance this campus will run under, AAUP or Corporate. We believe the confusion in this area results from the merging of these two forms of governance.

Charge 2 - Proposal scores be regrouped to show that the proposal is worth 46 points, past accomplishments 35 points and letters of support/years since last leave 19 points. The way the criteria form is set up, it appears that past accomplishments has the greatest weight in an application.

Communication of those individuals approved for leave, time period and activity/project they will be working on.

Instead of all approved proposals being available for viewing, only select stellar proposals. Perhaps have stellar proposals available in the library as well as provosts office? Or even better, saved to the web?

Requests for Assistance:

Permission to send out an email to faculty requesting concerns surrounding the faculty development leave process.

Recommended charges for next year:

None at this time.

-----Original Message-----

From: Jane Bessette [<mailto:bessette@unr.edu>]

Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 4:02 PM

To: Gena Jones; Tim C McFarling

Subject: Campus Affairs Committee

Gena & Tim,

First let me thank you both for the previous research and report you provided the Campus Affairs Committee regarding search waivers and the searches conducted in the past three years.

After reviewing the BOR section regarding search waivers you provided, I was wondering if and when the "annual reporting" of the search waivers is presented to the Chancellor & Board of Regents...is there a regular annual meeting that this usually occurs at or is it basically done when and if needed? Do you know? **This is normally requested by the system office sometime in the spring (we have not received the request yet this year). I believe it is combined in a report to the board for all institutions. To my knowledge it is not an agenda item.**

Also, after providing a mid-year report to the Faculty Senate Exec Committee, I was asked if exit interviews are routinely done with academic and administrative faculty members...if so, is there a basic form or questions that are used? **The departments send a questionnaire to terminated faculty members. They are asked to complete it and return it to HR. I review those and pass on to appropriate Dean. Here is the link to the form.**

<http://www.unr.edu/vpaf/hr/forms/documents/exitquestionnaire-faculty.doc>

The other question that was asked, is for those searches that were conducted from 2003-06 that Tim provided the report for, what were the reasons the positions were vacated by the predecessors... Took another job, asked to resign, etc.. **The reason for separation is confidential**

If you could shed some light on these areas, it would be very helpful.

Thanks,

Jane

Campus Affairs Committee Chair

775-784-4912

bessette@unr.edu

Questions to be answered by Audrey Casey & Faculty Development Leave Committee:

How many people are on the leave committee -

What is its make-up between admin and academic faculty

Is the criteria scoring sheet actually used by everyone on the committee

Are the scores added or averaged

Letters of Support

Can an application be submitted without letters of support recognizing they would be missing 10 points

Why can't external letters of support be accepted?

What kind of feedback if any, is given to those individuals who are not approved?

Can an email be sent to all faculty requesting their input on concerns?

Recommendations at this time:

Proposal scores be regrouped to show that the proposal is worth 46 points, past accomplishments 35 points and letters of support/years since last leave 19 points

Instead of all approved proposals being available for viewing, only select stellar proposals.

Perhaps have stellar proposals available in the library as well as provosts office? Or even better, saved to the web?

Sabbatical Applications and Approvals by Department
1995-2005

Dept	Total Submitted	Total Approved	Success Rate
Acad skills	1	1	100%
Acct/cis	11	6	55%
anthropology	6	6	100%
applied econ	6	6	100%
art	12	9	75%
basque studies	2	2	100%
biochem-ag	3	3	100%
biology	12	12	100%
c & I	8	8	100%
CEP	3	2	67%
chem/met eng	3	2	67%
chemistry	10	10	100%
civil eng	7	7	100%
CJ	4	3	75%
comp sci	3	3	100%
coop ext	6	4	67%
CTL	1	1	100%
economics	5	5	100%
Edu health service	1	1	100%
edu leadership	2	2	100%
edu spec	2	2	100%
electrical eng	6	6	100%
ETP	1	0	0%
english	36	32	89%
env sci	1	0	0%
ers	6	6	100%
fil	14	10	71%
geography	6	6	100%
geology	4	4	100%
geophysics	1	1	100%
geo sciences	11	10	91%
hdfs	7	5	71%
health ecology	3	3	100%
history	16	15	94%
holocaust ctr	2	2	100%
int medicine	1	1	100%
journalism	2	2	100%
library	2	1	50%
mgr science	18	12	67%
math	13	13	100%
mech eng	8	8	100%
microbiology	3	3	100%
mining eng	2	1	50%

	Total	Total	Success
	Submitted	Approved	Rate
music	6	5	83%
NRES	3	2	67%
nursing	3	3	100%
NSL/DGS	1	1	100%
nutrition	3	3	100%
NVBMG	3	3	100%
OISS	1	1	100%
oral history	1	1	100%
pathology	1	1	100%
pediatrics	1	1	100%
philosophy	6	5	83%
physics	9	8	89%
poli sci	7	7	100%
psychiatry	1	0	0%
psychology	9	9	100%
psych and behav sci	1	1	100%
sanford ctr	1	1	100%
seismology	1	1	100%
social work	6	5	83%
sociology	6	5	83%
speech path	2	2	100%
speech thtr	4	3	75%
Total	347	304	88%

Title 4, Chapter 8, Section 6.2

2. It is the objective of the NSHE to conduct internal or external searches for all full-time and half-time professional staff positions (defined in Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 2) with the exception of Temporary Part-time Faculty (defined in Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 32). **The institutional President or Chancellor may waive the search requirement where he or she determines the waiver to be in the best interest of the institution or System unit.** Each institution and System unit must have an internal process for requesting search waivers and for obtaining the approval of the institutional President or Chancellor. Each institution or System unit will be expected to maintain a list of search waivers and to report to the Chancellor and the Board annually.

