

3-22-2011

Faculty Senate Summarized Minutes, 3/22/2011

UNM Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

UNM Faculty Senate. "Faculty Senate Summarized Minutes, 3/22/2011." (2011). https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/fs_minutes/87

This Minutes 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 Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact amywinter@unm.edu.

FACULTY SENATE SUMMARIZED MINUTES

**2010-2011 Faculty Senate
MARCH 22, 2011**

The Faculty Senate meeting for March 22, 2011 was called to order at 3:01 p.m. in the Roberts Room of Scholes Hall. Senate President Richard Wood presided.

1. ATTENDANCE

Guests Present: Professor Margaret Connell-Szasz (History), Executive Dean Jean Giddens (Nursing), Associate Professor Steven Harris (University Libraries), Associate Professor Liz Hutchison (History), Professor Mary Kaven (Psychiatry), Professor Kathleen Keating (University Libraries), Professor Kate Krause (Economics), Editor Sari Krosinski (University Communication and Marketing), Professor Tim Lowrey (Biology), Director Susan McKinsey (University Communication and Marketing), President Henry Nemcik (UNM Foundation), Professor Carol Parker (Law), Chairperson Mark Peceny (Sociology), Lecturer III Holly Phillips (University Libraries), Associate Vice President Curtis Porter (Office of the Provost), Assistant Professor John Rask (Anesthesiology), Professor Christine Sauer (Economics), and Director Susan Tiano (Latin American Iberian Institute).

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved as written.

3. APPROVAL OF SUMMARIZED MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 22, 2011 MEETING

The February 22, 2011 summarized minutes were approved as written.

4. PROVOST'S REPORT

Deputy Provost Richard Holder reported the following:

- The new School of Engineering Dean, Dr. Katalin Roman, has been working with UNM one day a week making the transition. He will begin July 1, 2011. He has been participating in the budget formulation for the next fiscal year.
- The audit of the Provost's Office is part of the regular work plan. The audit was not triggered by any complaint or problem. A 32 page control self-assessment questionnaire was submitted on February 24, 2011. The scope of the audit has not yet been set.
- Provost Ortega has worked to protect faculty lines. However, there are 12 fewer lines than a year ago. Keeping all of the open lines is a decision to wait rather than to eliminate now. Some open lines are from retirements. Growth has been filling the vacant lines. There is no current budget plan to cut open lines. There are three positions that are back filling but will not be reflected in the faculty counts until next year.
- Provost Ortega met with the Operations Committee on March 15 regarding Study Abroad. Provost Ortega was unaware of the resolution being considered when she met with them. The resolution is being presented later in the meeting. The Operations Committee officially apologized on behalf of the senate as it was an oversight due to time constraints. Provost Ortega feels the issue is over what the definition of 'office' is. The emphasis is on the students who need a single location for Study Abroad and international issues. Presently there is a difficult maze of

offices that students must navigate. A Spring 2009 task force report recommended creating such a space for students.

5. FACULTY HANDBOOK POLICY C35 APPOINTMENT AND CONTINUATION OF DEANS REVISION

Faculty Senate Policy Committee (FSPC) member Tim Lowrey (Biology) presented the proposed revision to Policy C35. The FSPC is in the process of reviewing all 'C' policies in the UNM Faculty Handbook. The revision reflects that the Faculty Senate Operations Committee will conduct the annual Deans Evaluation and the Committee on Governance will conduct the confidential 5-year vote of the dean's faculty. The revision below was unanimously passed by the Faculty Senate.

C35 Policy

APPOINTMENT AND CONTINUATION OF DEANS

(Adopted by the Faculty Senate, April 14, 1992; Amended and reaffirmed by the Faculty Senate, February 25, 1997; Amended and reaffirmed by the Faculty Senate, October 7, 1997; Rewording to Section #3 was recommended by the Regents, November 13, 1997; Amended and reaffirmed by the Faculty Senate, December 9, 1997)

The following policy procedures will be utilized for the appointment, periodic review, and terms of office of deans and their administrative equivalents at the University of New Mexico. All appointment policies will be in accordance with affirmative action guidelines.

