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There will be a special Faculty Senate meeting on Tuesday, September 24 at 3:30 in the Kiva. EVERY faculty member on campus is encouraged and urged to attend this general discussion of the reallocation plan. We need faculty input about the plan and the process. We need faculty input so that we can reach some consensus about the issues.

All faculty members SHOULD ATTEND this meeting so that the faculty position on reallocation can be made known! For too long we have let the fate of the faculty and that of the educational programs at UNM be determined by others. The faculty must exercise its rights and prerogatives as faculty. We cannot be parochial about this process. We must act and stand together!

The Faculty Senate and its committees are organizing meetings at which faculty response will be solicited. We are asking each Faculty Senate standing committee to meet by the end of the day Friday September 20. These committees will welcome any faculty who are not members to the meetings. A few have been scheduled already:

- Budget Committee, Dodd Bogart, Chair, will meet Friday September 13, 12:30-2:00 p.m., SSCI 1061.
- Long Range Planning Committee, Maurice Wildin, Chair, will meet Friday, September 20, 1-2 p.m., in Room 320 of the Anderson School of Management.
- Research Policy Committee, Ed Walters, Chair, will meet Monday, September 16, 4 p.m., Roberta Room.

(FOR INFORMATION ON OTHER COMMITTEES, CALL A COMMITTEE MEMBER.)

TO: ALL UNM FACULTY SENATORS and ALL INTERESTED UNM FACULTY

FROM: Connie C. Thorson, President, UNM FACULTY SENATE

Subject: SPECIAL MEETING OF FACULTY SENATE

There will be a special Faculty Senate meeting on Tuesday, September 24 at 3:30 in the Kiva. ALL senators and ALL faculty members on campus should plan to attend this general discussion of the reallocation plan. Faculty need to seize this opportunity to comment on the plan and the process.

Some questions to be discussed are the following:

1. Are the faculty willing to give up their prerogatives in matters of curriculum, program development, and hiring?
2. Where do faculty salaries fit into the reallocation plan?
3. What will the pot of money being generated be used for?
4. What role will the faculty have in determining how the money is to be used?
5. What will the role of the faculty be in future reallocation plans?
6. Will the reallocation plan substantially improve undergraduate and graduate education at UNM?
7. What do faculty think about the proposed loss of some of the benefits?
8. Does the reallocation plan go far enough?
9. Have the right things been targeted in the plan?

This plan is only a tiny portent of what is to come.

The faculty at the University of New Mexico did NOT have input into the reallocation plan. The period from now until November 1 is the only assured time for input into the reallocation plan, so faculty should not withhold comment in order to see what the results might be. It is now or never.

We need faculty input so that we can reach some consensus about the issues.

All faculty members SHOULD ATTEND this meeting so that the faculty position on reallocation can be made known! For too long we have let the fate of the faculty and that of the educational programs at UNM be determined by others. The faculty Senate and faculty must exercise their rights and prerogatives as faculty. We cannot be parochial about this process. We must act and stand together!

SENATORS, PLEASE attend this SPECIAL MEETING and bring as many of your colleagues as possible.
The special meeting of the Faculty Senate to discuss the Reallocation Plan was called to order by Senate President Connie Thorson at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

President Thorson explained that the usual rules of the Senate would be suspended in order that all faculty members present would have the opportunity to speak to the issues before the Senate. Also, she said that a document had been distributed which contains suggested topics of discussion as well as the report of the Long Range Planning Committee in response to the proposed Reallocation Plan.

She stated that the Research Policy Committee's response to the Plan indicated that much of the proposed document has merit but that the faculty role in the process is not mentioned. Provost Paul Risser, she said, has encouraged everyone to send comments regarding the Plan to him. Suggestions will be put into a single file and put on reserve at Zimmerman Library. Additionally, copies of the proposed Reallocation Plan are on reserve at Zimmerman Library and the Medical School Library. Provost Risser has indicated a willingness, she told the Senate, to hold a town meeting concerning the Plan.

Senator Pauline Turner stated that last year's Senate Operations Committee had repeatedly urged Provost Risser to involve faculty in initial planning of the reallocation process and asked what had happened to that request.

President Thorson said there was no involvement of faculty other than that of the Operations Committee. She said that it is her understanding that when several deans were unable to make recommendations regarding reallocation, the Provost suggested faculty input but the deans did not agree to seek faculty input. At that point, Provost Risser said that he would write a document and submit it for faculty reaction. That is the document currently being proposed.

Senator Marion Cottrell asked if any dean ever requested faculty involvement. The problem is, he said, that the Provost asks the deans to involve the faculty and the deans think they are the faculty. Senator Shlomo Karni said that involvement occurred from the bottom up rather than at the deans' initiative.

