

MINUTES OF THE UNLV FACULTY SENATE

Date: 12/09/2025

Location: Student Union Room 208 B & C and via Zoom

Senators Present: Cheryl Abbate, Rabea Alhosh, Djeto Assane, Bobbie Barnes, Wolfgang Bein, Amanda Belarmino, Satish Bhatnagar, Tirth Bhatta, Sheila Bock, Monica Brown, Dan Bubb, Tim Bungum, Jaime Carbajal, Donovan Conley, Patience Crowder, Honghui Deng, Zhonghai Ding, Marni Dow, Nancy Esposito, Jorge Fonseca Cacho, Paul Forster, Kerie Francis, Gina Gamble, Patrick Griffis, Neamat Hassan, Isabel Herrera Pedro, Jason Hortin, Yvonne Houy, Jill Humphrey, Alethea Inns, Margarita Jara, Lori Johnson, Tracy Johnson, Barry Kamen, Julian Kilker, Keoni Kins, Necole Leland, Scott Loe, Susanna Newbury, Michael Nussbaum, Rafael Oganessian, Jennifer Pfannes, Daniel Proga, Paysha Rhone, Bill Robinson, An-Pyng Sun, Alex Talonov, Nicole Thomas, Craig Topple, Sue Wainscott, Dana Moran Williams, Monica Williams, Minnie Wood, Hassan Ziada

Senator Proxies: Sheila Bock for Kaitlin Clinnin; Patrick Griffis for Samantha Godbey; Bill Leavitt for Mahzarine Irani Rohani; Jorge Fonseca Cacho for Neil Opfer; Marni Dow for Jesse Taylor

Senators Absent: Jordan Fischette, Taro Ito, Tracy Spies

Executive Committee Leadership Present: Debbie Arteaga, Michael Kagan, Maria Roberts

Ex-Officio Present: Lorena Giese, Nic Irwin, Devin Lopez

I. Call to Order

Meeting called to order by Chair Roberts at 12:03 p.m.

II. Public Comment

No public comment.

III. Minutes of the November 18, 2025 meeting

Motion to Approve: Senator Wainscott; Second: Senator Kilker

Approved with no changes.

IV. Replacement of Computer Hardware

Kivanc Oner, Vice President for Digital Transformation and Chief Information Officer discussed technology funding.

- Funding sources include Academic Affairs Computer Replacement Program (AACRP), student technology fees, one-time funds, and department, college, unit, and grant funds.
 - UNLV has a state-wide allocation, AACRP, funded at \$300,000 yearly dependent on budget. We work with colleges to understand needs and provide resources.
 - Student technology fee is calculated per credit. We work with students to fund resources that best support their needs.
 - One-time funds, although not reliable, help fill the gaps and allow for special project work.
- UNLV IT Funds focus on large-scale campus-wide technology to include:
 - Classrooms, labs, loaner laptops
 - Core academic systems (Canvas, Zoom, Google, enterprise tools)
 - Immersive learning environments
 - Campuswide computer replacement needs.
 - Student-focused technologies
 - Standardized infrastructure equipment
- Academic Units (AACRP and departmental funds): Supports individual faculty and department needs to include laptops, desktop computers, printers, specialized software, and small-scale equipment. Decisions are made by the units and are processed and deployed by OIT. Not all systems are managed by OIT. An example is the Medical School that manages much of their equipment.
- Current investments (FY23 – FY25):

- AACRP - \$675,000:
 - Academic computer replacement
 - State-funded (\$300,000 annual)
 - Distributed to colleges
 - Managed by colleges/units
- Student technology fees - \$625,000:
 - Student-focused computer replacement
 - Technology loaner program
 - Classroom technology enhancements
 - Student computer lab enhancements
- One-time funds - \$4.2 million:
 - End-of-life computer replacement
 - Classroom technology
 - Student computer lab enhancements
 - Technology loaner program
 - Windows 11
- Department, college, unit, grant funds:
 - Initiated and funded externally to OIT
 - Assistance with selection, procurement, and implementation
- AACRP Snapshot
 - FY23 - \$300,000: 203 devices, 14 academic colleges, focus on department-level needs
 - FY24 - \$150,000 (state-reduced): Focus on Windows 11 replacement
 - FY25 - \$225,000 (state-reduced): Focus on Windows 11 replacement
- Computer replacement snapshot (FY23 - FY25): Total of \$4.8 million with \$625,000 from student technology fee and \$4.2 million from one-time funding.
 - 3,965 devices, 1,500+ devices for Windows 11 compliance
 - 20+ academic units, 20+ student computer labs, 500+ computer lab computers
 - 200+ classrooms, 50+ classroom computers, 200+ lecture recording devices, FDH 109 IMAX projector and system
 - 400+ loaner laptops for students
 - 150+ Graduate Assistant computers
 - 60+ headsets for immersive learning
 - \$250,000 library computer refreshes
- AACRP FY26 Process
 - \$300,000 available with allocation percentage based on FTE. Check with your department on available funding.
 - Work with the department/college to identify needs with IT consultation available.
- Faculty with questions, concerns, or would like to discuss needs are encouraged to contact Kivunc Oner (kivanc.oner@unlv.edu) or Bob Soulliere. Assistant Vice President for Digital Services and Solutions (bob.soulliere@unlv.edu).

