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DATE: August 12, 1983

To: All Members of the Faculty Senate

From: Anne J. Brown, Secretary of the University

Subject: Meeting

The first meeting of the 1983-84 Faculty Senate will be held on August 23 at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva. After the meeting there will be a social gathering at the UNM Club.

The agenda will be mailed later.

AJB/br
TO: All Members of the UNM Faculty
FROM: Anne J. Brown, Secretary of the University
SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Meeting

All members of the faculty are invited to attend the first meeting of the 1983-84 Faculty Senate on Tuesday, August 23, at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

The main topic of discussion will be faculty response to the Governor's Commission on Higher Education concerning faculty recommendations for the promotion of excellence and better coordination of planning and development in New Mexico higher education.

AJB/bt
TO: Members of the Faculty Senate  
FROM: Anne J. Brown, Secretary  
SUBJECT: Meeting of the Faculty Senate  

The first meeting of the 1983-84 Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, August 23, at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva.  
The agenda will include the following items:  

(pp. 1-7)  
1. Summarized minutes of May 10, 1983  
2. Memorial Minute for Professor Emeritus C. Clayton Hoff -- Professor William Martin  
3. Memorial Minute for Professor Sam Guyler -- Professor Alfred R. Rodrigues  
4. Memorial Minute for Professor Morton Schoenfeld  
5. President's Report -- Senate President David Kauffman  
6. Introduction of Senators  
7. Committee Replacements -- Professor Richard King  
8. Status Report on the University Planning Task Force  

(pp. 8-16)  
9. Governor's Commission on Higher Education/Senate Committee Responses  

Enclosed with the agenda materials are Faculty Senate Bylaws and names, addresses, and phone numbers of the Operations Committee.  

Immediately after the meeting, Senators are invited to the UNM Club for a brief social gathering.
The August 23, 1983 meeting of the UNM Faculty Senate was called to order by President David Kauffman at 3:35 p.m. in the Kiva.

The minutes of May 10, 1983 were approved as distributed.

Memorial Minutes. Professors W. C. Martin and Alfred Rodriguez read memorial minutes for Professor Emeritus C. Clayton Hoff and Assistant Professor Sam Guyler respectively. The Senate adopted the minutes by a rising vote and the Secretary was asked to send copies to the next of kin.

Professor Peter Ciurczak introduced Professors Rita Angel and Darrell Randall who presented a musical tribute—Vocalise by Sergei Rachmaninoff—to Professor Morton Schoenfeld, who died on July 16, 1983.

President's Report. Senate President David Kauffman gave a brief overview of operating rules of the Faculty Senate and noted that agendas are set two weeks in advance of each meeting. Committee chairs who have business for Senate action should meet with the Operations Committee the last Tuesday of each month at 3:30 p.m. in the Roberts Room (330 Scholes Hall). He stated that all Senate meetings are open to faculty and other interested persons and will be closed only in special cases.

During the summer the Operations Committee has been involved with the Governor's Commission on Higher Education. Senate Presidents of the other state institutions of higher education have met to share information and to establish a communication network.

Kauffman continued by stating that specific plans and goals for this year's Senate are (1) to cooperate with the University Task Force for Planning; (2) to begin the review of administrators as outlined in the procedures adopted by the Senate on April 13, 1982; (3) to try to obtain final approval for the procedures for search committees passed by the Senate on March 6, 1983; (4) to broaden faculty contact with legislators; (5) to explore the need for a University Ombudsman; (6) to seek the establishment of an advisory committee to the UNM
Bookstore; and (7) to confer with President Perovich about some sort of recognition for outstanding faculty and staff.

Kauffman concluded his remarks by saying that he had visited Regent President Henry Jaramillo, Jr. to discuss the matter of a presidential search. At the present time there is nothing definite to report on this subject.

Committee Assignments. Upon recommendation by Professor Richard King for the Operations Committee, the Senate approved the following committee assignments: Don Schlegel (Architecture & Planning) appointed as a member of the Budget Review Committee; Keith Wells (General College) as replacement for Jan Corzine (General College) on the Community Education Committee; Jan Corzine as a member of the Curricula Committee; Pearl Madrid (Computer Center) and David Padilla (Physical Plant) as members on the Faculty Staff Benefits and Welfare Committee; Richard Harris (Psychology) and Richard Van Dongen (Elementary Education) as members of the Human Subjects Committee; Jerome Shea (General College) and Edith Cherry (Architecture & Planning) as members of the Undergraduate Committee; and Fred Bales (Journalism) as a member of the Student Publications Board.

University Task Force for Planning. Provost McAllister Hull, Jr., chair of the University Task Force for Planning, said that only one meeting of the Task Force has been held and that an agenda has not been set. The Task Force will first look at the present units of the University and their plans for the next five, ten, and fifteen years. It is anticipated that a comprehensive plan will be developed with the help of everyone on our campus.