1. Deans will normally serve terms of five years. Administrative equivalents at branch campuses will also serve terms of five years.
2. Annual evaluations of the dean by faculty and chairs in the college shall be required and will be administered by the Faculty Senate. These evaluations shall be used by the Provost or Chancellor for Health Sciences for performance improvement and salary increment determinations for the dean. The results of the evaluations shall be made available to the Faculty Senate President by the end of the semester in which the evaluation is completed. The Faculty Senate President will review the evaluations of the appropriate Deans or equivalent persons with the Provost or with the Chancellor for Health Sciences.
3. Terms of office may be renewable. Appointments and reappointments to terms of office are to be made by the Provost or Chancellor for Health Sciences after consultation with departmental college faculty and chairs, University officers, and other such persons as they shall see fit. The consultation with college faculty and chairs shall include the taking of a vote by secret ballot on any potential appointment or reappointment. The vote shall be administered by the Faculty Committee on Governance. The results of the vote shall be transmitted to the Provost or Chancellor of Health Sciences and be made available to the faculty and department chairs of the respective college. Reappointment must also be guided by the stated willingness of the deans to continue in that position, the results of the evaluation in the fourth year, and the willingness of the faculty and chairs, evidenced by secret ballot, to have the deans continue in office. The appointment or reappointment of the Dean of Graduate Studies shall be made by the Provost after appropriate consultation with the Senate Graduate Committee, University officers, the graduate faculty, and other interested persons.
4. It shall be understood that a policy of terms of office for deans does not abrogate the long-standing policy of the University that deans serve in any college at the pleasure of the Provost or Chancellor for Health Sciences and that a dean's appointment and continuing appointment occurs with the advice of and in consultation with the faculty and chairs of the college. This means, simply, that deans may be replaced during a term of office; also, they may resign.

Resolution of a disagreement: In the case of a disagreement between the administration and the faculty and chairs of a college, an amicable resolution will be found. A dean serves at the pleasure of the Provost or the Chancellor for Health Sciences, but a dean's appointment and continuing appointment occurs with the advice of and in consultation with the faculty and chairs of the college. A dean who has lost the confidence and support of his or her faculty and chairs cannot provide the positive leadership needed by the college.

6. FACULTY SENATE RESEARCH ALLOCATION COMMITTEE CHARGE REVISION

Operations Committee member Vageli Coutasias (Mathematics and Statistics) presented the following revision to the Research Allocation Committee (RAC) charge. The revision has been approved by the Faculty Senate Policy Committee and the Operations Committee. The revised charge below was passed by unanimous vote of the Faculty Senate.

A61.15
Policy

RESEARCH ALLOCATIONS COMMITTEE

Committee Charge

The Research Allocations Committee supervises and allocates the Faculty Research Fund. The committee shall communicate and meet with the Vice President for Research or his/her designated representatives. They shall formally meet at least monthly during fall and spring semesters to discuss the availability and allocation of funds. The committee receives requests from faculty members for grants-in-aid, determines faculty eligibility for grants from the fund and the amount of such grants, and appraises the merits of proposed research projects as well as the productivity of the applicants.

Committee Membership

Ten members appointed by the Faculty Senate; of these ten, at least one shall be selected from each of the following seven areas; physical sciences--chemistry, earth and planetary, mathematics and statistics, physics and astronomy; life sciences--biology, psychology; social sciences--anthropology, "business and administrative sciences", economics, geography, history, law, political science, sociology; engineering--all departments of the School of Engineering; education--all departments of the College of Education; humanities--architecture, English, journalism, foreign languages and literatures, Spanish and Portuguese, philosophy, communication and fine arts--all departments of the College of Fine Arts. The term of service shall be two years. Committee members may be elected to a second two-year term. At least one year must pass before a Committee member who has served two consecutive two-year terms is again eligible to serve. At the last meeting each year, the Committee shall elect a chair from the eligible membership. The chair shall remain active through the summer session. The chair or a designated representative shall convene the initial meeting of the new committee.

7. FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Faculty Senate President Richard Wood presented the following report.

Budget Report to Faculty Senate President Rich Wood March 22, 2011

Fiscal Context:

1. Dramatic fall in NM state revenues for next fiscal year: Original estimates ranged from \$230 up to \$450 million.
2. Actual final state deficit estimated around \$150 million that had to be found to balance the budget (a Constitutional requirement).
3. National and state-level ideology against any revenue enhancement.
4. National and state ideology that in reducing government budgets, Universities are capable of absorbing budget cuts because they can shift burden of higher education's costs onto students.
5. In past: Rather poor faculty image in minds of a significant portion of legislators.
6. Need to address solvency issues within Educational Retirement Board system.
7. All employees lost 1.5% of income in the "ERB swap" two years ago; likelihood that it would become permanent.

