

5-1-2010

Faculty Governance, Volume 1, Issue 6

UNM Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/fs_documents

Recommended Citation

UNM Faculty Senate. "Faculty Governance, Volume 1, Issue 6." (2010). https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/fs_documents/72

This Newsletter is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Documents by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

Faculty Governance

VOLUME 1 ISSUE 6

MAY 2010



THE UNIVERSITY of
NEW MEXICO

INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

Year in Review	1
Response to the “Budget Summit”	2-3
Faculty Requested Special Procedure	4
Update From the Faculty Senate and	5-7
The Year Ahead	8

Please note:

Faculty Senate President Doug Fields resigned on May 5, 2010, citing lack of progress on shared governance. Much of this newsletter was written prior to his resignation.

Faculty Senate President’s Report by Doug Fields

Year in Review

With the 2009-2010 academic year now almost at an end, and the end of my term as Faculty Senate President approaching, I have been asked to give an overview of our accomplishments, failures and current and upcoming issues that need to be addressed. As a starting point, let me review the six faculty senate statements of principle given to the administration and endorsed by faculty vote at last year’s general faculty meeting.

1. The executive structure of UNM should return to a focus on academic programs. Thus, there should be two executive vice presidents – the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Executive Vice President for the Health Sciences Center. Those offices should report to the UNM President. The office of Facilities and Finance should report to those two Executive Vice Presidents.

The administration has rejected this recommendation outright.

2. Currently only the faculty and Deans are regularly evaluated by both those they serve and their supervisors. That culture of “360 degree” evaluation should extend through the upper administration and the board of regents.

As of this writing, we have received no request for evaluations of any upper administration. Last year, there was a request made with one week notice.

3. The center of policy development, implementation, and budget design needs to rest with the Deans and Department Chairs.

This is a difficult point to quantify, and I will leave it up to the reader to judge the progress on this front.

4. The Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs or a main campus faculty delegate and the Executive Vice President for the Health Sciences Center or an HSC faculty delegate should be voting members of the BOR Facilities and Finance Committee.

This recommendation has been implemented.

5. All searches for tenure-track faculty, Deans, Associate Vice Presidents and above should be national while encouraging applications from qualified members of the UNM community. (This would not

apply to temporary positions, such as Chairs in some departments, that are filled on a rotational basis from within the UNM community).

6. UNM should establish an annual report of Faculty Retention and Loss that will clearly present numbers and types of faculty gained and lost by each department. Reasons for losses should be included as well as the details of vacant positions waiting to be filled within each Department.

This has not been implemented. We continue to struggle to understand the current and past state of affairs with regard to numbers and nature of faculty on campus.

Additionally, at the general faculty meeting, we asked for an audit (really a performance audit) of I&G funds.

This has been finally completed (see page 4). Although the final product is underwhelming, rather than fighting over what has been done or not done, I would like to move forward, using the general template of the special procedures, but including all sources of revenue (not just I&G). This could be accomplished in our Faculty Senate Budget Committee, with administration’s cooperation and assistance.

More recently, the Legislative Finance Committee (LFC) is in the process of gathering data for a performance audit of both UNM and NMSU. As a part of that complete review, staffers from the LFC have been attending Board of Regent’s meetings, including our “Budget Summit”. I was asked to give my comments on the “Budget Summit” and include them on page 2.

The Faculty Senate has also been trying to understand how to best structure itself to serve the university by giving the faculty voice in a responsive, deliberative manner. We have created a structure task force that has initiated a Health Science Center Council (see page 6) and is working on better organizing the academic mission of the senate.

Finally, I want to thank you for your support during my term, and ask that you all stand behind Richard Wood, our next FS President. Rich reviews what is on our plate this coming year on page 8.

Response to the “Budget Summit” by Doug Fields

The New Mexico Legislative Finance Committee (LFC) is doing a performance audit on both UNM and NMSU as part of their normal oversight of state entities. As a part of this review, they were in attendance at the recent Board of Regents meeting which included the “Budget Summit”. The staff of the LFC asked for my comments on this meeting. Below is a slightly modified version of the letter I sent to them:

Modified version of April 12, 2010 letter to the Legislative Finance Committee from Doug Fields

We have witnessed a 3.2% decrease in main campus tenure/tenure track lines over the last ten years, a period during which the main campus student body has grown by 8.7% and student credit hour production has increased by 19.5% (32% in the large College of Arts & Sciences). The same decade witnessed a 120% increase in administrative costs and more than a 50% increase in the intercollegiate athletic budget. In a slightly shorter period for which we have data (2001-2009), the tuition paid by students rose about 50% on main campus and from 53% to 120% in the professional schools, and state appropriations increased by more than 21%. Together, these trends have a clear impact on excellence in the undergraduate and graduate educational missions, on faculty workloads, and on the ability to sustain the cutting-edge research needed to make New Mexico a scientifically, technologically, culturally desirable place for the investment that drives economic development in our knowledge economy.

