The University Mace  
Doug Fields

Recently, I was privileged to be asked to carry the UNM mace onto and off of the stage at the Freshman Convocation. This is a ceremonial event held at most colleges and universities in America today. Typically, this symbolic and traditional event marks the beginning of the academic year, and most important, welcomes incoming students to the institution, to its culture and environment, to its history and traditions, and to its leaders, its faculty, and staff. Curious about the history of the mace, I found the following:

"The procession is led by the Secretary of the University and the Faculty Senate President who carries the University Mace. The mace, originally a medieval weapon and later carried by sergeants at arms guarding kings and high church officials, gradually assumed a purely ceremonial character symbolizing authority. When used in academic processions, the mace usually precedes the entire procession.

The University of New Mexico Mace was designed and crafted for presentation at the Centennial Convocation in 1989 by Ralph Lewis, professor emeritus of art. The mace, originally a medieval weapon and later carried by sergeants at arms guarding kings and high church officials, gradually assumed a purely ceremonial character symbolizing authority. The foot of the mace is silver with a turquoise accent."

Without letting that go to my head, it surely reinforced the idea that the faculty of the university should be at the heart of decision-making and policies. As I find myself often doing, I did a quick Google search on the phrase “Faculty Authority”. One of the first hits was to my Alma Mater, Indiana University. From their Faculty Constitution:

"The faculty has legislative authority to establish policy and determine procedures for its implementation governing the teaching, research, and service aspects of the University's academic mission. Areas within the faculty's legislative authority include:

1. Academic mission.
2. Structure and standards for faculty governance.
3. Standards and procedures for creation, reorganization, merger, and elimination of academic programs and units.
4. Standards and procedures for determining the authority of academic units and the relationship between them.
5. Curriculum.
6. Class scheduling and academic calendar.
7. Admission and retention of students.
8. Student academic performance.
9. Standards and procedures for student conduct and discipline.
10. Athletics.
11. Creation and definition of academic ranks.
12. Standards and procedures for faculty appointments, promotion and tenure, compensation, conduct and discipline, and grievances.
13. Standards and procedures for appointment and review of academic officers.

Other authorities delegated to the faculty by the Trustees..." It goes on to comment that:

"The Constitution recognizes that the faculty's authority is subject to the powers of the Trustees and to state and federal law, but the Trustees defer to faculty authority in accordance with principles of academic freedom and faculty governance, generally recognized in the higher education community, to which the Trustees have subscribed."

Our Faculty Constitution is similar in scope, and I hope that our trustees, the Regents, hold a similar view of Faculty Governance.

Future meetings

Faculty Senate Meeting  
- Tues, Sept. 22, 2009, 3:00 pm  
- Lobo Room, Rm 3037  
(See page 6 for agenda)

General Faculty Meeting  
- Wed., Nov. 4, 2009, 3:00 p.m.  
- Woodward Hall

Board of Regent’s Meeting  
- Tues, Sept. 29, 2009, 9:00 a.m.  
- SUB Ballroom C
Strengthening Faculty Voice
Richard Wood

Building UNM's Academic Mission

The primary vehicle through which faculty can have voice in strengthening UNM's academic mission in all aspects of decision-making is the faculty structure, especially the Committees of the Faculty Senate. And you do NOT have to be a member of the Senate in order to serve on its Committees -- indeed, service on committees by non-senators is a crucial part of our service to the University as faculty members.

We encourage all faculty members to volunteer in their area of interest. We have space on the following Committees:

- Admission and Registration
- Budget
- Computer Use
- Curricula
- Faculty and Staff Benefits
- Governmental Relations
- Graduate
- Library
- Scholarship

Some open slots are restricted to particular colleges. Please volunteer to serve by contacting Karla Crawford in the Office of the University Secretary at karlac@unm.edu.

---

Transfer to ERB retirement system from alternative retirement plans (TIAA-CREF and VALIC)

As announced previously by UNM Human Resources, faculty members currently in one of the alternative retirement programs (TIAA-CREF or Valic) have a one-time opportunity to convert over to the ERB system. There has been some confusion among faculty regarding this opportunity, centered around whether any years of service prior to this year would "count", if a person chooses to convert to ERB. The correct information is as follows:

1. pre-2009 does NOT count toward "high 5 year salary" in the calculation of ERB benefits.
2. pre-2009 DOES count toward "rule of 75" for determining retirement eligibility, i.e. when you can begin drawing benefits.
3. pre-2009 does NOT count toward "years of service" in the calculation of ERB benefits.

We urge all faculty members to investigate their retirement situation, and to be sure they fully understand the advantages and disadvantages of converting to the ERB system or remaining in an alternative retirement system. Here are some resources for more information:

- Clarification on Senate Bill 572 - http://hr.unm.edu/articles.php?ID=243
- Alternative Retirement Plan (New ERB Information Sheet) - http://hr.unm.edu/articles.php?ID=205
- ERB Office: 505-888-1560
- UNM HR Retirement Services: 505-277-MyHR (6947)

---

Possible retirement incentives at UNM

As the Faculty Governance newsletter goes to press, the UNM administration is still evaluating whether a retirement incentive program for faculty is feasible and desirable. Our understanding is that an announcement will be forthcoming this Fall, either with details of such a program or making clear that no retirement incentives are foreseen. Watch for further details.