SABBATICAL/FACULTY DEVELOPMENT LEAVES 1995 - 2006

Years	Number of Sabbatical Leaves Available	Number of Faculty Development Leaves Available	Number of Applications Submitted	Number of Applications Approved	# of Applications Denied
2005-2006	15	15	36 (see breakdown by dept. below)	30 (see breakdown by dept. below)	6 (see breakdown by dept. below)
2004-2005	15	15	36 (see breakdown by dept. below)	30 (see breakdown by dept. below)	6 (see breakdown by dept. below)
2003-2004	14	14	42 (see breakdown by dept. below)	28 (see breakdown by dept. below)	14 (see breakdown by dept. below)
2002-2003	14	14	32 (see breakdown by dept. below)	28 (see breakdown by dept. below)	4 (see breakdown by dept. below)
2001-2002	14	14	28 (see breakdown by dept. below)	28 (see breakdown by dept. below)	None
2000-2001	14	15	29 (see breakdown by dept. below)	29 (see breakdown by dept. below)	None
1999-2000	14	14	33 (see breakdown by dept. below)	28 (see breakdown by dept. below)	5 (see breakdown by dept. below)
1998-1999	14	14	36 (see breakdown by dept. below)	28 (see breakdown by dept. below)	6 (see breakdown by dept. below)
1997-1998	14	15	29 (see breakdown by dept. below)	29 (see breakdown by dept. below)	None
1996-1997	16	8	27 (see breakdown by dept. below)	24 (see breakdown by dept. below)	3 (see breakdown by dept. below)
1995-1996	13	9	22 (see breakdown by dept. below)	22 (see breakdown by dept. below)	None

2005-06

Applications Submitted (by department):

Anthropology (1); Art (2); Biology (1); Civil & Environ Engr. (1); Coop. Ext. (2); Economics (2); Edu. Specialties (1); English (4); FLL (2); Geography (1); Geological Sci. (2); Holocaust Stds. (1); History (2); Internal Med. (1); Journalism (1); Mgr Science (3); Math (2); Mech. Engr. (1); Microbiology (1); Music (1); NRES (3); Psychology (1) = Total 36

Applications Approved (by department):

Anthropology (1); Art (2); Biology (1); Civil & Environ Engr. (1); Coop. Ext. (2); Economics (1); Edu. Specialties (1); English (4); FLL (1); Geography (1); Geological Sci. (2); Holocaust Stds. (1); History (2); Internal Med. (1); Journalism (1); Mgr Science (2); Math (1); Mech. Engr. (1); Microbiology (1); Music (1); NRES (2); Psychology (1) = Total 31

Applications Denied (by department):

*Economics (1); **Biology (1); FLL (1); Mgr. Science (1); Math (1); NRES (1) = Total 5
*Faculty member withdrew; **Faculty member deferred

2004-05

Applications Submitted (by department):

Art (1); Basque Studies (1); CEP (1); Chemistry (2); Comp. Sci. (1); Coop. Ext. (2); CJ (1); CTL (1); Elec. Engr. (1); English (4); Edu. & Health Svc. Outreach (1); Edu. Spec. (1); FLL (3); Geo. Sci. (2); HDFS (1); Health Ecology (1); History (1); Mgr. Science (3); NV Bureau of Mines (1); Pathology (1); Philosophy (1); Psych. & Behav. Sci. (1); Physics (3); Social Work (1) = Total 36

Applications Approved (by department):

Basque Studies (1); CEP (1); Chemistry (2); Comp. Sci. (1); Coop. Ext. (1); CJ (1); CTL (1); Elec. Engr. (1); English (3); Edu. & Health Svc. Outreach (1); Edu. Spec. (1); FLL (2); Geo. Sci. (2); Health Ecology (1); History (1); Mgr. Science (2); NV Bureau of Mines (1); Pathology (1); Philosophy (1); Psych. & Behav. Sci. (1); Physics (3); Social Work (1) = Total 30

Applications Denied (by department):

Art (1); Coop. Ext. (1); English (1); FLL (1); HDFS (1); Mgr. Science (1) = Total 6

2003-04

Applications Submitted (by department):

Acctg/CIS (1); Art (2); Biology (1); CEP (1); C & I (1); CJ (1); Chemistry (1); Civ. Egr. (1); Coop. Ext. (1); Economics (1); English (6); ETP (1); FLL (3); Geol. Sciences (2); History (1); HDFS (1); Mgr. Science (1); Math (1); Mechanical Egr. (2); Nursing (1); NV Bureau of Mines (1); Pediatrics (1); Philosophy (2); Physics (1); Political Science (1); Psychiatry (1); Psychology (2); Seismology (1); Social Work (1); Sociology (1) = Total 42