The faculty at UNM see the consequences of these trends every day: In increased student/advisor ratios (770 to 1 in 2009); increased student/faculty ratios (increased from 14:1 in 1999 to 21:1 in 2009 excluding part-time instructors and other non-tenure-track instructors); the high percentage of classes (45%) taught by these part-time faculty; and dramatic faculty losses in History, Math and Statistics, Chemistry, Spanish & Portuguese, and other departments crucial to UNM’s mission that have lost one-quarter to one-third of their tenure/tenure track lines.

We recognize that UNM has in recent months moved to address some of the above trends (most convincingly in hiring more student advisors). And in the 2009 budget rescissions, a good-faith effort was made to protect the academic mission, with significant results in holding back further declines. But these efforts do nothing to change the picture of declining investment in the academic “side of the house.” So if my comments here seem less than generous regarding the “Budget Summit,” the explanation is to be found in this context, not in any hostility toward the

University, its Administration, nor the Regents. We care enormously for this institution, for our students, and for the State of New Mexico, and so bring passion to searching for solutions to our problems.

There are two features of the “Budget Summit” on which we would like to comment: Process and Content. We first address the process that led up to the April 2 Board meeting, as well as the meeting itself, including why we always use quotes when referring to a “Budget Summit”.

While the term “Budget Summit” evokes a feeling of cooperative decision-making, the process that we just endured was nothing of the sort. We have been told that before the arrival of our current president, the constituent groups would actually meet together and work out budget solutions that would best address the needs of the university to meet its core missions. The current administration has rejected this concept in favor of a preferred top-down style of management, deciding out of public scrutiny what will happen, and then “communicating” this to the “employees” of the university.

The “Budget Summit” is a case study in this management style. Although packaged as a consultative process, its substance carried a veneer of consultation while the substantive discussions happened elsewhere (or perhaps were not held at all). Approximately one month before the April 2 BoR meeting, President Schmidly discussed with Faculty Senate OPS the idea of forming a President’s Strategic Advisory Team (PSAT) to address the looming budget issues and formulate cost containment strategies. We agreed to the idea of faculty, staff and administration coming together to solve budget issues, but asked that the team report in parallel to the President, the Faculty Senate and Staff Council. President Schmidly rejected that idea, and formed the group as an advisory group reporting to him alone.

The PSAT functioned well, from accounts given from both faculty and administrators (there was, unfortunately, little representation from staff on the team). However, President Schmidly only chose a few of the cost containment strategies from the PSAT, giving deference to those from his Executive VP for Administration.

Response to the “Budget Summit” *continued*

He presented his selection of "cost containment measures" to Faculty Senate leadership shortly before the April 2 meeting. In that presentation, he made the pitch that all non-teaching units would take a 10% cut in budget, including a \$90K reduction in I&G to athletics. What he did not present to us was his proposed increases in student fees that would restore the athletics budget and more.

He also did not present to us the effects of the implementation of several "cost containment" strategies. For instance, a reduction is being made in the Provost's office budget because of the assumed 1% reduction in cost of "Procurement, Purchasing and Housekeeping". The recommendations list this as a "Captured" savings, which, as defined on page 51 of the document, means that it would be transparent to the units (no cost savings), but would be captured in the Accounts Payable Department for reallocation, presumably back to the academic departments for mission centric purposes. However, the majority of this \$750k is now being applied as a harvest from the academic units. This is completely counter to how this was sold to the faculty senate leadership.

In summary, the process was not only non-inclusive, it was secretive at best. Now, let's turn to the content of the decisions made at the April 2 Board of Regents meeting. Despite the rhetoric of "Strengthening Core Mission" of the university through \$1.5M in "New Faculty for Enrollment Growth" and \$0.5M for "Advising", the reality in the Provost's office is that more students will be taught more credit hours with approximately \$1M less money. That is because Academics has been asked to "cost contain" approximately \$3M this next fiscal year, making the new \$2M insufficient to even maintain the current (and overstretched) budget.