Members of the Task Force are Richard Griego, Marvin "Swede" Johnson, Leonard Napolitano, Jeremy Sabloff, Marian Shelton, Al Utton, and Jim Wiegmann.

Governor's Commission on Higher Education. Professor Fred Harris, Chairman of the Governor's Commission on Higher Education, told the Senate that the Commission had three tasks. They are (1) to spotlight the good things about higher education in New Mexico, (2) to build a constituency for higher education and (3) to make recommendations concerning the promotion of excellence in higher education. He said that the first priority to be identified is to fund the formula at 100% and to increase faculty and staff salaries. There will be nine public hearings around the state with two of them being held at UNM. The Faculty Senate has been asked to submit a position paper to the Commission; however, all members of the faculty and staff are asked to make comments and suggestions if they wish to do so.

President Kauffman asked Senators to make any recommendations or statements regarding any subject dealing with higher education. Following is a brief summary of statements made:
The Commission should be concerned about a steady state in higher education and not just the immediate emergency.

The preceding comment should be extended to the library which received a one-time fix several years ago and hasn't recovered yet.

The Commission should recommend more money for support services.

Course fees should be studied. These fees represent unadvertised tuition costs.

A thorough case for every aspect of the University should be presented.

Faculty loads should be studied.

A long-range planning process should be carried on both internally and externally. There should be cooperative planning among the state's universities which are competing for funds.

Citizens of the state should be made aware of the fact that the University is trying to do its job, and professors teach without being paid for certain courses.

It is the student who suffers when a class is too big to allow the professor time to give attention to the individual.

President Kauffman urged Senators to contact any member of the Operations Committee to submit further comments to be included in the Senate's report to the Commission.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne J. Brown, Secretary
July 25, 1983

Dr. David Kauffman
Chemical & Nuclear Engineer Dept.
FEC 209
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131

Dear David:

I appreciated our meeting with the Operations Committee of the UNM Faculty and your and their willingness to undertake a paper, in addition to preparing a statement for the hearings.

The Commission will hold its public hearing for the main UNM Campus on Wednesday, September 14, beginning at 10:00 A.M. I'll get back to you on the place. It will be very helpful if you could present a faculty - viewpoint statement at that time which will help us in our recommendations for the promotion of excellence and better coordination of planning and development in New Mexico higher education and training. You can particularize about UNM, of course, and perhaps generalize for New Mexico, as well. We would like to have your statement (about 20 pages) in writing, with several copies, although we would appreciate it being briefed down considerably for the oral presentation to the Commission. Obviously, your statement should deal with salaries and related matters, with a proposed increase and justifications (and relevant regional and other comparisons). This will be very helpful to us. One suggestion in regard to immediate salary increases which you might consider is that we should recommend a two-step increase: one percentage increase to take effect upon adoption by the Legislature and to be paid for with a supplemental appropriation; another increase for the following fiscal year. Can information be gathered in regard to faculty members who have left or others who have rejected positions because of salary or other problems? This could be useful.

Now, in addition to your statement (and perhaps overlapping with it), we would really appreciate the Operations Committee preparing an issue paper (15 pages or so, with footnotes and charts, as applicable) by September 15 on the subject of "The Role of the Faculty in an Institution of Excellence." In other words, what is the pattern or goal we should be aiming for - from qualifications, to tenure, to involvement in university affairs. You could tailor the paper to an institution like UNM. I hope the Operations Committee will be able to undertake this task for us. It can be enormously helpful in the preparation of our report.

Sincerely yours,

FRED R. HARRIS
Chairman
To: Faculty Senate  
From: Undergraduate Committee  
Subject: Role of Faculty in an Institution of Excellence

The Committee's principal response to the call for input on this subject is that it feels the need for much more faculty involvement in several vital matters.

Primary is the need to determine a master plan delineating the central role and mission of the University. At present, it is most unclear as to whether the University's main effort is the providing of an academic education along traditional lines or instead making student attainment of readily marketable skills the central focus. The growth of a multiversity with branch campuses, such as the new Valencia County campus, has drained resources and has been brought about without the faculty's having a role in such planning. They have instead been obliged to watch $18 million spent on branch campuses without there being enough money to fund basic English and mathematics courses at the main campus. Teaching loads have grown heavier while faculty remuneration in salaries and benefits has remained static or decreased. Equipment has been supplied, but without the funding to maintain it.

Quality education of undergraduate and graduate students alike depends upon the morale of faculty as well as their teaching abilities. The state and the administration, in developing an excellent and outstanding institution, need to find ways to foster and enhance faculty morale and dedication. Ways must be found to enroll them to the fullest extent in the design and in the fulfilling of University goals and objectives. The faculty, in turn, would cooperate wholeheartedly in carrying out such a mission.