Applications Approved (by department):

Art (1); Biology (1); C & I (1); CJ (1); Chemistry (1); Civ. Egr. (1); Economics (1); English (4); FLL (1); Geol. Sciences (1); History (1); HDFS (1); Mgr. Science (1); Math (1); Mechanical Egr. (2); Nursing (1); NV Bureau of Mines (1); Pediatrics (1); Philosophy (1); Physics (1); Political Science (1); Psychology (2); Seismology (1) = Total 28

Applications Denied (by department):

Acctg/CIS (1); Art (1); CEP (1); Coop. Ext. (1); English (2); ETP (1); FLL (2); Geol. Sciences (1); Philosophy (1); Psychiatry (1); Social Work (1); Sociology (1) = Total 14

2002-03

Applications Submitted (by department):

Acctg/CIS (1); Applied Econ. & Stats. (1); Biology (2); C & I (1); CJ (1); Chemical Egr. (1); Chemistry (1); Civil Egr. (1); Ed. Leadership (1); English (2); ERS (1); FLL (2); Geography (1); Health Ecol. (1); History (1); Math (3); Mechanical Egr. (1); Mining Egr. (1); Nursing (1); NSL/DGS (1); Physics (2); Psychology (1); Political Science (1); Speech Pathology & Audiology (1); Sociology (2) = Total 32

Applications Approved (by department):

Applied Econ. & Stats. (1); Biology (2); C & I (1); CJ (1); Chemistry (1); Civil Egr. (1); Ed. Leadership (1); English (1); ERS (1); FLL (2); Geography (1); Health Ecol. (1); History (1); Math (3); Mechanical Egr. (1); Nursing (1); NSL/DGS (1); Physics (2); Psychology (1); Political Science (1); Speech Pathology & Audiology (1); Sociology (2) = Total 28

Applications Denied (by department):

Acctg/CIS (1); Chemical Egr. (1); English (1); Mining Egr. (1) = Total 4

2001-2002

Applications Submitted and Granted (by department):

Acctg/CIS (1); Applied Econ. & Stats. (2); Biology (3); C & I (1); Chemistry (2); Elec. Engr. (1); English (3); FLL (1); Geography (1); Health Ecol. (1); Managerial Sciences (1); Math (2); Mechanical Egr. (1); Nursing (1); Nutrition (2); NVBMG (1); OISS (1); Psychology (1); Political Science (1); Speech & Theatre (1) = Total 28

2000-2001

Applications Submitted and Granted (by department):

Acctg/CIS (1); Anthropology (1); Art. (2); Biology (1); C & I (1); CEP (1); Chemistry (1); Civil Egr. (1); Computer Science (1); Elec. Engr. (1); Economics (2); English (3); FLL (1); Geography (1); Geology (3); History (1); Managerial Sciences (1); Music (1); Psychology (2); Social Work (1); Sociology (2) = Total 29

1999-2000

Applications Submitted (by department):

Acctg/CIS (2); Applied Econ. & Stats. (2); Anthropology (1); Art (2); Chemistry (2); Civil Egr. (1); English (1); Env. Science/EGR (1); ERS (1); Geography (1); Geophysics (1); HDFS (1); History (2); Managerial Science (2); Math (2); Mechanical Egr. (1); Mining Egr. (1); Music (1); Nutrition (1); Oral History (1); Philosophy (1); Physics (1); Political Science (1); Sanford Center (1); Speech & Theatre (1); Sociology (1) = Total 33

Applications Approved (by department):

Applied Econ. & Stats. (2); Anthropology (1); Art (1); Chemistry (2); Civil Egr. (1); English (1); ERS (1); Geography (1); Geophysics (1); HDFS (1); History (2); Managerial Science (2); Math (2); Mechanical Egr. (1); Mining Egr. (1); Nutrition (1); Oral History (1); Philosophy (1); Physics (1); Political Science (1); Sanford Center (1); Speech & Theatre (1); Sociology (1) = Total 28

Applications Denied (by department):

Acctg/CIS (2); Art (1); Env. Science/EGR (1); Music (1) = Total 5

1998-1999

Applications Submitted (by department):

Academic Skills Ctr. (1); Acctg/CIS (2); Applied Econ. & Stats. (1); Anthropology (2); Art (1); Biochemistry (1); Biology (2); Civil Egr. (2); CJ (1); English (5); Geography (1); Geological Sciences (3); HDFS (1); History (3); Journalism (1); Library (1); Managerial Science (3); Math (2); Music (1); Speech & Theatre (1); Social Work (1) = Total 36

Applications Approved (by department):

Academic Skills Ctr. (1); Acctg/CIS (1); Applied Econ. & Stats. (1); Anthropology (2); Art (1); Biochemistry (1); Biology (2); Civil Egr. (2); English (5); Geography (1); Geological Sciences (3); History (3); Journalism (1); Math (2); Music (1); Social Work (1) = Total 28

Applications Denied (by department):

Acctg/CIS (1); CJ (1); HDFS (1); Library (1); Managerial Science (3); Speech & Theatre (1) = Total 8