One might make the argument that this is the new reality given the current economic situation, but then one would have to explain the ever-increasing budgets of non academic units. For instance, although the Student Fee Review Board (SFRB) heard a request from athletics to keep their portion of funding constant (at \$1.5M), no request for additional funds were made through that board, and the board decided on a slight decrease in their funding from student fees. However, the administration went around the SFRB by asking the BoR directly for a \$20 increase in fees to athletics (which would have represented a \$.4M increase). The BoR only approved a \$10 increase, but, at the same time approved a \$24 Facility fee increase.

This Facility fee was advertised in the “Budget Summit” presentation as going towards payment of the debt service on the 2007 series bonds "for upgrades to academic facilities". The 2007 series has been assigned to be used for: Hodgin Hall renovation (\$3M), Former Architecture building (\$2.1M), Dental Residency Facilities (\$2M), UNM signage (\$2M), and the Pit renovation (\$20M) among others. While I understand that even the Health Science Center may soon go through tough times, I'm guessing that the lack of revenue to cover these bonds cannot be traced to North Campus. Rather, the increased student facilities fees are a way to cover the lack of revenue from auxiliaries such as athletics.

In case these budget complexities obscure the point, let us be clear: The money to academics is decreasing this year by about \$1M dollars, while at the same time the money being allocated (either directly to, or as a relief for debt) to the athletic department is increasing by approximately the same dollar amount. As an exclamation mark on this point, the April 3 edition of the Albuquerque Journal had two main articles on the front page: the news of the increasing tuition and fees, and an article on the new contract for the UNM basketball coach (it failed to cover the two new football coach hires). So, rhetoric aside, the content of the decisions made at the "Budget Summit" continue the trend of spending priorities which we have seen in the recent past. The faculty believe that continuing these trends will diminish the quality of research, teaching and service which we can deliver for the benefit of the state and its current and future citizens.

In summary, because of the way that preparations for the “Budget Summit” were handled and the refusal of the Administration to face squarely the fact of declining investment in our academic mission, the “Budget Summit” itself failed in its presumptive aim: to create a path forward through our fiscal challenges, a path widely perceived as producing fairly shared sacrifice and wise spending that protects the State of New Mexico's future.

Faculty Requested Special Procedure

In February 2009 at a general faculty meeting, the UNM Faculty passed the following resolution:

Whereas, it is in the best interest of the University of New Mexico to understand how its resources were used to further its mission; and

Whereas, transparency in decision-making allows organizations to make better decisions through deliberations;

Therefore, be it resolved that the faculty of the University of New Mexico requests an immediate independent, external audit be conducted by a firm chosen by the State Auditor and approved by the President of the Faculty Senate.

This audit is to establish where the following funds have been spent since 2003:

- ◆ Increases in I&G funding
- ◆ Captured F&A funds from sponsored research
- ◆ Funds trimmed from end-of-year balances or
- ◆ Other balances held by units within the University;
- ◆ and how financing of construction of the Rio Rancho campus will impact I&G budgets in fiscal years 2010 and 2011.

The Agreed-Upon Procedures audit has now been finished and the results made available. We intend to ask the Faculty Senate Budget Committee to digest those results rather thoroughly and report back to the Faculty Senate regarding insights gained and findings to be pursued.

Intellectual Property Policy Update

At its April, 27th meeting, the Faculty Senate approved revisions to the University's Intellectual Property Policy. The purpose of the revisions is to assess and bring the policy into alignment with current practice, clarify roles in the commercialization process, and streamline the ownership appeal procedure. The Research Policy Committee's Intellectual Property Policy Subcommittee facilitated the discussions with stakeholders from Main Campus, Health Sciences Center and STC.UNM. The revisions will be brought to the Board of Regents for consideration for approval. Special thanks go to the following subcommittee members/participants:

Sherri Burr, Law School
Doug Fields, Faculty Senate President, Physics Astronomy
Michele Huff, Office of University Counsel
Lisa Kuuttila, STC.UNM
Richard Mertz, Office of University Counsel
Hugh Smyth, College of Pharmacy
Ana Andzic Tomlinson, formerly of the Office of University Counsel
Craig White, Anderson School of Management

Updates from the Faculty Senate

Health Sciences Center Council

Introduction

In 2009 the University of New Mexico Faculty Senate Operations Committee created a Task Force on Structure to form a proposal for restructuring the Faculty Senate to be more responsive and flexible to the needs of the faculty, administration and the University as a whole. The hope was that this would facilitate and improve the role and visibility of faculty in shared governance. The task force proposed building “umbrella” structures or Councils, to be led by elected faculty leaders. These Councils would have broad authority, within their domain, to make operational decisions in collaboration with the Faculty Senate and Administration.