Questions/Comments:

- Senator Bein: How about Linux?

- Oner: We do support Mac and Microsoft more. Linux requires a different level of expertise. 80% of our customers use IOS versus Android.
- Senator Kilker: (1) A lot of city governments are converting to Linux. (2) How is OIT involved in the process for navigating AI challenges and opportunities?
 - Kivunc Oner: We are working with the Faculty Senate AI Committee, Teaching and Learning Commons, and Provost Office. We are providing guidance on many of the tools out there. UNLV currently has licenses for Gemini Pro and Chat GPT. We are working closely with the Provost and President to understand what is possible.
- Senator Fonseca Cacho: How will the state's plan to centralize IT security impact UNLV?
 - Kivunc Oner: I supported this because I believe as a state we need a centralized security operation. Separate operations are not sustainable. For IT to deploy a security system for just UNLV would be between \$500,000 to \$1.1 million a year. When attacks happen at another state agency, we often do not have the information flow. We are working with the state CIO. What will it mean for us? We need to see how we can enroll, and the cost involved.
- Senator Rhone: Can you talk about Salesforce? Which units are using and what support is available?
- Kivunc Oner: We began using Salesforce in 2014. Registrar, recruitment, enrollment, advising to name a few currently using Salesforce. It is one of our main customer relationship tools. In the last two years, we have been working with the UNLV Foundation. The goal is to create a CRM that can follow the lifecycle of students to alumni.
- Senator Kilker: How can we help you as the Faculty Senate?
 - Kivunc Oner: I have been on this campus for 18 years in both decentralized and centralized roles which provided me with the opportunity to see the different ways decisions are made. The shared governance model of creating committees and sending representatives to express needs is not working. Often, these committees do not have enough people to have a conversation, and it becomes more of a rubber stamp. We need to be where you are at. We want to go to college and unit meetings, hear what you have to say. We have limited resources, so it is important that we utilize them in the way that solves problems.
- Past Chair Arteaga: After 12 years, my printer went out. I was told by OIT to go through my department, and they refused to purchase a printer or toner as they have centralized printing. The issue is my office is in another building. I bought a printer on my own.
 - These are the kind of conversations we need to have to determine if these are one-offs or common experiences. It is a continuous conversation.
- Senator Robinson: It is important to remember that the automatic upload of grades from WebCampus to MYUNLV was due to a request by the Faculty Senate. OIT was very responsive.

V. Academic Freedom and Ethics Committee

Andrea Wirth, Scholarly Communication Librarian, provided the following updates from the Academic Freedom and Ethics Committee:

- The Academic Freedom and Ethics Committee investigates complaints of violations of academic freedom. They also consider questions of ethical conduct of academic or administrative faculty.
- Membership consists of one tenured academic faculty from each degree granting college and school, one tenured librarian, and one administrative faculty member.
- "Academic freedom is the freedom of a teacher or researcher in higher education to investigate and discuss the issues in his or her academic field, and to teach and publish findings without interference from administrators, boards of trustees, political figures, donors, or other entities. Academic freedom also protects the right of a faculty member to speak freely when participating in institutional governance, as well as to speak freely as a citizen."
- Reaffirmation of the Principles of Academic Freedom (2017): "Academic freedom is the full and unfettered pursuit of knowledge."
- Sense of the Senate Regarding Freedom of Speech (2025): "NSHE Code makes clear that members of the faculty have the freedom and the obligation to teach, research, and discuss subjects 'even when the subject requires consideration of topics which may be politically, socially or scientifically controversial.'"
- Snippets from the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics:
 - Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them.
 - As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students.