1997-1998

Applications Submitted and Granted (by department):

Acct/CIS (1); Biochem – Ag (1); Biology (1); C & I (1); Elec. Engr. (2); English (3); ERS (3); Geology (1); HDFS (1); History (3); Holocaust Cntr. (1); Mech. Egr. (1); Microbiology (1); Mgr. Science (2); Music (2); Physics (1); Psychology (2); Speech Path (1); Speech/Theatre (1) = Total 29

1996-1997

Applications Submitted (by department):

Anthropology (1); Art (1); Basque Stds. (1); Biology (1); C & I (1); Chem/Met Engr. (1); Chemistry (1); Edu. Leadership (1); Elec. Engr. (1); English (5); ERS (1); FLL (2); History (1); Mgr. Science (2); Philosophy (2); Physics (1); Political Sci. (2); Psychology (1); Social Work (1) = Total 27

Applications Approved (by department):

Anthropology (1); Art (1); Basque Stds. (1); Biology (1); C & I (1); Chem/Met Engr. (1); Chemistry (1); Edu. Leadership (1); Elec. Engr. (1); English (5); ERS (1); FLL (2); Mgr. Science (1); Philosophy (2); Political Sci. (2); Psychology (1); Social Work (1) = Total 24

Applications Denied (by department):

History (1); Mgr. Science (1); Physics (1) = Total 3

1995-1996

Applications Submitted and Granted (by department):

Acct/CIS (2); Art (1); Biochem – Ag (1); Biology (1); C & I (2); Chem/Met Engr. (1); Comp. Sci. (1); Coop. Ext. (1); Economics (1); Geo. Sciences (2); HDFS (2); History (1); Library (1); Math (1); Mech. Engr. (1); Microbiology (1); Political Sci. (1); Social Work (1) = Total 22

Executive positions:

Position	Current occupant	Previous -->				
President	Interim: Joe Crowley, 2005-	John Lilley, 2001-2005 (search)	Interim: Steve McFarland, 2001	Joe Crowley to 2000		
VP for Academic Affairs --> Provost	John Frederick, 2002- (appointed)	Interim: John Frederick, 2001	Dave Westfall, 1996-2001			
Vice Provost (VPAF)	Jannet Vreeland, 2003- (internal search)	Carol Ort				
Vice Provost for Instruction	Bill Cathey					
Vice Provost for Ext. Stud.	Fred Holman, 2004 - (search)	Neal Ferguson, 1981-2003				
VP for Administration and Finance	Ron Zurek, 2004 (appointed)	Interim: Ron Zurek, 2003-2004	Ashok Chingra - 2003			
Associate VP for IRT --> VP for IT	Steve Zink, 2001 (appointed in 1997, upgraded)					
VP for Research & Dean of Grad School	Mark Brenner, 2005- (search)	Interim: Marsha Reed, 2004-2005	Linda Brinkley, 2001-2004 (search)	Ken Hunter, 1989-2001		
VP for Student Services	Shannon Ellis, 1997- (appointed)	Pat Miltenberger, 1987-1997				
VP for Development & Alumni Relations	John Carothers, 2005- (appointed)	Interim: John Carothers, 2004	Marilyn Johnson, 2002-2004 (search)	Interim? Bill Kemp, 2002	Interim: Bob Eggleston, 2001	Paul Page, 1989-2001
Communications --> Univ. Relations --> VP for Marketing & Commun.	Cindy Pollard, 2004- (search)	Robert Bruce, 2002-2003 (search)	Sandy Rogers, 1997-2001			
Dean and Vice President of Health Sciences	John McDonald, 2004 - (search)	Interim Dean: Steve McFarlane, 2001-2004	Bob Miller, 1999-2001 (search)	Bob Daugherty, 1982-1999		
Deans						
Mines	incorporated into College of Science	Interim: Jim Tarank, 2003	Jane Long, 1997-2002 (search)			
Arts and Sciences	split into CLA and CoS	Erik Herzik, 2003	Bob Mead, 1996-2002			
Liberal Arts	Heather Handy, 2005 - (search)	Interim: Erik Herzik, 2004-2005				
School of the Arts	Larry Engstrom, 2004 - (appointed)					
Science	Dave Westfall, 2004 - (search)	Interim: Dave Westfall, 2004				
School of Mines	Jim Tarank, 2004- (appointed)	Interim: Jim Tarank, 2004				
Journalism	Cole Campbell, 2004- (search)	Interim: Jennifer Greer, 2002-2003	Joanne Lee, 2001	Bill Slater - 1999-2001	Interim: Travis Linn, 1997-1998	Jimmy Gentry, 1992-1997
Business	Mike Reed, 1993 -					
Engineering	Ted Batchman, 1995 -					
CABNR	David Thawley, 1998 - (search)	Bernard Jones				
Cooperative Extension	Karen Hinton, 1998- (first Dean)					
Education	Bill Sparkman, 1996 - (search)					
Human and Community Services	Interim: Charlie Bulcock, 2005-	Jean Perry, 1990-2005 (first Dean)				
Libraries	Steve Zink, 1995 - (search)	Interim: Steve Zink, 1993-1995				
Academy for the Environment	Interim: Mike Colopy, 2005-					
Institute for Innovation and Informatics	Tim Casey, 2005					