The Faculty Senate approved the **Health Sciences Center Council** as a one-year pilot project on March 23, 2010.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of the HSC Council pilot project is to:

- Evaluate whether an HSC Council can be an effective mechanism to conduct Faculty Senate business related to the HSC.
- Enhance the role and visibility of HSC faculty in shared governance.

Function of the HSC Council

The HSC Council pilot project will perform the following functions

- Discuss HSC-specific policies, procedures, and issues in all areas, including but not limited to: organizational structure, financial issues, and educational, clinical, and research matters that affect HSC faculties and programs.
- Provide recommendations and/or advice to HSC Leadership and Faculty Senate Leadership on matters of importance to HSC faculty
- Form sub-committees and *ad hoc* committees as needed to conduct Council business.
- Consider and recommend on the following academic concerns of the HSC
- New units or programs within the HSC in conformity with the Faculty Handbook Policy A88: “Policy and Procedure for New Units and Interdisciplinary Reorganization of Academic and Research Units at the University of New Mexico”.
- Other changes that directly affect HSC faculty members and HSC academic needs
- Develop in collaboration with the Faculty Senate Curricula Committee, the Undergraduate Committee and the Graduate Committee, mechanisms to expedite approval processes for
- New courses taught by HSC components or educational programs
- Curricular changes within HSC educational programs

Update from the Faculty Senate *Continued*

Faculty Workload Issues

The present Policies C100 and C110 of the Faculty Handbook are out-of-date and do not really describe the situation at UNM with regards to our academic focus. The policies date back to 1978. These particular policies are among a very few where the Regents have no statutory authority for change, although they typically are provided a report from the Provost on workload issues every semester. The current tone of the two policies is that teaching is our primary mission. While teaching is still a very strong component of our mission, we are now a Carnegie I Research Institution, where research and other creative scholarly pursuits are just as important. Many of our units don't have faculty who teach 9 credits per semester in the traditional classroom mode. Much of our teaching now is in smaller, more informal research and scholarly groups of students and faculty. And it is common for some faculty to be released from some of their traditional teaching to engage with students in research and scholarly activities. For example, some faculty focus on individual students in musical, research, or clinical settings.

While generality in a policy to cover workload is desirable so that it can apply broadly across campus, we feel the tone of the policies should be changed to reflect the change in UNM from a primarily teaching institution in 1978 to a more complex research institution in 2010. The OPS committee, in conjunction with the Policy and Research and Teaching committees, is drafting some changes to the two policies this summer. After considerable coordination with various groups of administrators and faculty on campus, OPS will get general faculty input prior to asking the Senate to consider any changes.

Any changes in the policies will provide for individual units to have control over how they would interpret broad workload guidelines for their particular unique situation. Inputs on this policy are being solicited from faculty by the OPS committee now.

Regent Engagement

The OPS Committee has engaged in one-on-one conversations with many of the Regents this Spring, and hopes to talk with the others in the coming weeks. The purpose of these discussions is to provide the Regents with more in-depth understanding of academic matters on campus than they normally get in their formal meetings on campus each year, and for faculty leaders to better understand the Regents' point of view as those legally responsible for the university. Faculty in leadership positions (Operations Committee, Committee on Governance, and the Chairpersons of FS committees) are invited to attend these informal gatherings. We hope that the discussions between faculty and individual Regents will be fruitful in providing the Regents with a more complete picture of what faculty do, part of our long-term goal to improve shared governance on campus.

On HLC Accreditation and the Faculty Commission on University Governance

Background: At the time of the University's ten-year accreditation review in 2009, the Higher Learning Commission report identified problems in university governance at UNM (see <http://www.unm.edu/~accred/2009ReportOfAVisit.html> – especially pp. 3-5 of “Advancement Report” and p. 27 of the “Assurance Report”). The HLC asks for a report in 2011, and states that “the monitoring report shall incorporate actions such as but not limited to: a) a reinstatement of orientation sessions for the Board of Regents including protocols of policy management and best practices for board membership, b) revised budgetary process(es) to ensure that the strategic and academic goals of the university are the basis for the fiscal planning and c) defined and validated means by which deans, department chairs, faculty and staff are engaged in mission critical decisions of the university.” Finally, the HLC says in closing: “If incremental progress cannot be documented by the report due date, the Commission will immediately convene a Focused Visit or may shorten the time for the next comprehensive visit.” In 2011, the administration thus must submit to the HLC a report on the state of governance in the University.

