

9-1-2010

## Faculty Governance, Volume 2, Issue 1

UNM Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/fs\\_documents](https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/fs_documents)

---

### Recommended Citation

UNM Faculty Senate. "Faculty Governance, Volume 2, Issue 1." (2010). [https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/fs\\_documents/73](https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/fs_documents/73)

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](mailto:disc@unm.edu).

# Faculty Governance

VOLUME 2 ISSUE 1

SEPTEMBER 2010



## INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

Straight Talk on the Budget	1-3
Budget Definitions and Facts	4
Bottom Line	5
Consensus Data	6
Views of the Budget Submissions from Some Faculty & Departments	7-8
AF&T and AAUP	9
Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda	10

## Straight Talk on the Budget

Richard L. Wood, President of the Faculty Senate

Hard times and hard decisions at UNM: The most recent round of budget “rescissions” from the State of New Mexico bite hard at the academic mission to which we are dedicated. Preserving our particular mission as the premier research university in the state – if that is not to become simply a slogan rather than a reality “on the ground” – will require creative and courageous decisions. The Faculty Senate and broader faculty leadership are working to shape those decisions.

First, a few facts: Although the overall UNM budget amounts to about \$2.1 billion per year, that grand total masks a great deal of diversity of funding sources. Patient fees and insurance coverage drive much of the Health Sciences Center budget, which makes up about \$1.1 billion per year of the total budget. The main campus’ \$1 billion budget includes scholarly grants and awards (typically raised and overseen by faculty, \$170 million in awards and \$130 million in expenditures during FY2010) as well as other sources of revenue. At the

core of the main campus budget is \$175 million of “Instruction & General” (I&G) funding. At present, about two-thirds of the I&G funds come from general state appropriations (i.e. not “special project” I&G funds allocated to specific purposes, from particular research projects to student service offices to athletics); about one-third of I&G funds come from tuition revenues, and 5% from other sources.

The recent 3.2% rescission for the current (2011) fiscal year ending next June cuts about \$6 million from the I&G budget, and brings to approximately 15% the total cut in state appropriations to UNM over the last two years. More ominously, word from the Legislature suggests that we will face an additional 5% (\$9 million) cut in state appropriations for FY2012; more ominously still, New Mexico may follow a trajectory being pushed nationally to defund taxpayer support of higher education. Nationally, that trend posits dramatically higher tuition in order to sustain the quality of higher education, but whether political dynamics in New Mexico would support such tuition increases remains to be seen.



## Faculty Senate Meeting Dates for 2010

### All Meeting to be held in Scholes Hall 204, Roberts Room

- ◆ Tues, Sept. 28, 2010, 3:00 pm (see agenda page 7)
- ◆ Tuesday, October 26, 2010 at 3:00 pm
- ◆ Tuesday, November 23, 2010 at 3:00 pm
- ◆ No meeting scheduled in December 2010

## Straight Talk on the Budget *Continued*

Several interlinked dynamics are therefore shaping our future. Internally, our internal decision-making processes that involve the Board of Regents, central Administration, academic leadership by Chairs, Deans, and Provost's Office, and all of us through the Faculty Senate, will obviously matter greatly. Key questions include: How can those various centers of knowledge and authority inform decision-making? How can we take best advantage of state appropriations and tuition revenues to promote excellence of research, creativity, teaching, patient service, and community engagement? How can we use *other* existing revenues (beyond I&G) to best protect and advance our academic mission? How will faculty and staff knowledge from the front lines of academic work be drawn upon to understand the impact of various budget scenarios upon research and teaching?

Externally, key questions include the budgetary stance toward higher education to be adopted by the Legislature in the early 2011 session, both in terms of budget cuts *and* crucially whether legislators end the "tuition credit" practice, whereby the general fund captures a significant portion of any tuition increase that UNM adopts. Also, the effort underway by the Secretary of Higher Education to rationalize the institutional structure of higher education in New Mexico via a "Master Plan" could create an opportunity to better recognize and fund the distinctive mission of research universities. The recent evaluation of UNM and NMSU by the Legislative Finance Committee and the ongoing monitoring of accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission (including the recently-released survey of faculty and staff regarding university governance) also continue to shape how UNM responds to these

budget struggles. The Board of Regents, the Administration, and the Faculty Senate have all been active on all these fronts, and will surely continue to be active.

