The Campus and Fiscal Affairs Committee of the Senate, based on its charge from the Senate Chair, produced two major policy recommendations, and provided input on a number of other issues. These recommendations have been previously provided to the Executive Committee, and were discussed in the report of the Committee to the Senate in April.

The first recommendation concerns the process of equity adjustments on campus, which is provided here in Appendix A. The second recommendation concerns alternative mechanism for faculty compensation, in lieu of merit pay, and is provided here in Appendix B. The second recommendation would require a number of changes to either the UNLV Bylaws or Board of Regents policies. The CFA is prepared to create draft documents to make these changes, if requested to do so.

On our other charges:

1. We developed a set of Bylaws, which are provided separately.

2. We considered the possibility of developing questions for use in the presidential search, however, we determined that the Regental process is not far enough along for us to do so in a meaningful way. For example, the Regents have yet to create the “characteristics” document they normally use to create a job announcement, both of which would impact questions we might suggest.

3. We requested that the Executive Committee, in its regular meetings with the President and Provost, discuss with them the use of the data from the faculty evaluations of deans and vice presidents. We believe that the original system, under which the Senate chair received confidential data on the outcomes of those surveys, should be restored, and that the faculty of the unit should be given some information on the evaluation of their dean and/or vice president, given that the evaluation is, in effect, an evaluation of their unit.

The provost’s office has indicated a willingness to review the survey instrument currently being used to evaluate deans, but the validity of the survey cannot be correctly judged until a final determination is made on how the data are to be used. A survey that goes only to the provost would likely differ from one from which the Senate chair and unit faculty receive output.

We believe likewise that at least two vice presidents are over due for their three year reviews by their faculty, and we requested that the Executive Committee discuss this with the president. There is no survey instrument presently in use, as far as we know, and there is an argument that each VP would require a unique instrument.
The CFA is happy to proceed on this path, but we need guidance and participation from the President’s office, with a clear understanding of how the data from these surveys would be used. We believe that the EC must be the contact point for the initial discussion on this topic.

Given the priorities of the Legislative year, recurring PEBP problems, and more, we suspect that these questions were not discussed in depth with the president and provost. This coming academic year might be a more convenient time for the EC to do so.

4. We are continuing to have discussions with the new Vice President for Human Resources on the missing reports on salary adjustments. We are optimistic that the reports will once again be provided to the CFA and Faculty Senate.

5. Finally, we discussed the idea of UNLV creating an email and social media etiquette policy and concluded that (1) such a policy is dangerous in an atmosphere of academic freedom, that (2) there are many “guidelines” for good use on the web and the university could adopt one without making it “policy,” and that (3) the Academic Freedom and Ethics Committee is the better place to create a recommendation for the Senate on which guidelines to adopt.
Appendix A

Recommendations of the Faculty Senate Campus and Fiscal Affairs Committee with Regard to:

UNLV Process for Requesting a Permanent Change to Base Salary for Academic and Administrative Faculty Based on Inequity and/or change in Job Responsibility or Function

1. The process document states that:

   “Academic and Administrative Faculty Requests for individual permanent base salary adjustments outside of established merit and cost of living methods must be on the basis of one of the following:
   a. A perceived inequity amongst similarly situated peers within rank or job family within the institution,
   b. A perceived salary gap or disparity based on a protected class under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964,
   c. A significant change in job responsibilities and/or functions”

The Campus and Fiscal Affairs Committee does not agree with the requirement that requests be based solely on one of the three criteria. It is likely that faculty members with lengthy tenure at the institution who have faced, or who continue to face, discriminatory behavior based on race or gender also will be able to document salary inequities in comparison to more recently hired peers.

We recommend that faculty be allowed to present one request, which may outline inequities based on one or more of the three criteria presented.

2. The process document states that:

   “Requests can also be initiated by a supervisor on the faculty member’s behalf in a proactive manner, or in collaboration with the faculty member.”

The Campus and Fiscal Affairs Committee does not agree with the inclusion of this statement in the document. We are concerned that the unintended consequence of this statement would be to give greater priority to requests initiated or supported by the faculty member’s dean or supervisor, when many inequities, particularly with regard to race or gender, are the result of past or present action or inaction by deans and supervisors.

We recommend that this paragraph be removed from the document, and that each individual request be evaluated entirely on its merit, without regard to the support or lack thereof from a supervisor. Where a dean or supervisor believes that a civil rights issue exists in their unit, they are already empowered to repair such an issue, and, in fact, should act swiftly to do so.
Appendix B

The Campus and Fiscal Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate recommends the Senate take the following actions in light of the continuing lack of merit pay.

I. Steps within Ranks
   A. The CFA recommends that the University establish a series of titles within the current rank structure. Each new title should be accompanied by an increase in base pay. If that is impossible, a one-time financial award should be provided at each stage. For example:
      1. Senior Assistant Professor. Assistant Professor who has successfully completed mid-tenure review and found to be making satisfactory progress toward tenure.
      2. Senior Associate Professor. Associate Professor who is at least three years post-promotion, and is rated satisfactory in the preceding three annual evaluations.
      3. Senior Professor. Professor who is at least three years post-promotion, and is rated satisfactory in the preceding three annual evaluations.
      4. University Professor. Senior Professor who is at least three years post-title, and is rated satisfactory in the preceding three annual evaluations.
      5. ??? Professor. University Professor who is at least three years post-title, and is rated satisfactory in the preceding three annual evaluations.

II. Extra-contractual Compensation
   A. The CFA recommends that the limit on extra-contractual compensation be raised to at least 50%, especially for compensation from external grants. We understand that UNR is currently using 50%, while UNLV is using a 25% limit.

III. Summer School
   A. The CFA recommends the adoption of a policy which stipulates that summer school compensation shall increase automatically by the same percentage as any increase in summer fees charged to students.

IV. Awards
   A. The CFA recommends that every department establish at least one award for teaching, research, and service, in addition to college awards. Multiple awards are preferred. Each award should carry a financial prize.

V. Bonuses
   A. The CFA recommends that the Regent’s Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 25.5 be modified to allow the payment of bonuses to professional employees at the discretion of the president, tied to specific measurable performance standards for the individual or their unit.