At the November 2009 General Faculty Meeting, the faculty passed a resolution with the following language:

Update from the Faculty Senate *continued*

“...Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty of The University of New Mexico hereby request that the President-Elect of the Faculty Senate convene a Faculty Commission on Shared Governance to write a faculty report to the Higher Learning Commission by January 2011 assessing the steps taken to reinforce shared governance at the University, and their outcomes as of that time.

Be it further resolved that said Commission should include the President and President-Elect of the Faculty Senate; at least one other member of the Faculty Senate; two members of the Committee on Governance; and three other faculty members chosen for their understanding of and commitment to the mission of The University of New Mexico; and that the overall Commission reasonably reflect the diversity of disciplines and backgrounds represented within the UNM faculty.”

In response to this petition, we are constituting a Faculty Commission on Shared Governance made up of the members shown below. The Commission will monitor progress on university governance and draft a report to the Higher Learning Commission in Spring 2011.

Faculty Senate

Pamela Lutgen-Sandvik Arts & Sciences

Three faculty members:

Claudia B. Isaac	Architecture & Planning
Chaouki Abdallah	Engineering
Manuel Garcia y Griego	Southwest Hispanic Research Institute

Two members of Committee On Governance:

Ursula Shepherd	Committee on Governance	
Timothy Lowrey	Committee on Governance	
FS President-Elect:	Richard Wood	Faculty Senate
HSC member:	To be announced	HSC

Special Note

I want to thank everyone in the Faculty Senate and in the Operations Committee for their continued tireless efforts for the betterment of the university, and for the kind words of support I've received over the last few days. I remain passionate about our potential, and look forward to working with my colleagues again in the future.

Doug

From the President-Elect by Richard Wood

Year Ahead

Our work in the year ahead will be framed by three ongoing challenges:

- 1) the HLC's challenge to strengthen university governance at UNM (see page 6);
- 2) the fiscal challenges facing the State of New Mexico and the University; and
- 3) the urgent need to reinforce the University's core academic mission, eroded critically by many years of inadequate investment in tenure-track faculty hiring and retention.

What do these things mean?

Strengthening university governance is the shared work of the faculty; the chairs and deans; the President, Provost, and other EVPs; and the Regents in assuring that all decisions affecting the academic mission are made with adequate consultation and information. Our *fiscal challenges* present the opportunity to restructure the university in more efficient and effective ways, but also present twin risks: On one hand, of doing so precipitously, in ways that undermine the academic mission; on the other hand, of doing so in ways that effectively cannibalize tenure track faculty lines and staff administrative positions for short-term fiscal savings. *Reinforcing our core academic mission* means governing the University and making every budgetary decision in ways that promote research, writing, and creative work; support our teaching of undergraduate and graduate students; and advance our service as professionals within the University and the wider society.

In the year ahead, the Committees of the Faculty Senate will work on important detailed matters where we know we can make a difference: restructuring the core curriculum, overseeing broad curricular matters, revising policy, deciding how admissions and course registration occur, assuring that research and creative work are treated as central to our mission, rewarding good teaching and disseminating best pedagogical practices, etc. But we will simultaneously and assertively be raising (with one another in the Faculty Senate, and with the administration and Regents) the big-picture questions.

- How can we retain more of our most productive and creative faculty members?
- How can financial decisions be made so that UNM has more tenure-track faculty positions next year than this year, and more still two years later, and more still in ten years – at least beginning to catch up with New Mexico's need for outstanding scholars in a 21st century economy and diverse teachers in a 21st century society?
- How can we be sure that unit-level administrative staffing remains adequate to support the academic mission, and that higher-level administrative staffing levels are tightly tailored to support the academic mission?
- How can the faculty governance structure be made more dynamic and more efficient, and thus more effectively share in the governance of the University? How can we attract enough talented and dedicated faculty members to do so successfully?
- Can we create the set of relationships and the kinds of accountability needed so that the Board of Regents, the Deans and Chairs, the Administration, and the Faculty Senate constructively and effectively guide university decisions?
- Should fiscal Armageddon strike, and we must face yet more difficult decisions that fundamentally restructure the University: What criteria will guide such decisions? Through what deliberative process will they be made?

We look forward with you to the year ahead – and to the work ahead. By being involved, you can make a difference and help make the University of New Mexico a more rewarding place to serve.