From the Faculty Senate, this entails coordinating several initiatives simultaneously, while striving to focus on the most crucial areas. My recent report to the Board of Regents details our activities, and is available at [www.facgov.unm.edu](http://www.facgov.unm.edu). We have chosen to invest our primary energies in addressing the long-term FY2012 budget, including both the internal decision-making process and the larger political dynamics that will shape that budget. Thus, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee is deeply engaged with university budget authorities and academic leadership to provide faculty voice and front-line insight into the crafting of the FY2012 budget from square one. This effort has been endorsed by both the President and the EVP for Administration, whose office is actively supporting it. Simultaneously, the Governmental Relations Committee of the Faculty Senate has done extensive outreach to state legislators, striving to better inform them of the impact of budget cuts and the tuition credit upon our students' classroom experience and our academic mission.

This focus has meant that the University's strategy for meeting the current budget rescissions has largely taken shape separate from the Faculty Senate, led primarily out of the offices of the President, Provost, EVP for Administration, and the Deans. The strategy adopted has involved passing the 3% cut down to all units that receive I&G funding, i.e. "across-the-board" cuts. This has led many departments to

## Straight Talk on the Budget *Continued*

face miserable choices: Because the “base” for calculating cuts includes the salary lines for departmental faculty and staff, and because those salaries make up the vast majority of departmental budgets, in many cases the cuts required actually surpass the *entire* operating budget of the department. Furthermore, because departments cannot impose mandatory furloughs, options for meeting immediate cuts were few. Some departments – primarily those whose research fields have deeper pockets for external funding – could soften the impact by channeling “research overhead” into basic academic support costs. Others have had to propose dire measures: eliminating GA/TA support lines, trimming staff support already stretched thin, disconnecting faculty phone lines, sharply curtailing photocopy access or computer support, etc. Arguably, some of these measures make sense in tight budgetary times; but others directly undermine the heart of our academic mission.

Note that this situation is driven by the combination of budget rescissions and the decision to spread the cuts “across the board.” I have thus weighed in with the Administration and Board of Regents that any further cuts next year should *not* be done in this way. However, it is important to note that an additional wrinkle may provide a route to cushioning the worst effects of the current rescissions on our department-level mission: Funding for “back-filling” the most mission-critical cuts may become available. Such funding *might* produce an overall pattern of cuts that make reasonable sense in light of the short timeline available for decision-making and the fact that it had to occur in late summer and during the President’s medical

leave. *Critical issues:* How much “back-fill” funding will be available? How much will go to department-level funding? What priorities and who will determine how it is dispersed? The Faculty Senate continues to weigh in on these key questions, albeit within an overall focus on longer-term budgetary decisions. We think the latter can be driven by clear student- and mission-driven criteria, within a collaborative governance process including a strong faculty voice. Those decisions will best minimize damage to our academic if they draw upon expertise from the faculty as well as from the administration and Board of Regents.

The bottom line: The Faculty Senate and other governance bodies are working hard to create the kind of strategic budgetary process, legislative relationships, and partnerships in university governance that can *successfully* articulate faculty perspectives on the critical issues faced by the University of New Mexico. We are doing so while also working on matters on core academic terrain: the Provost’s academic prioritization process, curriculum, scholarly publishing, faculty disciplinary process, combining diversity and academic excellence as central to UNM’s unique mission, funding for post-doctoral fellowships, etc. We hope to use the Faculty Senate representative structure to draw on *your* insights for that work – ask your faculty senator what’s going on, and offer your views!

<sup>1</sup> The cut is not exactly 3.2% due to two complications: On one hand, the effect of the cut is diluted by the fact that state appropriations is only one of two sources of I&G funding. On the other hand, the effect is increased by the fact that some costs paid out of I&G (utilities, insurance, etc.) cannot be reduced immediately. These effects largely balance each other, leading to the 3% final cut to I&G budgets.