Non-Search Report

Worksheet 1a

Search Conducted				
College/Unit	Department	Position Title	Name	Date of Hire
PROVOST	Extended Studies	Vice Provost For Extended Studies	Fred Holman	1/1/2004
JOURN	Journalism	Dean, Reynolds School of Journ	Cole C. Campbell	7/1/2004
MDDN	President	VP Health Sciences, Dean	John McDonald	7/1/2004
PRES	Marketing & Communications	Vice President, Marketing & Communications	Cynthia Pollard	3/1/2004
PROVOST	Liberal Arts	Dean, College of Liberal Arts	Heather Hardy	
PRES	Graduate School	Vice President for Research/Dean of the Graduate	Mark Brenner	
Internal Promotion				
College/Unit	Department	Position Title	Name	Date of Hire
VPAF	Admin & Finance, VP	Admin & Finance, Vice President	Ronald Zurek	7/1/2004
DAR	DAR	Vice President Development and Alumni Relations	John Carothers	1/14/2005
SCDN	Dean's Office	Dean, Science	David Westfall	7/1/2004
Waiver, External Hire				
College/Unit	Department	Position Title	Name	Date of Hire
PRES	Intercollegiate Athletics	Director, Intercollegiate Athletics	Cary Sue Groth	4/15/2004
PRES	Economic Development	Director of Economic Development	Tim Casey	7/1/2005
Positions Vacant				
College/Unit	Department	Position Title	Name	Term Date
		Vice President Development and Alumni Relations	Marilyn Johnson	
		Dean, Arts & Sciences		
		Vice President for Research/Dean of the Graduate Sch	Linda Brinkley	
		Dean, Science	None New Position	
		Vice President, Marketing & Communications	Robert Bree	
		Admin & Finance, Vice President	Ashok	
		Director, Intercollegiate Athletics	Ault	
		Dean, Reynolds School of Journ		
		Vice Provost for Extended Studies		

Search and Search Waiver Information for Dean and Above Positions
2003-2006

Searches Conducted 2003-2006

College/Unit	Department	Position Title	Name	Date of Hire
PROVOST	Extended Studies	Vice Provost For Extended Studies	Fred Holman	1/1/2004
JOURN	Journalism	Dean, Reynolds School of Journ	Cole C. Campbell	7/1/2004
MDDN	President	VP Health Sciences, Dean	John McDonald	7/1/2004
PRES	Marketing & Communications	Vice President, Marketing & Communications	Cynthia Pollard	3/1/2004
PROVOST	Liberal Arts	Dean, College of Liberal Arts	Heather Hardy	8/1/2005
PRES	Graduate School	Vice President for Research/Dean of the Graduate	Mark Brenner	8/8/2005
PRES	Intercollegiate Athletics	Director, Intercollegiate Athletics	Cary Sue Groth	4/15/2004
PROV	Provost	Vice Provost	Jannet Vreeland	1/1/2003
LADN	Dean's Office	Interim Dean, Arts & Science/Liberal Arts	Eric Herzik	1/1/2003
HCDN	Dean's Office	Interim Dean, Health and Community Science	Charlie Bullock	1/1/2006

Internal Appointments (Waivers) 2003-2006

College/Unit	Department	Position Title	Name	Date of Hire
VPAF	Admin & Finance, VP	Admin & Finance, Vice President	Ronald Zurek	7/1/2004
DAR	DAR	Vice President Development and Alumni Relations	John Carothers	1/14/2005
SCDN	Dean's Office	Dean, Science	David Westfall	7/1/2004

Vacated Positions 2003 - 2006

College/Unit	Department	Position Title	Name	Term Date
DAR	DAR	Vice President Development and Alumni Relations	Marilyn Johnson	8/30/2004
ASDN	Dean's Office	Dean, Arts & Sciences	Robert Mead	12/31/2003
PRES	Graduate School	Vice President for Research/Dean of the Graduate School	Linda Brinkley	8/7/2004
SCDN	Dean's Office	Dean, Science	None New Position	
PRES	Marketing & Comm.	Vice President, Marketing & Communications	Robert Bruce	7/28/2003
VPAF	Admin & Finance, VP	Admin & Finance, Vice President	Ashok Dhingra	8/30/2003
PRES	Intercollegiate Athletics	Director, Intercollegiate Athletics	Chris Ault	8/30/2004
JOUR	Journalism	Dean, Reynolds School of Journ	Joann Lee	8/30/2004
PROVOST	Extended Studies	Associate Vice President/Dean	Neal Ferguson	8/30/2003
PROVOST	Provost	Vice Provost	Carol Ort	12/31/2003
MDDN	President	VP Health Sciences, Dean	Stephen McFarlane	8/30/2004
HCDN	Dean's Office	Dean, Health and Community Sciences	Jean Perry	12/31/2005

Internal Search

Failed Search - Dean, College of Science

UNR Faculty Senate Morale Task Force 2005-2006 Final Report

Submitted by: Bourne Morris, Chair
May 10, 2006

Committee Membership

Glen Atkinson
Patty Charles
Indira Chatterjee
Fred Harris
Gary Haynes
Bourne Morris
Maggie Ressel
Grant Stitt
Jill Wallace
Faculty Senate Liaison; Maureen Cronin

In August 2005, the Morale Task Force was elected by the Faculty Senate and given the task of seeking solutions to the causes of low morale identified in the Ad Hoc Faculty Morale Report of the summer of 2005. Our charge was to solicit input from the university community and recommend solutions to the problems.