Senator Gloria Birkholz said that although she regrets the lack of involvement it is not necessarily helpful to debate that now but it must be made clear that there will be no abdication of faculty involvement in curricular questions.

Professor Jean Newman said that it was her experience that chairs had been asked by deans to respond specifically to budgetary consideration but had been given no idea of how sweeping the proposed Plan was or of the level at which it was being addressed. Some decisions now appear to be already made or the deadlines make it difficult to respond appropriately.

There was some debate of the proposal that 10% of all courses be deleted by a certain date. Senator Turner said that some departments will "eliminate" courses which have always been listed, but not taught for years. Therefore, it may be a meaningless exercise. Professor Larry Gorbet suggested that it may simply be a question of shuffling students around.
Regarding the question of the responsibility for allocation of funds, Professor Margaret Werner-Nashburne pointed out the lack of a section regarding administrative responsibility. Senator Cottrell said that the Senate should push for an appropriate balance of that responsibility.

Regarding the plan for a reduction of the faculty's role in university policy formation, Senator Turner said that time spent in committee and faculty governance activities does not necessarily detract from a faculty member's effectiveness as teacher and researcher. Senator Jim Thorsen suggested saving money by lowering administrative salaries.

In response to the recommendation to reduce the number of faculty committees, it was suggested that the policy committees, promotion and tenure committees and curricula committees remain and that other college-level committees might be eliminated. Close scrutiny of college-level committees was suggested in a document distributed at the last meeting of the University Planning Committee. Senator Mary Harris pointed out that it is very difficult to find faculty members to fill all the committee vacancies. A few do a lot of work and others do little. Senator Cottrell criticized the tone of the request to downsize committees. The Faculty, he pointed out, has a Constitution and its own governance. No other body has a right to tell faculty or the Faculty Senate how to organize. It is the prerogative of only the faculty. Not all committees are efficient or productive but decisions involving them remain in the hands of the faculty.

Professor Phil Bock suggested that the document was designed to instill panic and the experience at other institutions had been that roughly $10,000 would be saved, most of which would be used in the first court case resulting from the process.

Professor Seymour Alpert said he feels that the Senate has a tremendous amount of power and it needs to be used. He urged the Senate to pass a statement disagreeing with the reallocation document, and stating that the Senate has been left out of the process and therefore will not comply. Another option would be a vote of "no confidence" in the administration.

Professor Charles Beckall suggested that the Operations Committee function as chief liaison between the Senate and the Administration. It should, he said, assure that the Administration is listening and determine whether the faculty is indeed willing to work on the process. He feels that several ad hoc groups will be needed to work on specific issues included in the Reallocation Plan.

Several suggestions were made regarding how the money saved in the reallocation would be used. The usefulness of making and submitting such a list was questioned. Professor Brian Hansen said that the key issue is not what would be done with any saving realized from the reallocation process but rather who gets to make those decisions. The faculty clearly has been left out of the process. He explained that in the UNM 2000 document, the issue of administrative accountability was deleted. Also, the plans for reallocation which were included in early drafts of UNM 2000 were deleted from the final document. UNM 2000, he said, gives maximum freedom to the administration and minimizes input of faculty governance. The administration sees a reduction in faculty involvement as an opportunity to decrease participation in decision-making functions, increase work loads and thereby increase student credit hours which will increase funds needed and thereby increase administrative salaries. Senator Cottrell said that the Senate must see this allocated to UNM by the Legislature. He said that the faculty must see this pattern and respond to it rather than making a list of what to do with the supposed extra dollars realized.
President Thorson explained that at the last meeting of the University Planning Council, which includes only two faculty members and one staff member, it was clear that the only priority for administration was new programs. A motion was therefore passed stating that anything could be the recipient of reallocated dollars. She said that is why she wants to know what the faculty's wishes are regarding the supposed savings. If the faculty doesn't say what it wants, nothing will be done.

It was pointed out by Professor Elizabeth Kostas of Dental Programs that if the Dental Programs are transferred to another institution, the money certainly won't stay at UNM but would go with the Program.

Senator Marion Cottrell explained that in June 1989, the Board of Regents had passed a resolution ordering President May to do a reallocation study and held a discussion regarding "Centers of Excellence." He suggested that the faculty prepare the list and additionally that the Senate should pass a resolution inviting the administration to submit proposals regarding how the money might be spent for consideration by the faculty.

Senator Turner suggested that the fact that faculty had been excluded in the process be included in any resolution passed by the Senate.

Professor Richard Berthold said the reallocation document is contemptuous of the faculty and contains glaring errors. There is no mention of the area which is most clearly out of control financially — the Administration. He said that the faculty must clearly state its wishes — that a new document be created and that a reallocation committee be formed which will include faculty. The faculty does have power and it should be used to embarrass the administration publicly.

Senator Priscilla Smith questioned the implications of the Plan for the branch campuses and their articulation with the main campus in Albuquerque.