## DEFINITIONS AND FACTS

- ◆ “I&G” money has historically formed the main funding stream for the operating expenses of the University, including most faculty and staff salaries, some administrator salaries, some graduate student assistantships, departmental operating budgets, etc.
- ◆ I&G stands for “Instruction and General” and is made up of two revenue streams: First, appropriations from the New Mexico Legislature, divided into general I&G (see above) and Research & Special Projects (state funds appropriated to specific projects within UNM) . Second, tuition revenues from students.
- ◆ Current (FY2011) *general I&G* budget: \$175 million.
- ◆ In FY2011, about two-thirds of general I&G comes from state appropriations; about one-third comes from student tuition that has been budgeted. 5% comes from other sources.
- ◆ In addition, a portion of expected tuition is *not* budgeted each year (fiscally prudent, since UNM never knows whether or not enrollment, and therefore tuition, will actually reach expect levels. Last year, “unbudgeted tuition” was about \$5 million; it was mostly used for meeting last year’s budget reductions. This year, unbudgeted tuition may reach a similar level; at present, it appears that it will be set aside to cushion the coming much deeper likely budget cuts.
- ◆ Current (3.24%) budget rescission: \$6 million in cuts to the I&G budget on main campus alone, plus \$3 million on north campus. UNM expects this cut to remain in place for next fiscal year.

### IN ADDITION

#### UNM EXPECTS THE LEGISLATURE TO CUT I&G FUNDING BY ANOTHER 5% FOR FY2012...

producing approximately another \$9 million just in main campus cuts alone (HSC operations are funded much more fully via payments by patients and their insurers; I&G cuts there are thus disproportionately less harmful there, although they can hurt individual programs significantly)

Total cut projected in FY 2012 I&G budget: \$15 million less in main campus I&G funding than originally budgeted this year (which was already down from previous years).

### IN ADDITION

#### IN ORDER TO MEET BUDGET RESCISSIONS THAT HAVE ACCUMULATED OVER THE LAST TWO YEARS...

UNM used one-time funds to fill budget holes. These funds (federal stimulus dollars, redirected building renewal dollars, and other sources) may well not be available for this purpose next year. This may create a *further* fiscal hole for FY2012 of up to \$13 million.

## BOTTOM LINE

The current budgetary pain being felt at UNM main campus (\$6 million in addition to previous cuts) simply pales in comparison to what may be coming (up to \$26 million, including the current cuts). UNM must plan *now* for next fiscal year and work to ameliorate the inevitable effects of these cuts on our academic mission. We believe such amelioration must include attention to **both** I&G and non-I&G revenue sources (where the latter can be re-channeled into priorities driven by the academic mission).

## OUR COMMITMENTS

- ◆ Working to assure that spending of I&G funding consistently prioritizes the core academic mission of the University
- ◆ Working to assure that spending of non-I&G funds consistently places priority on filling critical holes in funding for the core academic mission of the University, before funding “extras”.
- ◆ We will stay focused on the critical question: how will the budget for FY2012 (July 2011-June 2012) address the current and coming budget cuts and fiscal holes?
- ◆ The Faculty Senate Budget Committee is leading the effort to build broader faculty-based budgetary expertise, and collaborating with the Office of the EVP for Administration to pilot a “strategic budget process” this year to design the budget for FY2012.

## BEYOND THE GLOOM

Celebrating what we do: The faculty also need to be thinking hard about how to meet the harsh funding realities with strategies for generating new revenues. Of course, we have been doing that for a long time: Our teaching generates tens of millions of dollars in tuition revenue each year, and faculty-sponsored research generated \$170 million in grants and contracts in the last fiscal year alone. We should be proud of that track record.

Finding new opportunities: But we must also be looking at additional ways to increase revenues at UNM in ways appropriate to a research university. We never want to fall into the dead end of simply chasing dollars for the sake of funding; that would quickly take UNM away from excellence in teaching, research, and scholarly creativity. But where we can find new major funding sources for research and creativity – either via grant-writing or via the upcoming major capital campaign – we must move assertively to draw on them. And where we can generate significant new teaching revenues *and* sustain strong academic standards – perhaps via the better versions of online class work – we should move assertively to do so. These will require new dynamism among the faculty, a kind of more vigorous *and* intellectually-driven entrepreneurship. Watch for more about this in the near future.