Our position and efforts:

1. Build better faculty ties to the Legislature (Faculty Senate Gov't Relations Committee and FS President, partly in collaboration with the UNM Office of Governmental Relations)
2. Political realism: Raise issue of revenue enhancements for the future, but work within realistic expectations of what we could actually affect.
3. In budget crisis, find common ground with UNM administration in order to protect UNM budget.

Key issues:

1. Budget cuts: 5% hit to higher education was the opening assumption at Legislature.
2. Tuition credit: End it, or get it implemented more fairly.
3. Oppose effort to make 1.5% ERB Swap permanent and add an additional 1.75% ERB swap, perhaps permanently.
4. ERB: Support responsible restructuring of ERB, but oppose unfair efforts.

5. Prioritize any capital investment funds for UNM Chemistry building and (secondly) Biology building

Quick interim summary of outcomes (just enough to understand budget scenario):

1. Budget hit to UNM: About 3% cut to core state component of I&G budget; 19% to RPSPs (but uneven)
2. Tuition credit: 3.1% [done via a fairer way of allocating tuition credit, an important precedent]
3. 1.5% ERB Swap made permanent; 1.75% additional ERB Swap added (*not* for ERB solvency, but rather to balance the state budget) – but we **defeated** a serious effort to make the 1.75% permanent as well.

Budget Scenario:

1. UNM proposes to cover the full 1.75% additional hit to salaries, permanently; except AVPs and above will not be covered.
2. Each College Dean established a level of cuts they could absorb. Total is ~\$880,000 and Arts & Sciences is held harmless.
3. Along with substantial additional budget trimming by Administration and non-College units in Provost's Office, big savings proposed via IT "rapid redesign", ongoing Pause & Hold, others.
4. Reinvestment of >\$3 million to "academic mission" including protecting some RPSPs, UNM Press, some new Faculty and GA/TA positions, and new investment to address A&S structural deficit
5. Does end up asking for a tuition rise above and beyond tuition credit, to sustain UNM as a serious research university

Associate Vice President Andrew Cullen (Planning, Budget and Analysis) added to the budget report by presenting the following

scenarios:



REVENUE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14
State General Fund Increase (Decrease) SFC REC		-	-
Workload Increase	6,096,118		
Tuition Credit Rate (\$100/ student or 3.1%)	(3,855,804)		
Tuition Credit Formula Base Growth	(5,374,800) (3,403,591)		
Tuition Waivers Reduction	(3,850,044)		
Other Reductions (RTW, Prorated, etc)	(361,479)		
FY 12 Projected Reduction for ERB SWAP 1.75%	(3,881,900)		
Unrealized Revenue (Interest Income)	(1,000,000)		
Enrollment Growth - FY 11 Un-Budgeted Tuition - one time	3,500,000		
Enrollment Growth - FY 11 Un-Budgeted Tuition - permanent	1,500,000		
Replace One-Time Funding Sources (see below in transfers)	-	(9,242,019)	
Total Funding Changes:	(5,256,700)	(9,242,019)	0
EXPENDITURES			
Required Use of Funds	6,716,797	384,000	208,000
Strengthen Core Mission	2,811,400	450,000	-
Total Additional Spending Requirements	9,528,197	834,000	208,000
Reduction of Expenditures	(8,340,861)	(442,000)	(300,000)
Administrative Fund Balance Pull-Back (One-Time Reduction)	(5,742,019)	0	0
Total Increase (Decrease) of Expenses:	(4,554,683)	392,000	(92,000)
BALANCE	(702,017)	(9,634,019)	92,000
Tuition Increase			
	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
State Tuition Tax (4.05% Impact)	3,855,804	-	-
Tuition Increase (1% = \$950K)	-	-	-
Total Tuition	3,855,804	0	0
Surplus/ (Shortage)	3,153,787	(9,634,019)	92,000
ELIMINATION OF ONE-TIME FUNDING	(7,500,000)		
NET	(4,346,213)		