In our December mid-year report we expressed serious concern with top-down leadership and advocated partnership between faculty staff and administrators. Some of the top-down decision-making seems to have been addressed.

But, after a year of examining the morale issues on the UNR campus, we conclude that our morale problem is a management problem.

The root causes of continuing complaints from faculty and staff seem directly related to the following:

1. Evaluation of faculty and staff is, for many, a changing process with occasionally unexpected outcomes. Forms change. Criteria change. Evaluators change. Although procedures, goal statements and role statements are designed to maintain the integrity of the process, too often procedures are ignored or misunderstood.
2. When administrators have not been trained in good management practices, they tend to ignore problems or let them fester until they become causes for grievances and lawsuits.
3. Whether because of heavy workloads or an absence of knowledge, deans and vice presidents are often too busy to train their chairs and directors or to address the problems themselves.

In the final analysis, even faculty and staff who did not complain of fear did complain of frustration. So did administrators. And while there is much talk of shared responsibility for the management of the campus, the realities of shared governance have fallen short of the rhetoric.

The recommendations we offered in December and the additional recommendations in this report are designed to address these on-going morale problems.

First, here is a review of the recommendations presented to and accepted by the UNR Faculty Senate in December 2005:

1. Ombudsman

To help people resolve disputes before they reach the level of grievances and lawsuits, we recommended the university hire an Ombudsman. The senate voted to approve and the provost has informed us that a position description is being developed and he is planning a search to fill the position can be filled by July 1.

2. Annual Evaluations for top administrators

To help deans and vice presidents become better informed about problems and potential problems in their units, we recommended that they be evaluated every year by their own faculty and staff. Some top administrators are only evaluated only by the president and some only every three or four years. We felt

this does not provide the kind of current information deans and vice presidents need from those they supervise. The senate approved this recommendation.

As of this report, all but five of the academic and administrative units on campus have developed, or are in the process of developing, a form for the annual evaluation of deans and vice presidents.

The five exceptions are:

- The College of Business Administration
- The College of Science
- IT/Library
- The Graduate School
- Administration and Finance

3. Strategic Planning

Last semester, the deans told us they felt left out of the planning and decision-making process and that too much of this function was given to the University Planning Council (UPC). To help deans reclaim their responsibilities, and because we believe deans and vice presidents should be held accountable for the management of their own units, we recommended (and the senate approved) abolishing the UPC and putting the deans, vice presidents and senate leadership in charge of planning for the campus. This recommendation has been implemented in part. The UPC no longer exists/

We further recommended that strategic planning be coordinated with the university self study.

4. Management Training

To help administrators develop the skills to resolve conflicts and deal effectively with complex personnel problems, we recommended management training programs for all those who supervise personnel in the university. We were aware of a similar recommendation from Human Resources. Since the HR report estimated a very high cost for campus-wide management training, the task force recommended that management training for deans and vice presidents be started as soon as possible so top administrators could help middle managers until overall training begins. We have been told by the provost that some management training may begin in the fall of 2006, "budgets permitting".

5. Communications

To improve communications we recommended the minutes of the Academic Leadership Council meetings be distributed to all faculty. This recommendation has been accepted and implemented.

6. Merit Pay

We recommended no one be excluded from merit because of rank or range. Since this year's merit is yet to be distributed, we don't know if that problem persists.

NEW RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FACULTY SENATE
TO CONSIDER

During the spring semester, we met with associate deans and groups of department chairs and administrative faculty. We also met with the Academic Leadership Council to consider some of the problems facing rotating department chairs. The result of our spring discussions and our recommendations to the senate are detailed as follows.

7. Service

We have concluded that university service is seriously undervalued and that this fact contributes to the perception that shared governance is also undervalued.

Service is not uniformly defined and recognized across campus.

According to the system code, service is defined as: "membership and participation in professional organizations; the ability to work with faculty and students in the best interests of the academic community and the people it serves; service on university or system committees; recognition among colleagues for possessing and the capacity for further significant intellectual and professional achievement; and recognition and respect outside the system community for participation and service in community state or nationwide activity."

Yet, if we look at various colleges and units on campus, "service" is widely and differently defined. For example, some colleges view academic advising as service. Others regard advising as part of teaching. Some view service exclusively as activity performed off campus.

What seems true of all units is that service is not highly regarded or rewarded. This has led to the erosion of faculty governance as few wish to invest time in activities that are seen as relatively unimportant.

Since the Regent's Handbook requires an "excellent" rating in either research or teaching to receive tenure, tenure-track professors are discouraged from doing more than minimal service lest it interfere with their progress. This situation sets up the notion among newly hired faculty that service is not valued. In some cases, faculty proceed through their careers continuing to feel service is not rewarded and behave accordingly.