## CONSENSUS DATA

In a spirit of well-informed faculty involvement in university governance, the Faculty Senate will be sharing data in the weeks to come regarding key issues facing the University. In spirit of shared governance, we will present "consensus data" -- that is, data which we and the Administration agree represents a reasonable view of reality.

Table 1. 10-year trends in tuition revenues, state appropriations (after rescissions), and tenured/tenure track faculty on main campus.

TEN-YEAR TREND DATA FOR UNM MAIN CAMPUS:	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	% change
Tenure/Tenure-track faculty	790	793	789	791	789	776	781	764	783	793	804	1.8%
Final I&G appropriation	\$129,420,000	\$133,869,200	\$141,635,900	\$144,065,400	\$150,175,800	\$152,144,600	\$160,639,600	\$169,961,900	\$188,558,200	\$189,828,113	\$183,678,156	41.9%
Tuition Revenue	\$43,640,772	\$48,961,262	\$53,740,334	\$58,889,464	\$63,687,680	\$73,264,402	\$78,652,614	\$78,880,305	\$83,370,298	\$88,160,657	pending	102.0%
Total Main Campus Budget	\$540,500,000	\$530,000,125	\$545,684,398	\$569,866,760	\$605,253,688	\$634,660,971	\$711,173,566	\$781,175,750	\$805,221,078	\$888,904,414	\$889,589,063	64.6%

Table 2. How the reductions in I&G revenue from the State have been addressed, either via budget reductions to the units under the Provost ("Academics") or to units elsewhere ("Administration"); or via re-channeling of other funds (Building Renewal & Replacement funds, unbudgeted tuition moneys, or federal stimulus monies).

### Main Campus Instruction & General

#### FY 09 thru FY 11 State Appropriations

	Academic	Administration	BRR	Stimulus	Tuition	
<b>FY 09 Original State Appropriation</b>						<b>194,726,500</b>
<b>FY 09 State Rescission</b> (internal reallocations)	(1,147,064)	(4,276,129)	(1,892,307)			(7,315,500)
<b>FY 10 State Appropriation</b>						<b>187,411,000</b>

	Academic	Administration	BRR	Stimulus	Tuition	
<b>FY 10 Original State Appropriation</b>						<b>187,411,000</b>
<b>FY 10 State Rescission</b> (internal reallocations/revenue)	(3,631,116)	(2,495,784)		(3,741,100)	(3,000,000)	(12,868,000)
<b>FY 11 State Appropriation</b>						<b>174,543,000</b>

<b>Total Reductions/Rescissions</b>	<b>(4,778,180)</b>	<b>(6,771,913)</b>	<b>(1,892,307)</b>	<b>(3,741,100)</b>	<b>(3,000,000)</b>	<b>(20,183,500)</b>
	<b>23.7%</b>	<b>33.6%</b>	<b>9.4%</b>	<b>18.5%</b>	<b>14.9%</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Main Campus Total

FY 09 Original Main Campus State Appropriations Total including RPSPs:	\$ 211,838,500
FY 11 Original Main Campus State Appropriations Total including RPSPs:	\$ 185,945,600
<b>Total Reduction in State Funding:</b>	<b>\$ (25,892,900) -12.22%</b>

Thanks to the Office of Planning, Budget, and Analysis; the Division of Human Resources; and the Office of the Provost for their work to produce clear data.

## Views of the Budget: Submissions from Some Faculty & Departments

At the Board of Regents meeting on September 14, the Faculty Senate President outlined the current work of the faculty and suggested some of the high-level "hard questions" that UNM must answer as we address our budget challenges. That report included proposals from several departments for how they would absorb the current budget rescissions. We include here a few additional notes from departments or individuals not included at that time

### BUDGET FRAMEWORK

UNM's total budget for FY 2011 exceeds \$838 million. For this year, the State of New Mexico will provide \$175 million. The proportion of the budget provided by state I&G funds therefore totals only about 20%. Can some of UNM's substantial streams of revenue beyond the state I&G funds be used to fund the university's academic mission? Of particular interest to faculty members is the \$141.5 million in tuition and fees projected to be collected for main campus for the 2010-2011 academic year (some but not all of which is I&G) - how will those funds be distributed to academic and non-academic units?