D.W. Trester/yc
TO: Members of the Faculty Senate  
FROM: Richard W. Holder (for the Research Policy Committee)  
SUBJECT: Role of Research in an Institution of Excellence

Of the three commonly accepted purposes of a University (research, teaching, service), research (or equivalent scholarly work) is the most important. Without it, the other two purposes soon become impossible to fulfill. The following points about research and scholarship at UNM are deserving of further thought and discussion:

1) Without adequate opportunity and support for research and scholarship, it is impossible to attract or retain the kind of highly qualified faculty required to make this an "Institution of Excellence." Even with a high level of outside support in the form of grants, the kind of research needed here at UNM will cost local money. Excessive teaching loads, inadequate staff support, a paltry budget for the library, no funds for travel to professional meetings or bring outside seminar speakers here are among the factors that make scholarship here more difficult to carry out than it should be.

2) Research and scholarship are intimately involved with both graduate and undergraduate education. In many fields (e.g. the sciences), much of the research output is done by graduate students in pursuit of their advanced degrees under the close direction of faculty. Undergraduates also "do" an amazing amount of research, some even for course credit. Further, the results of scholarship done here are often then presented as material in upper division courses. Beyond these points, most would agree that a teacher who can be active in research is much more versed in his or her field and much more "alive" intellectually than one who is prevented from active scholarship. Surely in most cases the active researcher will make the better teacher.

3) In spite of the central importance of research and scholarship to the function of our University, recognition of this is not widespread in the state. Support and understanding at high government levels seems good when equipment and building bond monies are considered, yet once the equipment and buildings are present they are forgotten. No staff can be hired to operate or repair the equipment. Few maintenance agreements are permitted. No appreciation of the fact that a sophisticated research instrument in the sciences has a finite lifetime and will wear out and need to be replaced exists. This leads to faculty spending time repairing instruments, and to panics when they finally die. We could learn much from business here (i.e., depreciation of equipment so funds could be set aside for replacement).
4) Although most if not all faculty should continue to teach, our overall research efforts would benefit enormously from creation and support of endowed chairs, research professorships, and/or distinguished professorships. We have almost none of these positions now, and thus lack the leadership and experience the occupants of them would provide. Also, senior faculty with proven records of high scholarly productivity are much more easily recruited if positions like this are available. We might even create temporary (1 semester or 1 year) distinguished positions at which faculty from other institutions could spend a sabbatical infusing our school with their skills, enthusiasm, and knowledge.
The report of the Long-Range Planning Committee to the Senate last year provided a more detailed list of academic planning procedures. We will briefly summarize them here. However, we will state at the outset that it is our belief that there is no way that an institution can achieve a degree of excellence without deciding upon where it wants to go and then determining a reasonable and rational plan of how to get there. This planning process is an integral part of attaining excellence.

Planning for Excellence

Planning is essential in order to establish the long-range goals of the university, i.e. what kind of university do we wish to have: high-tech, Harvard-on-the-Rio Grande, specialist in Southwest Studies, etc. Knowing what kind of institution we are to be will allow all segments of the university to plan accordingly. The plan should be specific enough that outsiders such as review groups can see the course the university is plotting, but should also allow flexibility for responding to new opportunities and changes when such are advantageous to the university and its constituencies.

Stages of such planning include:

- Establish goals (10-20 year time frame)
- Review of departments and programs (external and internal review)
- Decide on plan at unit levels (full faculty participation)
- Dialogue between units and higher administration
- Decide upon university five-year plan
- Implement two-year sub-plan for operational (budget) purposes
- Review and evaluate overall progress on continuing basis

Faculty Participation

It is up to the state via the Regents to decide upon the overall mission and goals for the university. Beyond that, the faculty must be involved in each step of the planning process. As the experts in various disciplines and with extensive experience in higher education, the faculty must provide the collective wisdom from which a viable plan of excellence can be conceived and effected.

In particular, at the unit level, the input of the faculty is essential to establish viable academic planning. At higher levels, faculty input will be more representative, via the Senate and its committees. Faculty members should recognize the responsibility incumbent upon them to serve on planning and evaluation groups both at the unit and university levels.
The purpose of this memorandum is to serve as a discussion document during the Faculty Senate meeting scheduled for August 23, 1983.

The Budget Review Committee (BRC) met on June 15, 1983. BRC reached general agreement on several points and endorses several aspects regarding preparation and submission of the 1984/85 budget. On July 7, 1983 three members of BRC met with President Perovich, Provost Hull, and Director of the Budget Wiegmann to discuss the BRC endorsements, identified as follows:

1. Increased faculty and staff compensation (salary and fringe benefits) should be of the highest priority.
2. Attempts should be made by the University to restore the 1983/84 budget cut (4%) in 1984/85 -- then add an appropriate percentage for compensation and other expenditures.
3. Contributions for retirement should be 75:25, with the state contributing 75% and the employees 25%.
4. Special funding should be found to support adequately General Library automation efforts, especially for the new science/engineering complex/programs.
5. Equipment renewal replacement and maintenance is imperative to maintain excellence in teaching and research; adequate funds should be provided through an increased proportion of land and permanent fund revenue designated for this purpose.

