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Bel Campbell has resigned as President of the Faculty Senate and I, as Vice President, will complete her term of office through May 1995. At the May 9 meeting the Senate will elect officers for the 1995-96 academic year. Please be thinking about who you would like to lead the Senate next year.

A special meeting of the Faculty Senate has been called for April 4, 1995, 3:30-5:00 p.m., in the Kiva. At this meeting we will continue discussion on faculty accountability and a post-tenure review procedure. A notice will be sent to all faculty inviting them to participate. I hope the discussion will lead to recommendations for action to be taken at the regular meeting of the Faculty Senate on April 11, 1995 meeting.

You soon will be receiving a copy of the latest draft of UNM 2000. If time allows we will discuss the document at the April 4 meeting. This matter will also be included in the Provost's report to the Faculty Senate at its April 11 meeting.
### 1994-95 Faculty Senate Membership

**ARCHITECTURE & PLANNING**
- Stephen Schreiber 1993-95

**ARTS & SCIENCES**
- Hyndianne Beene (English) 1993-95
- James Boone (Anthropology) 1994-96
- Beverly Burris (Sociology) 1994-96
- Joel Bybee (Linguistics) 1994-96
- Mel Campbell (Physics & Astr) 1994-96
- Anthony Cardenas (Span & Port) 1994-96
- Jeff Davis (Math & Stats) 1993-95
- John Geissman (Earth & Plan Sci) 1994-96
- Linda Hall (History) 1994-96
- Ustrid Kodric-Brown (Biology) 1994-96
- Tom Kyner (Math & Stats) 1993-95
- Abby Waldron (Psychology) 1994-96

**EDUCATION**
- William Kane 1994-96
- Elizabeth Nielsen 1993-95
- Avery Ortiz 1993-95
- Hynette Oshima 1993-95
- Victor Delclos 1995-97
- Stephen Preskill 1995-96

**ENGINEERING**
- Charles Fledermann (E&CE) 1993-95
- Howard Schreyer (Mech Engr) 1993-95
- Joyce Johnson (Civil Engr) 1993-95
- George Luguer (Th & Dance) 1995-97

**FINE ARTS**
- Joe Rothrock (Art & Art Hist) 1993-95
- Steven Block (Music) 1994-96
- Larry Lavender (Th & Dance) 1995-97

**HALLUP BRANCH**
- Nancy Ziegler 1994-96
- Jan Bruker 1994-95

**GENERAL LIBRARY**
- Harry Lull 1994-96

**LAW**
- William MacPherson 1993-95
- Scott Taylor 1995-97

**MANAGEMENT**
- John Finkelstein 1993-95
- Avraham Shama 1995-97

**NURSING**
- Cheryl Lear 1994-96

**PHARMACY**
- Ernest Dole 1994-96

**PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**
- Deborah McFarlane 1994-95

**VALENCIA BRANCH**
- Richard Melzer 1994-96

**DENTAL HYGIENE**
- Demetra Logothetis 1993-95

**MEDICINE**
- Judith Brillman (Emer Med) 1994-95
- Tom DeCoster (Orthopaedics) 1994-96
- Robert Glew (Biochemistry) 1994-96
- Deborah Graham (Med Lib) 1993-95
- Blaine Hart (Radiology) 1994-95
- Andrew Hsi (Pediatrics) 1994-96
- Peggy Kelley (Surgery) 1994-96
- Carolyn Mold (Microbiology) 1993-95
- Christine Nathe (Surgery, Dental Hygiene) 1995-97
- Kurt Nolte (Pathology) 1994-96
- Edward Reyes (Pharmacology) 1994-96
- Gloria Sarto (Obst & Gyn) 1993-95
- Gerald Weiss (Physiology) 1993-95

**AT-LARGE**
- Joseph Champoux (Anderson Schools) 1994-95
- Monica Cyrino (For Lang & Lit) 1994-95
- Peter Fabisch (For Lang & Lit) 1993-95
- Alan Reed (Pub Admin) 1993-95
- Richard Santos (Economics) 1993-95
- Henry Trevhitt (Comm & Journ) 1994-96
- Maurice Wildin (Mech Engr) 1994-96
- Beulah Woodfin (Biochemistry) 1994-96

*New Senators*
UNM FACULTY

YOU ARE INVITED TO A SPECIAL FACULTY
SENATE MEETING
APRIL 4, 1995, IN THE KIVA, 3:30-5:00 P.M.