### ALTERNATIVE

Given that state funding for state universities is likely to decrease throughout the country in the next few years, faculty members want to ensure that I&G funds provided to UNM from the State of New Mexico are spent primarily on the academic mission of the university. Auxiliary units, such as Athletics, the UNM Foundation, the Alumni Association, have access to streams of revenue outside of state funding, and therefore I&G funding for auxiliaries should be eliminated as soon as possible.

### ON THE LIGHTER SIDE

One faculty member sent in the following:

Perhaps I can describe the budget reduction plan for my department through the story of the man who ran into a friend who was training his donkey to work without eating. The donkey was complaining loudly but eventually carried the load, and the owner was very proud. A few days later he met the same friend again, who was now looking downcast. "So, how is your donkey's training going?" "Would you believe it, just as he got used to work without eating, the darned donkey went and died on me. Just my bad luck..."

## Views of the Budget: Submissions from Some Faculty & Departments *Continued*

### BUDGET RESCISSIONS IN MUSIC

One difficulty in dealing with budget cuts is the fact that from the state perspective, the government is taking back 3.2% in I&G funds. At the unit level, that primarily means faculty salaries, part-time salaries, graduate assistantships, and department management functions (like phone, office supplies). If on paper almost all of the 3.2% funding lowers the budget and funds available for part-time salaries (as has occurred in music), it doesn't necessarily change the need to retain all of the part-time faculty members who are serving the curriculum. Other soft or endowment monies must somehow cover the need to maintain the curriculum in the case where fulltime faculty members are unable to meet the curricular need. For instance, in music, the need to hire an organist, a flamenco guitarist, or a harpist is not a full-time need, yet there must be an individual faculty member to serve these needs for individual students within a comprehensive curriculum (orchestras need harpists and a much ballyhooed flamenco program must have access to guitarists). This is a time where fundraising and development and other entrepreneurial methods of raising income (e.g., online courses through extended university) become key elements of strategy in maintaining a program like music. A single loss of a part-time faculty position such as trombone destroys all orchestra and band performance possibilities as well as the education of almost all of the 400 music majors who are enrolled in these ensembles.

### BUDGET RESCISSIONS IN HUMANITIES

Within the Humanities unit of the College of Arts and Sciences, the 3.2% budget rescission has forced departments to propose cutting their operating, GA/TA, and staff budgets. Operating budgets which have been stagnate for years and then been decreased over the five years as a result of harvesting (2006-2008) and budget rescissions(2009-2010) have forced departments to cut travel funds, telephones, syllabi and handout copying, and office supplies. At present, the Humanities departments can only cover a half of the current budget rescission if they zero out their operating budgets. The other half of the rescission has to come from cuts in GA/TA lines, staff lines, or if allowed, faculty and staff furloughs, suspension of faculty SACs for administrative duties, or consolidation of administrative duties within various units. While proposals have been made to share staff duties among departments, the current 10 year data show that staffing in the Humanities unit has decreased from .28 staff per faculty in 2000 to .25 staff per faculty. At the same time, the student credits hours in the College of Arts and Sciences has grown 25.90%.

## WHAT FACULTY SHOULD KNOW ABOUT AF&T

By Vic Strasburger, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee Chair

AF&T is a constitutionally designated faculty committee, composed of senior tenured faculty, which reviews and renders recommendations and/or decisions on a variety of different cases per Section B of the Faculty Handbook. These cases are typically based upon issues involving promotion, tenure, sabbaticals, or abridgement of academic freedoms. They may also involve issues of improper consideration or procedural violations.

Many conflicts can be resolved before they reach the level of a full-blown case before the Committee if they are aired and discussed early. In addition, Jean Civikly-Powell is now the official University Ombudsperson and also directs the Faculty Dispute Resolution program; and we encourage you to use her considerable skills.

The committee chair is a resource for informal consultations to assist a faculty member in determining which avenue best suits the needs of their particular circumstance. Current membership of the committee can be found at [facgov.unm.edu](http://facgov.unm.edu).

AF&T is also responsible for developing and vetting many policies that affect faculty. See: [handbook.unm.edu](http://handbook.unm.edu).