	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14
Required Use of Funds			
Utility - Back Fill of Stimulus Funding	3,941,000		
Utility Inflation - PNM Rate Case (13.4% Increase over Three-Years)	480,000	384,000	208,000
Internal Audit - Audit Committee Recommendation	75,000		
Bad Debt Expense - projection of 1% of tuition increase	38,558	-	-
3% Scholarship Transfer	587,639		
Tuition Waivers - G/A and T/A	94,600	-	-
Liability/Property Insurance Premium Increases	1,500,000		
Subtotal	6,716,797	384,000	208,000
Strengthen Core Mission			
• Faculty & Staff Compensation Increase (FY13 - 3%, FY14 - 2%)	-	TBD	TBD
• Associated Fringe Benefit Increase @ 30%	-	TBD	TBD
Formula Distribution - HSC	395,000		
Absorption of RPSPs per Dean's Recommendation	210,900		
UNM Press Subsidy	250,000		
Faculty Promotions	200,000		
Faculty Positions	750,000		
GA/TA Positions	250,000		
Arts & Sciences Part-time faculty	500,000	450,000	-
FY 2010-11 Commitments	255,500		
Subtotal	2,811,400	450,000	-
Reduction of Expenditures			
a. Budget Reductions (Provost Recommendation)	(1,078,964)	(142,000)	-
b. Budget Reductions (Administrative Recommendation)	(2,003,616)	(300,000)	(300,000)
c. Pooled Fringe Benefits Reduction	(475,465)	-	-
Executive Salary Cuts by increased ERB contribution (total cut \$100K)	(46,550)		
Permanent Pause & Hold (Attrition)	(1,000,000)		
d. Information Technology Rapid Redesign	(2,365,139)	-	-
e. Dean's Council - Trigger Point	(871,127)		
General Administration Reduction - TBD	(500,000)	-	-
Subtotal	(8,340,861)	(442,000)	(300,000)
Administrative Fund Balance Pull-Back (One-Time Reduction)			
Academic Affairs (Total Amount \$4,308,992)	(3,000,000)		
Administration (Total Amount \$2,742,019)	(2,742,019)		
Subtotal	(5,742,019)	-	-
Elimination of One-Time Funding Sources			
Faculty Sabbaticals	(400,000)		
Transfer to Building Renewal & Replacement	(3,500,000)		
Pause & Hold	(1,500,000)		
Use of Balance	(2,000,000)		
Voluntary Furlough	(100,000)		
Subtotal	(7,500,000)		

* The University would like to include a compensation increase in FY 13 and FY 14 - amount to be determined at a later date.

7. FACULTY DISCIPLINARY POLICY C07

Faculty Senate Policy Committee Chair and Senator Nikki Katalanos presented the proposed FHB Policy C07 Faculty Disciplinary Procedures. The current version contains the changes requested by the Faculty Senate. The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee unanimously approved the revisions as did the Faculty Senate Policy Committee. The Faculty Senate voted 29 to 2 with 1 abstention to approve the following policy.