Professor Dodd Bogart said that the most important thing was for the Senate to support the motion that any reallocation plan must come to the Faculty Senate for approval. He told the Senate that the conclusion of the Budget Committee now is that the first priority is the issue of salaries and he would like for the Senate to specify that a portion of any savings realized through the reallocation process be earmarked for salaries.

Senator James Thorson asked if a study had been undertaken by the Budget Committee regarding administrative salaries and Professor Bogart responded that the first step has been taken in such a study and that a more definitive study is forthcoming.

Senator Marion Cottrell moved approval of the following resolution:

A need for some reallocation has been widely acknowledged at the University of New Mexico. The current Reallocation document does not meet this need.

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate has a charge to enter into negotiations with the faculty for the development of a collegial process and plan for reallocation and the establishment of budgetary priorities at the University of New Mexico, all to be submitted to the Faculty Senate for final approval.

WHEREAS the first priority is the issue of salaries, the Faculty Senate recommends that a portion of any savings realized through the reallocation process be earmarked for salaries.

WHEREAS the Senate did not have the opportunity to discuss the development of the reallocation process, amendments to the current document, and the process and the document charged the Administration to enter into negotiations with the faculty.

WHEREAS the Senate suggested including the fact that faculty had been excluded in the process be included in any resolution passed by the Senate.

WHEREAS the Senate suggested that the Senate support the motion that any reallocation plan must come to the Faculty Senate for approval.

WHEREAS the Senate decided that the conclusion of the Budget Committee now is that the first priority is the issue of salaries.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Faculty Senate adopts the following resolution:
President Thorson recognized Mimi Swanson, President of the Staff Council, who said that these issues involve all constituencies, faculty, staff and students and that she would like for staff to be considered in the Senate's deliberations. She pointed out that a high percentage of minority groups at UNM make less than $16,000 a year and that the upper level administrative positions are held mainly by Anglo males.

A straw vote of all present was taken and the vote was in favor of the proposed resolution with one opposed.

The motion was called and the Senate voted to approve the Resolution as stated.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne J. Brown
Secretary
Broad Issues for Discussion

1. The envisioned "seeking of advice" (p. 9, paragraph 1) notwithstanding, the Reallocation Plan concentrates decision making in the hands of the central administration—the Provost, Vice President, and Deans). Rather than centralizing the decision process, it should remain balanced by input from the operational level.

   We would like an outline for an expanded faculty role in decisions affecting the faculty and which the faculty are expected to understand, to support, and to implement.

   The reallocation plan fails to elucidate such questions as (a) when the amount of discretionary revenues will be known, (b) how and by whom specifically they will be allocated, and (c) what specifically the role of the faculty will be in this budgetary decision making. The Administration needs to provide a clarification of these questions. The Faculty expects to be intimately involved.

2. The document states that the "curriculum is the responsibility of the faculty; the allocation of resources is the responsibility of the administration." (See p. 9, pt. 3)

   This appears to separate in an unrealistic way the responsibility of the faculty for curriculum and the responsibility of the administration for the allocation of resources. The responsibility of the faculty is rendered meaningless unless there is a corresponding allocation of funds.

   The objective should be an appropriate balance between administrative concerns over resources and faculty concerns over instructional needs.

3. The reallocation plan appears to envision a reduction of the faculty's role in university policy formation (see especially p. 3, goal 1). The savings that should be emphasized are those in central administrative budgets rather than a reduction in faculty involvement in administrative decision making.

   Would the proposed cut in faculty committee participation and also in administrative duties remove the faculty even further from decision making than they are now?

4. What are the top priorities for the use of any money made available as a result of reallocation?

   Where do faculty (and staff) salaries fit into the reallocation plan?

5. What has been left out of the reallocation plan that should be included?
1. Before any programs are terminated or substantially cut, appropriate faculty committees (perhaps the Graduate Committee or the Undergraduate Committee) will establish criteria and priorities for terminating, cutting, or moving these programs can be established.

2. Non-baccalaureate programs (main campus and Medical School) will be examined by the appropriate faculty committees so that criteria and priorities for demonstrating urgent need for salary increases should be addressed in any attempts at reallocation.

3. Classes with small enrollments (10 or fewer for undergraduates and 5 or fewer for graduates) will be examined by departments and colleges and appropriate faculty committees so that reasonable and fair recommendations about discontinuing a course, offering a course less often, altering a course, or retaining the course as it stands can be made.

4. A review of all duplicate courses will be undertaken by department and college faculties and the appropriate Faculty Senate committees so that decisions regarding retention or deletion can be undertaken.

5. The preoccupation with reallocation should not distract attention from the need for major increases of revenues from established as well as new sources. As a responsibility correlated with any reallocation process, the University should commit itself to vigorous efforts to increase revenues from other sources.