Recently tenured faculty are told it is "their turn" to run for the Faculty Senate and many of the university committees. Senior faculty and staff who may have done service in the past no longer see a need for their involvement in university committees. The Faculty Senate office reports it can take as many as thirty phone calls to find someone willing to serve on a university committee.

Last summer's Ad Hoc Committee Report described the Faculty Senate as "marginalized and powerless."

So, for all the talk about the importance of shared governance, only a limited number seem willing to accept responsibility for actually sharing the governance. And too many of our most experienced seniors avoid it all together.

We feel it is essential that senior faculty become more involved in service that truly supports the institution. For this to occur, faculty need to be rewarded for service by having service count proportionately to the percentage of their time allocated to it in their role statements. Also, it should be the responsibility of deans and chairs to encourage senior faculty to allocate larger percentages of their time to service activities so that membership on the Faculty Senate and important committees are sought rather than shunned.

The same logic should apply to administrative as well as academic faculty. The result could be that all faculty begin to feel more empowered and more committed to shared governance.

Recommendation: The Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate be charged with 1) examining the role and importance of service in evaluating faculty and staff and 2) seeking ways to encourage senior faculty to fully engage in shared governance on this campus.

Rotating Department Chairs

While examining the role of service, we encountered some particular problems facing the associate professors who are elected to serve as department chairs for three years.

Many seem to feel their “service to the department” although important, interferes with their careers. Several told us they do not have ambitions to become administrators, but they do want to be promoted to full professor and the three years devoted to department duties significantly hampers their ability to do the kind of research required for promotion.

They also feel over-worked, under-staffed, and insufficiently trained to deal with personnel problems in their departments. And despite added stipends and above average merit awards, too many still see the three years put in as a considerable sacrifice.

We believe viewing a critical management role as a thankless task and a sacrifice does not bode well for improvement in morale or in management practices.

Recommendations: Given the importance of the chairs in the university, the Morale Task Force recommends a special ad hoc committee be convened to examine the function of rotating academic chairs and discuss with the current chairs and their deans ways to make this essential work more effective and more desirable. We also recommend establishing a permanent group of seasoned chairs to advise and mentor new department chairs.

8. Joint and Split Appointments

In discussion with faculty who have held joint or split appointments, we learned of some of the following morale problems:

- Expectations were unclear or ambiguous.

- Resources (especially space and funds) were not committed for the long term, or unequally committed by different units.
- There was lack of cooperation between departments/units, or power plays between units
- Appointees perceived lack of support from one or both units
- Appointees received inadequate communication from supervisors

UNR's 2003 Strategic Planning Report recommended the Provost convene a work group in Fall 2003 to create a plan for managing "split" appointments, to be implemented July 1, 2004. As far as we know, no such group ever met.

The 2003 Strategic Planning Report also contained a proposal for two alternative methods to support split appointments¹. Both of the alternatives, College-to-College Programmatic Coordination and Fee-for-Service, would be applicable mainly to split appointments in CABNR, some statewide programs, and perhaps, the College of Medicine.

We do not think these alternative methods are workable outside CABNR, College of Medicine, or statewide programs, because joint (as opposed to split) appointees in the other colleges such as Science and Liberal Arts would be expected to "belong" to each unit sharing the positions. Funding should therefore come from each home unit.

Recommendations:

- We recommend the provost's Office and Human Resources develop detailed yet flexible documents providing guidelines to establish, manage, and evaluate joint appointments. Numerous possible templates and examples are available on the administrative websites of other universities such as Michigan, Missouri, UCLA, Northern Illinois, and Texas A&M.
- We recommend a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) be in place for every joint appointment before an offer letter is dispatched and a contract is prepared. This requires the departments/units to cooperate at the outset in designing all aspects of an individual's work assignment. It also requires cooperation in securing guarantees about funding and contingency plans in the event that part of the funding must be removed
- What should be included in an MOU?
 - Specific funding responsibility for each part of the appointment and longevity of commitments
 - Specifics about accountability, reporting lines, and options about flexibility
 - Instructions for preparation of annual personnel evaluation(s), and specific assignment of ultimate authority in case of conflicts between units
 - Instructions about annual role/goal statement preparation and approval
 - Specifics about space and other resources (office, lab, computer, equipment, telephone, mailbox, clerical support, etc.) to be provided by each unit.

¹ A "split" appointment is interpreted here as meaning a position that is distinct from what we call a "joint" appointment. In a split appointment, an individual may have two very different roles in two separate units sharing that individual; for example, she/he may teach in one unit and carry out research and extension duties in the other. In a joint appointment, the individual has similar roles in both units, including a combination of teaching, research, and service/outreach.

9. Administrative Faculty Evaluations

A questionnaire was sent to administrative faculty in March 2006. We posed three questions: 1) What do you like about the administrative faculty annual evaluation process and form? 2) What do you not like about the administrative faculty annual evaluation process and form? and 3) What would you do to improve the administrative faculty annual evaluation process and form? We received 35 responses via e-mail and fax. Responses were organized by question and were then summarized. No names or identifying information were included in the list or in the summary. The following discussion is based on findings from the questionnaire, from other conversations with administrative faculty, and from the Morale Task Force discussions.