Should any of BRC's endorsements be included in any presentation that might be presented to the Governor's Commission on Higher Education, viz., at the public hearing scheduled for September 14, 1983?

RM/sm
To: Faculty Senate
From: Richard F. Tomasson, Co-Chairman, Faculty-Staff Benefits/Welfare Committee
Subject: Discussion paper on future benefit changes.

At the last meeting of the Faculty-Staff Benefits/Welfare Committee, there was discussion of future changes in the system of benefits. Among the measures discussed were: (1) improvements in the pension system, above all, changing the base period on which pensions are calculated to three years from the current five years and improving adjustments for inflation; (2) improving sick benefits and sick leave; (3) similar treatment of men and women in sick leave; (4) abolishing inequities in maternity leave provisions; and (5) raising the percentage contribution of the University to health insurance.

There was less enthusiasm in the Committee than there had been earlier for having the University pick up a larger share of the retirement contribution (increasing, say, to 75 percent from 50 percent the University's share). The reasons for this diminution of interest were two: (1) monies put into the New Mexico Educational Retirement Fund (ERA) were to become tax deferred for federal income tax purposes, and (2) an argument to the effect that if the University picks up a larger share of retirement the influence of members would become less. (I am not convinced by this latter reason.)

I attended as a visitor the meeting of the ERA Board on July 22 in Santa Fe. Attached is a statement "Recommended ERA Legislation" of proposals to be introduced in the 1984 legislature. It was written by Frank Ready, Director of ERA, after much previous discussion with the Board. The proposals were tentatively accepted by the ERA Board subject to further discussion at its next meeting on October 22. One additional item, incidentally, was added to "possible changes."
It is:

"(g) Adjustment of inactive members' contributions."

The purpose of this suggested change is to introduce an element of portability into the system. Workers leaving the system would be more likely to leave in their contributions if they were subject to growth.

I oppose item (a) which proposes a nonactuarially reduced pension after 25 years of service credit regardless of age. (It is now 30 years.) This proposal has been vigorously pushed by the State's chapter of the NEA. It provides too great an incentive to early retirement. I also believe it will cost more than the calculated .09 percent of payroll for both employee and employer. (Proposal (c), however, modifies the impact of (a) in that there will be no adjustment for increases in the CPI until age 65.) I favor proposals (b), (c), and (d). It has been calculated that this package will necessitate an increase in contribution of both employee and employer to 8.1 percent of payroll from the present 6.8 percent.

I (and I believe the entire Benefits Committee) favor lowering the base period upon which pensions are based to the three-year final average salary from the present five-year average. This change has been made recently in many programs for government employees. Civil Service Retirement (CSR) made the change in 1969 and the Public Employees' Retirement Association of New Mexico made the change in 1981. Change to a three-year average base may be the most likely addition that could be made to the ERA Board's tentatively accepted proposals. To make this addition will necessitate pressure from the membership. However, it is anticipated that this will be a good year for education in the Legislature.
It is recommended that one bill be introduced containing the following changes to the Educational Retirement Act:

(a) To provide for an unmodified retirement benefit with twenty-five (25) years of service credit regardless of age.

(b) To provide for the survivor's benefit now afforded by Option B, after the member has completed five (5) years of earned service credit. Upon retirement, the member could choose the manner in which he/she desired to receive the retirement benefit.

(c) To provide for an annual adjustment to the retiree's benefit beginning at his age 65 --- such adjustment to be one-half (½) the change in the CPI, not to exceed four (4) percent.

(d) To provide for monthly remittance of employee and employer contributions, but retain the quarterly reporting procedure.

The cost of the above changes in the ERA will be met through increased contributions by the employee and employer as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>1st Year Cost to Each</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>.09%</td>
<td>.09%</td>
<td>$648,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>.12%</td>
<td>.12%</td>
<td>$864,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>$7,848,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>$9,360,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are numerous changes that have been considered by the Board's Advisory Committee and by the Board itself. Some may warrant more serious consideration in future years; however, it is my recommendation that no changes be made in the foreseeable future that would cause an increase in the employee/employer contribution rate. Nevertheless, some possible changes are listed:

(a) Three-year final average salary

(b) Straight two (2) percent Benefit Formula

(c) Following retirement, an optional benefit reverts to normal benefit when the beneficiary pre-deceases the retiree.

(d) Application of accrued sick leave toward retirement service credit.

(e) Partial retirement wherein the member draws part of his retirement benefit while working part-time.

(f) Provides some type of health insurance upon retirement.