C 07
Policy

FACULTY DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES

1. The University encourages a supportive problem-solving approach to performance problems, but the University recognizes that misconduct may require disciplinary action. The University normally uses a progressive discipline to address misconduct. Progressive discipline is intended to be corrective, *not* punitive in nature. It is designed to provide faculty with notice of deficiencies and an opportunity to improve. However, some violations of policies and procedures, or continued negative behavior, may be of such serious nature that suspension without pay or discharge pursuant to Faculty Handbook policies may be appropriate.
2. Any member of the faculty, including any serving as an academic administrator, who violates a published University policy may be subject to warning, censure, suspension without pay, or dismissal. In determining the corrective action, the chair and other administrators should take into account the seriousness of the violation and the degree of culpability of the faculty member. Teaching or research assistants in their faculty capacity are considered faculty members for purposes of this Policy.
 - a) "Warning" means an oral reprimand or expression of disapproval.
 - b) "Censure" means a written reprimand or expression of disapproval, which should include an explanation of the nature of the misconduct, and the specific action to be taken by the faculty member *and/or* chair to correct the problem, including mentoring, if appropriate, and a statement that further disciplinary action could occur should the problem persists.
 - c) "Suspension without pay" means disciplinary suspension without regular salary for a stated period of time.
 - d) "Dismissal" means termination of employment (see Faculty Handbook sections B.5.3, B.6.4.3, and B.5.4).
3. The procedures specified in this Policy provide for the consideration and determination of proposed disciplinary actions against faculty members short of dismissal. Consideration and determination of disciplinary actions that may result in a proposed dismissal of a tenured faculty member, or dismissal of an untenured faculty member prior to expiration of his or her contract term, are governed by sections B.5.3, B.6.4.3, or B.5.4, respectively, of the Faculty Handbook and are not covered by these procedures. However, cases in which faculty dismissal has been considered pursuant to sections B.5.3, B.6.4.3, or B.5.4, and a lesser sanction is ultimately proposed instead by the administration, shall be handled under this policy, without duplicating steps that have already taken place. In particular, if the chair and dean conclude that suspension without pay is appropriate in a case in which dismissal was considered but rejected, the faculty member is entitled to request a peer hearing as provided below in sections 10 and 11
4. In the case of allegations against a faculty member that appear to be within the scope of another specific University policy that has its own procedures for investigation and resolution (including but not limited to allegations of research misconduct, discrimination, or sexual harassment), the chair or dean shall forward such allegations to the appropriate person or department for handling pursuant to the applicable policy. If such a process requires the chair to make a disciplinary determination after an investigation and recommendation from another University body, this policy will be followed in determining the appropriate discipline. If the other procedure involved a hearing before a faculty committee, any factual determinations will not be subject to reconsideration by faculty peer review under this policy.
5. References to the department chair in this policy also include the program director or associate or vice dean in a non-departmentalized school or college. If allegations are made against a department chair or other administrator, the next higher academic authority shall perform the functions assigned in this Policy to the chair, and the provisions shall be modified as appropriate. Any individual(s) bringing an allegation of faculty misconduct to the chair's attention is protected by, and subject to, the University's policy on reporting misconduct (UBPPM section 2200, Whistleblower Protection and Reporting Suspected Misconduct and Retaliation).
6. In all cases other than those set forth in paragraphs 3 and 4 above, if a member of the faculty is alleged to have violated a policy of the University, the department chair shall provide the faculty member a written notice explaining the nature and specific content of the alleged violation, together with a copy of this policy, and shall discuss the alleged violation with the faculty member. The written notice shall be given to the faculty member within ninety (90) days of the chair learning of the apparent violation of policy and within two (2) years of the date of the apparent violation. If the apparent violation could not have been discovered earlier by the chair or other administrators using reasonable diligence, then the written notice shall be given within ninety (90) days of the discovery of the apparent violation. But in no event can written notice be given to the faculty member after four (4) years from the actual date of the alleged violation. The faculty member may be accompanied by one person in meeting with the chair. The faculty member and the chair shall notify each other at least two working days prior to the scheduled meeting who, if anyone, will be accompanying them at the meeting. The chair should issue a written report within five (5) working days after the meeting summarizing the discussion with the faculty member, keep a copy in the faculty member's file, and send a signed copy to the faculty member. Before, during or after the meeting, the chair may ask the faculty member to respond in writing to the notice and present any relevant written material within a reasonable time specified by the chair. Likewise the faculty member shall be free to submit any materials reasonably desired on his/her own volition, no later than five (5) working days after meeting with the chair unless the chair grants additional time in writing. The matter may be concluded at this point by the mutual consent of all parties.

7. The department chair or the faculty member may initiate conciliation proceedings at any time prior to the chair's decision by contacting the Ombuds/Dispute Resolution Services for Faculty program as provided in Section C345 with notice to the other parties. Conciliation may be undertaken if both parties agree.

8. If a mutually agreeable resolution (with or without conciliation) is not achieved, the department chair shall make a decision in the matter and communicate it to the faculty member in writing within ten (10) working days after meeting with the faculty member or the termination of conciliation efforts if they are unsuccessful, whichever is later. The faculty member shall have ten (10) working days from receipt of the written decision to submit a written request for review by the appropriate dean, who will issue a written decision concerning whether the chair's decision is upheld, modified or reversed. Prior to making a decision, the dean shall meet with the department chair and the faculty member, and their representatives if desired, together or separately, and shall receive and consider any documents the parties wish to submit. Documents shall be submitted within five (5) working days of the faculty member's request for review. If formal conciliation has not been attempted previously, the dean may refer the matter to the Ombuds/Dispute Resolution Services for Faculty. The dean will communicate his/her decision to the parties in writing within ten (10) working days after meeting with the faculty member or the termination of conciliation efforts if they are unsuccessful, whichever is later.