- As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars.
- As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars.
- As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens.
- Responsibilities of the Academic Freedom and Ethics Committee include:
 - The committee investigates complaints of interference in academic freedom and questions of ethical misconduct.
 - Reviews and recommends policies related to academic freedom and ethical conduct.
 - Provides guidance to faculty members with questions about their options regarding academic freedom and ethical issues.
- The work process for filing a petition is as follows:
 - Academic faculty notify the Faculty Senate Academic Freedom and Ethics Committee and the Chair of the Faculty Senate via email about...
 - Questions of ethical conduct of a member of the academic or administrative faculty in pursuit of their official duties.
 - Violations of academic freedom as defined in the NSHE code.
 - Clearly identify the violation of academic freedom or ethical conduct of a member of the academic faculty or administrative faculty. Include references to Bylaws etc.
 - Prepare a letter of petition, including:
 - Name of petitioner and date of petition
 - Respondent (person complaint is against)
 - Brief description
 - All available relevant documentation
 - The Respondent shall have (90) calendar days from the day they receive a copy of the petition from the Faculty Senate Chair to file a response addressed to the Committee in care of the Chair of the Faculty Senate. Failure to respond within the time limit may be deemed a default by the Respondent and the Committee shall recommend in favor of the Petitioner.
- Academic Freedom and Ethics Committee responsibilities include:
 - The committee will notify the Senate Chair if it determines it does not have jurisdiction.
 - Respect and maintain confidentiality (members all sign confidentiality agreements).
 - Establish a Review Committee with no members of the Review Committee permitted from the same college or unit as the Petitioner or Respondent.
 - Any member who otherwise has a conflict of interests or may reasonably [be] perceived to have a conflict of interest shall not be chosen as a member.
 - A quorum of the Review Committee shall consist of at least eighty percent of the Review Committee.
 - Report annually back to the Senate on the number and type of cases considered and action taken on each case with no mention of names.
- Committee has not received any petitions in the last three years. Examples from past years include a dean accused of nepotism and a dean accused of changing grades submitted by faculty members.
- Initiatives completed as requested by Faculty Senate include:
 - Shadow personnel files (2023)
 - A more robust version of this presentation (2024)
 - Grade change policy (2024)
 - Faculty use of self-published textbooks in their courses (2024)
- Current initiatives underway include:
 - Position paper on ethical use of AI

- Our former chair and ongoing committee member, Christine Bergman, led the development of a more robust version of the slides I am presenting today, with audio. We will work with the Faculty Senate to post that file on our committee's website. Numerous committee members over the last few appointment cycles contributed to the content.
- Current committee rosters can be accessed at the following link: unlv.edu/facultysenate/committees/academic-freedom#members. If your unit doesn't have a representative (Law, Dental, Medical), please consider volunteering.

Questions/Comments:

- Senator Wainscott: The respondent having 90 days seems overly generous. Has the Senate considered making this a shorter time frame? I would recommend 15 days or maybe 30 days.
 - Andrea Wirth: I don't know the history of the 90 days, but I do agree that it is long. We are happy to look at our processes.
 - Vice Chair Kagan: Time is a problem. I think the committee should look at how you can respond in emergency situations. When we see frightening occurrences at other universities, it happens quickly.
- Senator Wood: I appreciate that there haven't been any complaints in the last three and a half years, but sometimes that is not good news. It could speak to an environment of fear of retaliation. What is the best way for us to outreach?
 - I agree with you. Communicating that our committee is a resource would be appreciated. We also want to connect with new faculty during new faculty orientation and other events.
- Chair Roberts: A lot of this is similar to the grievance process. If it applies to your job or promotion, it goes to the Grievance Committee. If it is about ethics or bullying, it goes to this committee.

VI. Chair's Report

Chair Roberts provided the following updates:

- The Chancellor was absent from the Board of Regents meeting due to illness, so Faculty Senate Chairs met only with Chair Brooks. We asked for increased representation on the Faculty Evaluation and Workplace Culture Committee. He agreed we should have more seats at the discussion. We also explained that bad treatment and retaliation of students and employees continue and that it is systemwide. We discussed training for new chairs, deans, and executive leaders before they decide to become chairs, deans, etc. The training should emphasize the consequences for abuse of their power and ignoring university and college bylaws. He agreed and contacted Human Resources right after we left to find out why supervisors, faculty, and students are not being disciplined for abusing their positions.
- Apparently, in some colleges, students get together and complain about professors who they think are too hard on their grading. At some institutions, groups of faculty get together and bully or find ways to keep other faculty from being promoted or being successful. And of course, we see some of that through our grievance process. We also suggested yearly input from faculty and staff for deans and associate deans.
- Much discussion revolved around financial issues and student fees. Many students spoke about the fees and their stories resonated with the board. As such, student fees increases were put on hold for further review.
- The security information where all police stations were to report to the Chancellor and one security person assigned at the NSHE level, was also placed on hold. This was an issue that was previously discussed, but the information is so old now that they need to look at more updated information and incidents since that study was done.
- Salary study was not voted on.
- Coming up December 11, 2025 is the Workforce Committee. Agenda items include: (1) Alignment of credit for nationally recognized examinations like CLEP, AP, and IB. (2) Program demand gaps analysis and projections, and (3) Update on effort to provide credit for prior learning.