THIS MEETING WILL BE A CONTINUATION
OF THE DISCUSSION ON FACULTY
ACCOUNTABILITY THAT WAS INITIATED AT
THE MARCH FACULTY SENATE MEETING

THE DISCUSSION WILL INCLUDE THE ISSUES
OF:
FACULTY ACCOUNTABILITY
EVALUATIONS AFTER TENURE
POST-TENURE REVIEW
PRODUCTIVITY
ACADEMIC FREEDOM
UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE
TEACHING EVALUATIONS

THERE WILL BE TIME FOR AN OPEN GENERAL DISCUSSION THAT WILL
LEAD TO RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION TO BE TAKEN AT THE APRIL 11
FACULTY SENATE MEETING.

TIME WILL ALSO BE SET ASIDE FOR A DISCUSSION OF THE LATEST DRAFT
OF UNM 2000.

PLEASE COME AND PARTICIPATE.
(Summarized Minutes)

The April 4, 1995, special meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Senate Vice President Harry Llull at 3:40 p.m. in the Kiva.

Senators present: Steven Block (Music), James Boone (Anthropology), Anthony Cardenas (Spanish & Portuguese), John Geissman (Earth & Planetary Science), Robert Glew (Biochemistry), Roy Johnson (Civil Engineering), William Kane (Education), Tom Kyner (Mathematics & Statistics), Harry Llull (General Library), Deborah McFarlane (Public Administration), Gloria Sarto (Obstetrics & Gynecology), Howard Schreyer (Mechanical Engineering), Jerome Shea (University College), Henry Trehwitt (Communication & Journalism), Holly Waldron (Psychology), Maurice Wildin (Mechanical Engineering), Beulah Woodfin (Biochemistry).

PURPOSE OF MEETING
The primary purpose of this meeting was to continue discussions initiated at the March Faculty Senate meeting on faculty accountability and post-tenure review.

ANNOUNCEMENTS
Senate President Llull announced that there would be summarized minutes prepared from this meeting.

President Llull reminded Senators to sign-in. He asked Senators and faculty to state their name and department clearly when recognized to speak, for clarification of the minutes.

Copies of the Senate Floor Substitute for Senate Bill 1131 relating to faculty tenure and copies of the UNM 2000 were available at this meeting.

President Llull stated the goal of this meeting was to generate ideas, group understanding, recommendations, or outlines in terms of procedures regarding faculty accountability and post-tenure review that could be presented to the Faculty Senate at the April 11 meeting.
OPEN DISCUSSION

Prior to opening up general discussions on the main topic for this meeting, President Llull provided background information on core issues discussed recently by the Faculty Senate. At its March meeting, the Faculty Senate started discussions on issues of post-tenure review, faculty accountability, and mandatory teaching evaluations. Since that meeting, the Legislature has passed a substitute post-tenure review bill (SB 1131) which authorizes the Regents and the President to start a post-tenure review process emphasizing teaching, teaching evaluations, teaching versus research, and detenuring. There is a detenuring process in the UNM Faculty Handbook, pps. B5-6 and the American Association of University Professors statement regarding Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings appears on pps. B14-15.

Discussion on the issues ensued and consisted of the following dialogue.

Senator Kane suggested faculty take a leadership role in this process, as opposed to having it mandated by some other body, and that they focus on the three areas of faculty responsibility: teaching, research, and service. He urged faculty to position themselves so that they not get evaluated on teaching only. He said he realizes the Legislature perceives faculty as just being teachers.

President Llull responded the Senate Bill includes factors regarding evaluations of a faculty member’s teaching, research and scholarly activities, and contributions made in the area of public service.