6. In its treatment of where reallocations savings are to go, the reallocation plan fails to address the question of faculty (and staff) salaries. The attempts at reallocation.

7. Is the general notion of program consolidation a good one?

8. Can we continue to increase Student Credit Hours, necessary for continued funding, and increase quality teaching and learning?

A faculty committee will meet with David McKinney to look at suggestions in the Business and Finance section that affect faculty. Several that might be community education courses; grounds maintenance; the subsidy by the I and G committees for the south campus; administrative transportation; UNM, etc.).

Those concerned about losing their positions should see the Faculty Handbook, page B-5, section 7. Also, see the AAUP Statement of Principles, pp. B-11 and
5. Serious decisions appear to have been made as assumptions to the preliminary reallocation plan which would reverse decisions which have previously been made with a deliberate process involving affected academic units. For example, the centralization of control of professional graduate programs under the Office of Graduate Studies is a very serious change which should require review and approval by the appropriate university decision structure. Analogously, the proposed integration of some centers into academic units should require separate deliberative decisions or in academic issues such as curriculum or hiring or tenure? What assurances are there that faculty are currently involved adequately rather than, as implied, involved at a level that can be curtailed without serious implications to the institution?

6. The recommended process emphasizes administrative mechanisms such as the Planning Council while ignoring the critical role in strategic planning that is vested in the elaborate administrative structure of the university including deans, department chairs, directors, etc. Strategic planning should be done by the faculty, staff, students and administration of each unit and these plans should be the basis upon which reallocation is made. Under the President's Council reviews each plan. The 16 January 1991 memo from President Peck regarding the "Institutional Planning Process" suggests that the Planning Council will prepare and recommend a legislative package directly to the President and Regents without feedback from or involvement of the administrative academic units. The role of the Planning Council needs to be further examined especially in conjunction with the responsibilities of the administrators in academic units.

7. Faculty morale, already low, is likely to suffer unless the faculty is encouraged to participate through a planning process within each academic unit. It will not suffice to have representation by a few faculty members in special committees. Review and feedback on each plan is necessary to continue faculty involvement. In the past, many plans and proposals, even those requested by the administration, have received no feedback. If faculty involvement in committee work is to be curtailed, is the faculty to be less involved in administrative and deliberative decisions or in academic issues such as curriculum or hiring or tenure? What assurances are there that faculty are currently involved adequately rather than, as implied, involved at a level that can be curtailed without serious implications to the institution?

8. Why do some units appear to have been exempted from the process (for example, the auxiliary units such as the athletic department and the bookstore, President's office and North Campus)?

9. The reallocation criteria for consideration of programs seems to be highly ambiguous. Will satisfaction of market demands, efficiency of operation, importance to the UNM mission (whatever that is), and quality be considered? How about the programmatic thrusts suggested by UNM 2000? How about the priorities of efforts not mentioned in UNM 2000 such as graduate education and related research vis-a-vis undergraduate education? What are the university's real priorities? If, for example, they are cultural plurality, undergraduate education and Southwestern programs, then more resources must be allocated to them and taken from graduate education, etc. If the UNM 2000 statement does not imply real priorities, then what are they? If everything is high priority, then nothing is high priority.

10. How have resources been reassigned through recent reallocation schemes such as the revision of the overhead rates returned to the generating units? What was the process by which this decision was made? What are the programmatic implications and how are they to be communicated to the units which are supposedly involved in planning within the academic units?

11. In addition to allocation of I & G monies, how will funds from the UNM Foundation be distributed? What other sources exist (such as real and intellectual property income) and how is it allocated and about to be reallocated?
12. The tone of the 29 August 1991 document entitled "Preliminary Recommendation: Reallocation Plans" using words including "inertia" and "lethargy" suggests that the administration feels that faculty will not discontinue programs or institute changes unless forced by an administrative process. This does not reflect the actual historical actions of the faculties of various units which have voluntarily divested or curtailed programs or degrees.

13. Is the proposed reallocation process only a first step in changing the allocation (budgeting) process in a more comprehensive and studied manner? If so, what is the "plan for planning and budgeting" in the longer term? Since UNM 2000 does not set interim, annual targets for expected levels of achievement of objectives, perhaps the reallocation process should start with an explicit target such as x percent of the I and G budget to be reallocated. In this manner, the faculty and others would know what the administration's level of expectations is for this reallocation process.

14. What is the role and job description of the proposed full-time director of planning? If the locus of planning responsibility is eventually to be the existing administrative structure of the institution, is this director or his/her staff to provide support to the deans, chairs, etc.? If planning is to be emphasized as a key administrative function, shouldn't a planning office and staff be available to support the administration's planning process? Shouldn't additional resources be allocated to improving administrator's skills in planning?