9. If the faculty member does not agree with the dean's action, he/she may submit a written request for review by the Provost or Chancellor within five (5) working days of receipt of the dean's decision. The Provost/Chancellor will decide the matter on the record unless he/she determines that it would be helpful to meet with the parties, together or separately. Within ten (10) working days after receipt of the complete record or after meeting with the parties, whichever is later, the Provost/Chancellor shall uphold, modify or reverse the dean's decision by written notice to the parties. The Provost/Chancellor may seek an advisory investigation and opinion from the Faculty Ethics Committee. The decision of the Provost/Chancellor is subject to discretionary review by the President or Board of Regents if requested by the faculty member.

10. If the chair, after meeting with the faculty member and considering all materials submitted pursuant to section 6, proposes to suspend the faculty member without pay, the chair shall meet with the dean to review the matter. If the proposal is supported by the dean after meeting with the chair and the faculty member, the faculty member is entitled to a faculty peer hearing. The faculty member shall send such a request to the Provost/Chancellor within five (5) working days of receipt of the dean's determination.

11. If a faculty peer hearing is requested as provided in this Policy, the chair of the Faculty Ethics Committee will arrange for a hearing before two members of that Committee from outside the faculty member's department, chosen by the Ethics Committee, and one uninvolved department chair from a different school or college chosen by the Provost/Chancellor. The hearing will be held as soon as reasonably possible and shall be conducted according to the University's Dispute Resolution Hearing Procedures. The University Secretary's office shall make arrangements for the hearing. Hearings shall be recorded and shall be private unless both parties agree that the hearing be open. The hearing panel may uphold or reverse the proposal to suspend the faculty member without pay. If the panel's decision is to reverse the proposal, the panel may direct the chair and dean to impose a lesser disciplinary measure. The panel's decision may be reviewed on the record by the Provost/Chancellor, but the panel's decision shall not be reversed or modified except in the case of clear error, which shall be detailed in writing by the Provost/Chancellor. The decision of the Provost/Chancellor is subject to discretionary review by the President or Board of Regents if requested by the faculty member.

12. The faculty member may bring a complaint before the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure if he/she believes the matter or its handling is within the jurisdiction of the Committee. The Committee will determine whether the matter is within its jurisdiction and, if so, shall handle the matter under the Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Normally, review by the AF&T Committee should be sought after the determination by the Provost/Chancellor. If the faculty member pursues the matter before the AF&T Committee, AF&T shall accept the facts as determined by the faculty peer hearing, if one was held.

13. If the final determination is that no misconduct occurred, efforts shall be undertaken to the extent possible and appropriate to fully protect, restore, or maintain the reputation of the faculty member.

14. These procedures do not supersede Appendix VIII to Part B of the Faculty Handbook, concerning the Faculty Ethics Committee, and a faculty member who believes that he/she has been improperly accused of unethical behavior may bring the matter to the attention of the Ethics Committee under Appendix VIII after determination by the Provost/Chancellor.

8. STUDY ABROAD RESOLUTION

Operations Committee member Melissa Bokovoy (History) presented a Study Abroad Resolution. The Provost engaged the faculty in 2009 regarding the Study Abroad Program and International Studies. It was reported that it is too difficult for students to navigate all the requirements through the different departments and a single office should be created.

After some discussion the Faculty Senate unanimously approved, with one abstention, the following Study Abroad Resolution.

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION CONCERNING STUDY ABROAD

WHEREAS international education in general and study abroad in particular are critical elements of the University's academic mission, and

WHEREAS the success of study abroad and international education programs on campus currently depends upon coordination between an excessively dispersed set of programs and units including the Office of International Programs and Studies (OIPS); the Latin American and Iberian Institute (LAI); liaisons, committees, and task forces housed within Academic Affairs; the Vice President for Student Affairs; the International Studies Institute; and programs housed within individual academic units, and

WHEREAS the UNM Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs has announced plans to create a Study Abroad Office which could add an additional administrative unit relating to study abroad and international education,

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of New Mexico create an ad hoc committee to propose a strategic plan for submission to the Provost by Summer 2011. The strategic plan would include recommendations for restructuring the organization of study abroad and international education programs in a manner that promotes academic excellence while containing costs.