Senator Block said the procedures for post-tenure review should definitely be formulated by the faculty if a recommendation for post-tenure review is made by the Regents and President Peck. He said the Faculty Handbook should be revised to contain a section outlining post-tenure evaluation procedures very clearly, and he recommends rehabilitation of non-productive faculty rather than detenuring. Senator Block added two years probation and reevaluation period is not reasonable for faculty who have earned their way through this far. He said faculty proactivity on this issue should not only address post-tenure review, but also include perks and salaries commensurate to that of other faculty across the United States.

Senator Wildin commented that it is not known at this time what the Regents will recommend or whether the Governor will sign the bill.

President Llull asked whether Faculty Senate and faculty are going to be reactive or proactive on this issue.

Senator Woodfin said it appears the sense of the legislature is there should be post-tenure review. The original purpose of this bill was to mandate post-tenure review,
however, through amendments the bill became advisory in nature and authorizes the board of regents to direct the president of the university to institute a post-tenure review process. Senator Woodfin said opinions expressed by administrators indicate that if institutions do not follow the recommendations of this bill a post-tenure review process will be imposed upon the faculty.

Professor Byron Lindsey (Foreign Languages & Literatures) said he was surprised when the issue of post-tenure review came up. He thought the Annual Supplement to the Biographical Record were used as a post-tenure review mechanism and were required from faculty university wide. He suggested the annual supplements be made mandatory and the Faculty Handbook amended to include this factor. The point can be made to legislators that this type of faculty review is being done.

Meanwhile, a process could be specified and all departments required to review the biographical supplements every five years for evaluating faculty productivity in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Professor Lindsey feels the post-tenure period is an important time for faculty contributions to major university service. He said the number of faculty present at this meeting indicates university service is not a very high priority for most faculty, and this is reflected by the lack of sufficient nominees for the Senate, and Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee.

President Lull said individual faculty have recommended to him that a committee be formed to survey UNM colleges' procedures regarding annual reviews and evaluations of faculty. There appear to be procedural issues involved, and faculty are not getting feedback regarding their individual reviews.

Senator Schreyer pointed out it has been the Department Chairs’ and Deans’ responsibility to review faculty, to provide written statements and feedback from evaluations to them, and if this is not being done, it is what should be done. He also suggested part of the post-tenure process include periodic reviews by peers via committees. Senator Schreyer further recommends the existing biographical update committees suggest part of the post-tenure process include periodic reviews by peers via committees. Senator Schreyer further recommends the existing biographical update procedures to reports be a major component of the review process, with follow-up procedures to determine whether deficiencies and recommended actions have been heeded.

Professor Christiane Joost-Gaugier (Art and Art History) voiced her concerns that added responsibilities and proliferation of paperwork would further impede the quality of teaching, and research, and prove that faculty are not intellectuals, but public servants. She said Annual Supplements to the Biographical Record and college workload reports which include teaching, research, and service are in place to evaluate quantity of output rather than quality of research and scholarly activities.

Professor Hugh Witemeyer (English) stated it is in the faculty’s best interests to take the initiative to conceive a post-tenure review process (it may be the price of keeping
tenure) that is compatible with all units and branch campuses. He agrees that faculty are being reviewed regularly in some departments, but it is not being done consistently university wide.

Senator Trewhitt pointed out items #2 and #3 in Senate Bill 1131 do not dictate follow up procedures for inadequate performance in teaching, research and scholarly activities, or public service; the follow up occurs only in regards to teaching evaluations. He cautioned the Senate about going beyond the framework of the bill.

Senator Kane also agreed post-tenure review could be imposed on faculty in the future. He further agreed that while there are biographical sketches and merit work plans which can be used for evaluating faculty, there is no mechanism in place for corrective actions for faculty who do not participate in teaching, research and scholarly activities, and service, and who do not have high scores in teaching. He said because there is no mechanism for punitive action against faculty if correction actions do not transpire, the legislators are concerned that these faculty who do not meet their classes, teach only six hours a week, do not produce in the areas of research, scholarly activities, and public service still have tenure and continue on as faculty members.