Closed Session Began at 1:11 p.m.

VII. Sense of Senate Regarding Trump/Department of Education Compact

The following information was provided for the proposed Sense of Senate regarding Trump/Department of Education Compact.

- The Department of Education has been promoting a "compact". It was initially offered to several elite universities and has now extended to all universities to sign.

- Many Faculty Senates around the country have made statements.
- UNLV has not signed the compact but has not said they wouldn't.
- As part of our statement, we want to commend NSHE institutions for not signing.

**UNLV Faculty Senate
Sense of the Senate Opposing
the U.S. Department of Education
"Compact" on Higher Education**

WHEREAS the United States Secretary of Education has requested American colleges and universities enter into a *Compact for Academic Excellence in Higher Education*;

WHEREAS this Compact would restrict university employees from speaking on matters of public concern, in violation of NSHE policies;

WHEREAS this Compact would mandate policies restricting free expression that would violate the obligations of a public university under the First Amendment;

WHEREAS this Compact would impose on UNLV a rigid definition of gender that would demean many students and colleagues and conflict with Nevada law;

WHEREAS this Compact promotes a paranoid and derogatory orientation toward students who are not U.S. citizens;

WHEREAS this Compact contains provisions which endanger the independence of the University and its governing structures, including the central role of shared faculty governance;

WHEREAS this Compact would impose rigid tuition and admissions structures that do not respond to the unique circumstances of UNLV and NSHE institutions;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that UNLV leadership should be applauded for not joining this Compact. UNLV leadership should continue to uphold the traditions and principles of UNLV by not agreeing to this Compact.

Motion to Approve Sense of the Senate: Senator Wainscott; Second: Senator Oganessian

Summary of Discussion Points

- Signing the compact is associated with the potential for "privileged money" for universities. There is concern about the consequences if the university doesn't sign.
- Senators sought assurance that their individual votes and closed-session discussions regarding the compact would remain confidential, which was confirmed by the Executive Committee.
- Part four of the compact, Institutional Neutrality, was a major point of contention, with concerns that the language (especially "Actions relating to") is "incredibly broad" and could severely restrict faculty members' ability to comment or even discuss certain topics. Some felt this part effectively means they "cannot comment on anything" and is "completely unacceptable."
- The compact itself was described in negative terms, with multiple senators calling it "utter trash" and expressing the belief that it aims to "end anything contrary to conservative views," despite containing language about academic freedom.
- Concerns were also raised about a provision requiring the university to "refund tuition to those who drop out" as not being a strong business practice.
- The President and Provost previously commented that they "have not signed the compact," and the Chancellor previously stated he "would not endorse it."
- Suggested to add language to address equality in admissions and highlighting the university's unique MSI/HSI status.

- There were different views on whether to act quickly to formalize the Senate's position or take the time to build a united message across all NSHE Faculty Senates. One senator argued that scheduling challenges make it impossible to wait for the Board of Regents' agenda before acting, and that voting now would prompt other institutions to consider the compact. The need to act quickly to avoid losing benefits (like the HMO in a past example) was cited. Others argued that the "smartest way" is to discuss with other senates, fearing that acting alone would "put a target on our back" as the only NSHE institution to make a statement.
- At the conclusion of the discussion, there appeared to be agreement among the senators that the compact is highly problematic. The prevailing sentiment was expressed as: "I think silence is complacency. We need to put our skin in the game."

Motion Approved

VIII. Student View on Increased Fees

- Primary concern was the quickness in the decision. Students would like the legislature to fund the full 80%. Students are also asking for transparency.
- The Regents are not getting real data. The institutions are hiding enrollment issues by counting high school students who are paying \$75 per class.

IX. Essential Functions of Faculty

Moved to January meeting.

X. Annual Evaluations of Supervisors

Moved to January meeting.

XI. Future Action Items

A. Faculty Climate Survey

XII. New Business

- Continued discussion of student fees.
- Presentation from an administrator/researcher providing an AI update.
- Discuss the issue of limiting the number of degrees that are considered professional which impacts financial aid.
- Explanation for the process of investigating Title IX violations.

XIII. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 2:02 p.m.

Bobbie Barnes, Secretary