CONSENT AGENDA TOPICS

9. FORMS C FROM THE CURRICULA COMMITTEE

The following Forms C were approved by voice vote of the Faculty Senate:

- Name Change of Digital Field Broadcast Concentration in BA of Journalism and Mass Communication, College of Arts and Sciences
- Deletion of Advertising Concentration in BA of Journalism and Mass Communication, College of Arts and Sciences
- Deletion of Public Relations Concentration in BA of Journalism and Mass Communication, College of Arts and Sciences
- New Strategic Communication Concentration in BA of Journalism and Mass Communication, College of Arts and Sciences
- Revision of Degree in MA of Latin American Studies, College of Arts and Sciences
- Revision of Health Policy Concentration in PhD of Nursing, College of Nursing
- Deletion of Leadership for Community and Organizational Learning Concentration in MA of Educational Leadership, College of Education
- Deletion of School Leadership Towards Administrative Licensure Concentration in MA of Educational Leadership, College of Education
- Deletion of Instructional Leadership Concentration in MA of Educational Leadership, College of Education
- Revision of Ethnology Concentration in BA of Anthropology, College of Arts and Sciences
- Revision of EdD in Education Leadership, College of Education
- New Minor in BA of Health, Medicine and Human Values, College of Arts and Sciences
- Revision of Minor in Physics, College of Arts and Sciences
- New Major in Dual Degree of BS Athletic Training and BSED Physical Education, College of Education

- Revision of Major in MA of Education Leadership, College of Education
- Revision of Post-Masters Education Specialist Certificate in Educational Leadership, College of Education
- Revision of Major in Master of Public Health, School of Medicine

10. FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPROVALS

Faculty Senate President Elect Tim Ross (Civil Engineering) presented the spring Faculty Senate Committee approvals. The following faculty assignments to the committees were approved by voice vote of the Faculty Senate.

Faculty Senate Committee Appointments Needing Senate Approval

First	Last	Title	Dept	Committee	Date
Bruce	Perlman	Professor	School of Public Admin	Governmental Relations	8/25/2010
Ben	Njus	Visiting Lecturer	Valencia Campus	Admissions & Registration	8/31/2010
John	Russell	Professor	Mechanical Eng	Athletics	8/31/2010
Fran	Wilkinson	Professor	University Libraries	Faculty Staff Benefits	8/31/2010
Judith	White	Assistant Professor	Communication & Journalism	Research Policy Committee	8/31/2010
Peter	Vorobieff	Associate Professor	Mechanical Eng	Ethics Committee	9/1/2010
Coleen	Arviso	Lecturer	Gallup Campus	Admissions & Registration	9/1/2010
Cassiano	De Oliveira	Professor	Chemical Nuclear Eng	Research Policy Committee	9/1/2010
Cristian	Bologa	Research Assoc Professor	Biochem Molecular	Research Policy Committee	9/1/2010
Katja	Schroeter	Associate Professor	Foreign Lang Lit	Scholarship	9/2/2010
Christos	Christodoulou	Professor	Electrical Computer Engineering	Curricula	9/2/2010
Sheri	Thomas	Assistant Professor	School of Law	Library	9/2/2010
Caroline	Smith	Associate Professor	Linguistics	Scholarship	9/3/2010
Maya	Elick	Professor	Earth & Planetary Sciences	Library	9/3/2010
Jackie	Shane	Associate Professor	University Libraries	Computer Use	9/10/2010
Cassiano	De Oliveira	Professor	Chemical Nuclear Eng	Computer Use	9/13/2010
Tim	Castillo	Associate Professor	School of Architecture & Planning	Undergraduate	9/13/2010
Teresa	Cordova	Associate Professor	School of Architecture & Planning	Budget	9/13/2010
Susan	Fox	Associate Professor	College of Nursing	Curricula	11/18/2010
Paul	Farnsworth	Lecturer	Biology	Computer Use	12/2/2010
Theresa	Strike	Assistant Professor	Law Library	Admissions & Registration	12/2/2010
Kevin	Cahill	Professor	Physics & Astronomy	Admissions & Registration	12/2/2010
Caleb	Richardson	Lecturer III	History	Computer Use	12/3/2010
Durwood	Ball	Associate Professor	History	University Press	3/9/2011
Matthew	Hofer	Assistant Professor	English	University Press	3/9/2011
A. Gabriel	Melendez	Professor	American Studies	University Press	3/9/2011
Teresa	Wilkins	Professor	Gallup Campus -Anthropology	University Press	3/9/2011
Richard	Hayes	Associate Professor	Philosophy	KUNM	3/21/2011