With respect to the evaluation process, responding administrative faculty are positive about the fact that their self-evaluation is a part of their evaluation by their supervisor. They also feel that the process of evaluation, if conducted as suggested with discussions with their supervisor throughout the year of goals and performance, can be effective in guiding professional development and in communicating progress and performance.

Criticisms of evaluation of administrative faculty fall into three main areas: shortcomings of the evaluation form, supervisors not following the prescribed process of evaluation and the lack of opportunity to contribute to the evaluation of supervisors.

As for the form, administrative faculty express confusion over what to focus on in the self-evaluation (part I), PDQ, goals, or the areas of program management, fiscal management, human resource management, public relations and professional and community services. Several have expressed the opinion that the responsibilities of program management, fiscal management, etc. may apply to some administrative faculty but not to most. Many feel that there is a lack of connection or link between the self-evaluation in part I and the evaluation categories in part II that the supervisor uses to evaluate performance. Other criticisms include: categories in part II are not a good match with some faculty's PDQ, primary functions or goal statements; definitions of categories in part II are not clear; there is a lack of clear guidelines on what constitutes excellence and a lack of objective measures of success; the evaluation is not well suited for research oriented type of work; and the category of community service is not appropriate as interpreted by some supervisors.

As for the process, some administrative faculty criticize supervisors for not doing an adequate job of relating the self-evaluation (part I) to the evaluation of categories in part II and to the final evaluation rating. They feel that when discussions of performance between supervisor and employee occur only at the end of the evaluation year, they don't have an opportunity to respond or to improve performance. Because merit level is determined in large part by the final evaluation rating, administrative faculty expressed a desire to know their recommended merit level near the time of the evaluation instead of several months later. Several administrative faculty expressed the opinion that being able to evaluate their supervisor and having those evaluations considered in the supervisor's evaluation could improve the overall evaluation process over the long term. Other criticisms include: inconsistencies in evaluations from year to year with equal levels of performance due to personal relationships between the supervisor and employee; supervisors not following the process recommended by HR; supervisors not giving constructive feedback during the final evaluation; employees distorting their accomplishments in their self-evaluations; changes in the final evaluation rating after the evaluation meeting with the supervisor (and after meeting of supervisors with their AVP or VP); the evaluation period follows that of

the calendar year instead of the fiscal year; and in most units there is not a provision for evaluation input from others.

Recommendations:

Recently, Human Resources formed the Administrative Faculty Evaluation Task Force for the purpose of reviewing the current process of administrative faculty evaluation and proposing a revised process. We do not mean to duplicate the tasks of this newly formed group, but instead wish to add information to the process and to strongly encourage the task force to consider the following:

- Revision of the evaluation form with a focus on direct links between the self-evaluation and the supervisor's evaluation of the administrative faculty member, categories that better reflect scope and substance of work, and clearer distinctions between what constitutes satisfactory, commendable and excellent levels of performance.
- An ongoing development process between supervisor and administrative faculty that would contribute to the professional development and improved performance of the faculty and that would be viewed as a fair and consistently applied process.
- Attempts to more closely align the time of receiving evaluation and receiving notification of rating.
- Assurance that service to the department, the University, the community and to the profession are given value in evaluation of administrative faculty.

Summary of Recommendations to the Faculty Senate May 8, 2006

1. The Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate be charged with 1) examining the role and importance of service in evaluating faculty and staff and 2) seeking ways to encourage senior faculty to fully engage in shared governance on this campus.
2. The establishment of a special ad hoc committee to examine the function of rotating academic chairs and discuss with the current chairs and their deans ways to make this essential work more effective and more desirable. Also establish a group of seasoned chair to mentor new department chairs.
3. The provost and Human Resources develop guidelines to establish, manage, and evaluate joint and split appointments. We further urge that a Memorandum of Understanding be in place before a joint or split appointment offer letter is dispatched and a contract is prepared.
4. The Administrative Faculty Evaluation Task Force recently created by Human Resources review and consider the findings and recommendations of this task force.

Conclusion

The members of the Morale Task Force wish to thank the faculty Senate for entrusting us with the responsibility to seek responses to the very serious issues raised last summer by the ad hoc committee.

We have one final request based not so much on our findings as on the experience of our members. Those of us on the Morale Task Force are all old hands at serving on university and senate committees. Most of us have been at UNR long enough to know that, even with the unified and formal endorsement of the Faculty Senate, some useful recommendations may never see the light of day.

While a few of last December's recommendations have been implemented or are promised to be implemented this year, some will take longer and could easily be forgotten, neglected or modified so much they fail to address the problems described.

If we are not to see a continuance of the morale problems that prompted this mission, we urge the senate to be vigilant in pursuing real solutions, not just discussions of solutions. We also urge the current senators to encourage their constituents to step up to the responsibilities of shared governance, to show up and speak up at meetings, to serve on committees, and to foster clearer communication and more respect among all our colleagues.

UNR Faculty Senate Meeting
May 10, 2006
[Agenda Item #6](#)

Please follow the link below to the full report of the Academic Standards Committee (it is an 85-page report in PDF format).

<http://www.unr.edu/facultysenate/CteeInfo/AcStandFinal06.pdf>