Senator Glew described the evaluation procedures used in the biochemistry department and said he was very much in favor of a uniform post-tenure review process that could bring incompetent faculty up to par. He said that he felt that most chairpersons would very much favor having an additional, powerful evaluation instrument.

Senator Kyner noted that the percent of non-performing faculty is low, and expressed apprehension about revising the Faculty Handbook. He suggested review processes already in place should be done properly.

Senator Woodfin was also concerned about revising the Faculty Handbook. She said the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee follows explicitly stated procedures in the Faculty Handbook concerning the termination of service of a faculty member who has tenure. She believes detenuring should be decided by the faculty member who has tenure. Senator Woodfin said a process could be developed for periodic review for faculty. Senator Woodfin said a process could be developed for periodic review for faculty. She said post-tenure review a potential for unfairness due to departmental politics. She said post-tenure review could lead to serious decisions affecting faculty, and its ramifications need to be thought through carefully. Senator MacFarlane concurs faculty who are not thought through carefully.
performing satisfactorily should be put on notice.

President Llull said his memory of Provost Coleman's comments regarding post-tenure review started from the premise that only faculty who are not performing up to par would be affected. President Llull said he has also heard comments to the effect that if UNM is going to institute post-tenure review it should be a very clear process that affects everyone, not just targeted individuals.

Senator Waldron said she is in favor of faculty accountability, but thinks measures already in place such as ICES and biographical updates, which are optional, have not been articulated clearly to the legislators. She talked about existing departmental mentoring and peer review processes. Senator Waldron asked whether it is truly necessary to have uniformity university-wide as long as there are departmental standards for periodic reviews of faculty, even if they are being implemented differently. She talked about incentives and reinforcements versus punitive measures for faculty with inferior performance.

President Llull said a faculty committee should be formed to investigate and review what different departmental procedures regarding evaluations and faculty reviews exist. He said the legislature is not fully aware of these processes.

Professor Joost-Gaugier recommended that faculty review mechanisms already in place be made mandatory and be the same across the university, with merit rewards. If this does not work in five years, then we should implement a post-tenure review process such as the one being suggested.

Senator Glew agreed that a university statement regarding unacceptable performance by a faculty member after a given period of time should be implemented, with incentives and goals involved.

Paul Weiss, General Library, said the movement towards post-tenure review and faculty accountability is sweeping the nation, and whether SB 1131 gets signed or not there could be more restrictive bills passed in future sessions. Therefore, faculty should view this as an opportunity not a threat. He suggested faculty take these issues seriously, and while discussing post-tenure review and faculty accountability bring up issues of incentives and merit pay as well and communicate these clearly to the legislators.

President Llull said there have been discussions inside and outside the Senate regarding the ways in which faculty can communicate more directly with the Regents, possibly with legislators. The period for public comments at the Regents' meeting last month was well attended and all students were afforded the opportunity to speak. He said faculty will be taking better advantage of these opportunities.
RECOMMENDED RESOLUTION

After general and open discussion, Senate President Harry Llull asked for a motion to present to the Faculty Senate. The following recommendations drafted by Senator Kane during the meeting were accepted by all present to be forwarded to the Faculty Senate at the April 11 meeting.

To instruct the Faculty Senate Operations Committee to appoint a task force or committee to review and make recommendations on issues related to review and periodic evaluation of tenured faculty such as:

1. Needs to be viewed as an opportunity to be Pro-Active.
2. Needs to review and incorporate what currently is going on such as student evaluations/annual biographical sketches/workload reports.
3. Needs to focus on scholarship/research/teaching and service.
4. Needs to establish a review every 3-5 years.
5. Needs to establish merit reinforcers.
6. Needs to establish professional development as opposed to a corrective program.
7. Needs to clarify a mechanism to act on non-performing faculty.
8. Needs to look at issues of standardization across the university.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anne J. Brown, Secretary