AGENDA TOPICS

11. FORM C FROM THE CURRICULA CMTE: PROPOSAL TO ADD HIST 181-182 TO CORE

Faculty Senate Curricula Committee Chair Kathleen Keating (University Libraries) presented a proposal authored by Kimberly Gauderman (History) and Elizabeth Hutchison (History) to add History 181 and 182 (Latin American Survey) as acceptable to the core for history/humanities. The proposal was approved unanimously by the Faculty Senate

Proposal to add History 181-182 (Latin American Survey) to the UNM Core Curriculum Cover Sheet for Form C presented for Faculty Senate consideration, March 22, 2011 By Kimberly Gauderman and Elizabeth Hutchison

Since March 2010, Kymm Gauderman and Liz Hutchison (History) have worked with the Department of History, the Registrar's Office, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Faculty Senate Undergraduate and Curriculum Committees to add two Latin American history survey courses (History 181-182) to the UNM Core Curriculum in the Humanities. The change would add these two existing courses to the history options already in the Core – Western Civilization and U.S. History – that many undergraduates now use to fulfill their Core Humanities requirement. This proposal has secured the unanimous support from the departmental, College, and FS committees involved, and has served as a test case on changes to the Core for the Provost's Working Group on the Core Curriculum and the FS Curriculum Committee.

Below please find a summary of the justifications offered by the Department of History for adding these courses to the UNM Humanities Core Curriculum:

- Broadens undergraduate choices for Core Humanities coursework in history from four courses to six, reducing enrollment pressure on existing Core courses, increasing student-faculty contact, and making better use of faculty resources in the History Department;
- Latin America is a region of historic significance for New Mexican students; this course further diversifies Humanities Core offerings and supports advanced undergraduate courses in Latin American Studies across the curriculum;
- Many of the Graduate Assistants in History who support faculty teaching in the existing Core surveys are drawn from the department's strong program in Latin American History, and would benefit from the opportunity to work in their area of specialization.

Because of the emergent nature of procedures for making changes to the Core Curriculum, it has taken over a year (and two separate strategies) for this proposal to clear the requisite seven committees in order to reach the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate's March 22 meeting is the last opportunity that would allow History 181 and 182 to fulfill student Core requirements in the Humanities in the coming academic year (2011-2012).

Please contact either Kimberly Gauderman and Liz Hutchison (kgaud@unm.edu, ehutch@unm.edu), or Kathleen Keating, Chair of FS Curriculum Committee (kkeating@unm.edu), with any questions you have about the proposed addition to the UNM Humanities Core Curriculum.

A motion was made and seconded that the FS Curricula Committee will develop a policy and procedures for adding courses to the core. The motion was unanimously approved.

12. FORM D FROM THE CURRICULA COMMITTEE

Executive Dean Jean Keim (College of Nursing) presented a Form D creating a Doctorate of Nursing Practice. The national standard for this professional degree has moved to the doctorate level. New Mexico is only one of two states without a doctorate program.

A motion was made to table the request until the Health Sciences Center Council has had the opportunity to consider the request.

The motion was approved 17-4. The request will be sent to the HSC Council and will return to the Faculty Senate for consideration at the April 26, 2011 meeting.

Senator Douglas Fields called for quorum. The required quorum of 40% (24 senators) was achieved with a count of 27 senators present.

The approval process for this request is confusing due to the fact that the HSC Council is a pilot and is not in the current approval path for the Form D from the College of Nursing. Discussions and development of the approval process incorporating the new council structure will continue. Further details will be provided to senators at a future meeting.

13. NEW BUSINESS AND OPEN DISCUSSION

No new business was raised.

14. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rick Holmes
Office of the Secretary