However, not all problems are within AF&T's purview. For example:

CASE #1: A faculty member dislikes his chair and feels that he is being assigned to unimportant committees that are just "busy-work." *Clearly, this faculty member should discuss his concerns*

*with his chair first. If not satisfied, the University Ombudsperson or FDR program might help. Or the faculty member could continue up "the chain of command" to the Dean and Provost. This may potentially be an AF&T case if the assignments are so overwhelming and time consuming that they adversely impact the faculty member's research and teaching. However, this type of problem should first go through the administrative chain of command and/or FDR before coming to AF&T*

CASE #2: A faculty member feels that her chair is harassing and/or discriminating against her. *Allegations of discrimination, harassment and "hostile workplace" first go to the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO).*

CASE #3: A faculty member thinks that a co-PI on a grant is embezzling funds. *This would go to the Office of Vice President of Research and the University Auditor.*

CASE #4: A faculty member feels that a fellow teacher is harassing a student. *This goes to the Dean of Students.*

CASE #5: A faculty member is denied tenure and/or promotion. *This is an AF&T case!*

CASE #6: A faculty member criticized his chair at a faculty meeting and is now relieved of his graduate seminars and forced to teach 2 introductory courses instead. *This is potentially an AF&T case.*

CASE #7: A faculty member is denied a sabbatical with no explanation and no review by the department's relevant committee. *This is potentially an AF&T case.*

## The American Association of University Professors (AAUP)

The UNM Chapter of The American Association of University Professors, the national professional organization which for decades has championed academic freedom and responsible governance, welcomes inquiries on membership. UNM's chapter has recently revitalized and is actively working with the faculty to explore beneficial options and outcomes in this period of financial hardship. The chapter focuses particularly on issues of shared governance, academic freedom and the rights of non-tenured, part-time, and adjunct faculty. AAUP National President Cary Nelson has stated, "It's important to preserve the values that make higher education in the U.S. what it is, and an AAUP chapter is the best way to do that."

For more information, visit [www.aaup.org](http://www.aaup.org) and contact UNM AAUP Chapter Secretary Les Field at [lesfield@unm.edu](mailto:lesfield@unm.edu).



Primary Business Address:

Faculty Governance  
c/o Office of the Secretary  
MSC05 3340

Website: [facgov.unm.edu](http://facgov.unm.edu)

Phone: (505) 277-4664

Fax: (505) 277-4665

E-mail: [facgov@unm.edu](mailto:facgov@unm.edu)

**Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda**

**September 28, 2010, 3:00 pm, Scholes Hall 204, Roberts Room**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Approval of Agenda   | Action  |
| 2. Acceptance of the August 24, 2010 Summarized Minutes   | Action  |
| 3. Provost's Report-Tenure Track Hiring and Department Level Faculty Numbers  | Information<br><i>Suzanne Ortega</i>                    |
| 4. Faculty Senate President's Report  | Information<br><i>Richard Wood</i>                      |
| <b>CONSENT AGENDA TOPICS</b>  |   |
| 5. Form C from the Curricula Committee<br>Revision of School Health Education Concentration in BSED, College of Education | Action<br><i>Richard Wood</i>                           |
| <b>AGENDA TOPICS</b>  |   |
| 6. UNM Post-Doctoral Fellowship Program   | Information<br><i>TBD</i>                               |
| 7. Email/Messaging/Calendering Task Force   | Information<br><i>Moira Gerety</i>                      |
| 8. Grade Entry Task Force   | Information<br><i>Terry Babbitt</i>                     |
| 9. Report on FS Council Pilot Project   | Information<br><i>Doug Fields &amp; Nikki Katalanos</i> |
| 10. New Business and Open Discussion-Salary Book Online?  | Action<br><i>Richard Wood &amp; Pat Lohmann</i>         |
| 11. Adjournment   |   |

**FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEES**

For the first time in many years our FS committee roster are virtually full. The positive response to serve on a committee has been very refreshing. Last spring's "call for volunteers" generated many more faculty who are interested in serving than there are committee openings. The Faculty Senate leadership wants everyone to know how grateful we are, and we look forward to moving shared governance ahead in the next weeks and months. Thank you all for your interest! —Tim Ross, President-Elect