---

[Sign up to receive e-news from the NMERB]
South Campus Dorms
Doug Fields

How many of you know that UNM is considering entering into a contract with the private developer American Campus Communities to build new dormitories on south campus? This is a part of a plan to develop South Campus farther (with the athletic facilities, the Student Services Center, etc.) and a way to alleviate the congestion on the main campus dorms in preparation for new dorms on main campus (also to be built and operated by ACC). I have attempted to get some more information about the plans, the Memorandum of Agreement and the timeline for input from the faculty and communities, but have so far not been able to find this information either on the web sites of the Real Estate Office (http://frem.unm.edu/reo/), the non-existent website of Lobo Development, or on the site of the VP for Institutional Services (http://frem.unm.edu/ISS/Index.shtml).

Along with President Schmidly and the Provost, I would encourage faculty to fully participate in forums on the campus Master Plan.

Related links:
- Master Agreement for Student Housing
- Outline of UNM ACC Agreement

Athletics and the Core Mission

The subject of how and why athletics should be related to the core mission of a research extensive university is one that is sure to get a good debate going at any university. What should be beyond debate is the transparency of that relationship—how do resources flow to and from athletics, who makes those decisions, and the processes for shared governance oversight and input.

For these purposes at UNM, we have our Athletic Council, a committee of the Faculty Senate. This year, Alfred Mathewson is the chair, and I look forward to working with him to empower this important committee. For instance, perhaps this committee could be used to review affiliate advertising for appropriateness, with a hope to avoid embarrassments in the future, see:

- http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=myViY21EzPk
- http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6ZQy_5jWPQA&feature=related

Faculty Workload
Howard Snell

A review of policies C100 and C110 from the UNM Faculty Handbook was proposed and approved as part of the fiscal year 2010 UNM President’s Workplan at the 11 August 2009 Board of Regents Meeting. Along with other published UNM policies and unpublished documents maintained by the Provost’s Office, C100 and C110 outline expectations of how the professional efforts of UNM faculty may be distributed among teaching, research, and service. President Schmidly’s proposal seeks review “...to ensure that these policies are appropriate to the current mission of the university and that they are applied fairly and consistently in all departments across campus.” Faculty effort was also a central component in the review of various policies dealing with outside employment and extra compensation (C130 and C140) completed at the request of the Board of Regents in 2008. The last revisions to C100 (Academic Load) and C110 (Teaching Assignments) apparently occurred in 1977 when the University of New Mexico was a considerably different place—thus the opportunity to bring policies dealing with aspects of faculty effort into line with UNM’s desire to join the Association of American Universities is timely. The Faculty Senate Operations Committee looks forward to proposing improvements in these policies and seeks your input. Please send your comments via email to snell@unm.edu with Faculty Workload in the subject line.

A new section of the Faculty Senate Website contains links to several documents relevant to these issues.
This week these three focus groups met with Brian Sanderoff of the firm Research and Polling, Inc. to provide him with inputs on appropriate questions to ask of Faculty and Staff on Shared Governance issues. The first survey is expected to be distributed to faculty and staff this fall, and another follow-up survey is planned for the following fall semester.
Audit Status
Douglas Fields

On Friday, September 18th, I made a presentation to Regent's Audit Committee on the Faculty requested audit. The Committee discussed each of the recommended scope items from the office of the State Auditor:

Item #1: Budget comparisons of "restricted" Instruction and General (I & G) funds expenditures/revenues at the college or office level, broken down into the following categories: (a) instructional; (b) academic support; (c) student services; (d) institutional support; (e) physical plant (f) any other units receiving I & G for FY03, FY04, FY05, FY06, FY07, FY08 and FY09.

Item #2: A detailed analysis of Facilities and Administration (F & A) revenues and allocations/expenditures sufficient to explain the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) debt and the reduction in the F & A return to the units for FY03, FY04, FY05, FY06, FY07, FY08 and FY09. Include a comparison of budgeted amounts to actual expenditures/revenues.

Item #3: A detailed analysis of the amount of funds that were "harvested" (including the tax on growth in fund balances), and where the money was transferred for FY03, FY04, FY05, FY06, FY07, FY08 and FY09. This analysis should include details of revenues and transfers into and out of the Reserves (I&G contingency account or Undesignated Fund Balances.) Include a comparison of budgeted amounts to actual expenditures/revenues where applicable.

Item #4: A detailed analysis of how the current operations of the Rio Rancho campus are being funded including the impact on the I&G budgets for FY 10 and FY 11. In the course of the Regent's Audit Committee meeting, it was decided that:

Information from FY03 and FY04 were difficult to compile in a way which would be simple to compare with the other years because of the change from the old accounting system to Banner. The committee decided to drop these years and to make it a five year study (from FY04).

Item #2 was already accomplished in the 2007 audit of the OVPR's office. The Faculty Senate President and an audit specialist from the faculty will be given access to the working documents of the audit to verify that the audit was not significantly redacted from its original. The term "restricted" will be removed from Item #1, and the sentence "Include a comparison of budgeted amounts to actual expenditures/revenues." will be added to the end of Item #1. The Faculty Senate President will be given access to any discussions or working papers of the auditing firm, subject to NM state law and standards of auditing practices.
Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda
September 22, 2009, 3:00 p.m.
SUB Lobo Room, 3037

AGENDA TOPICS

1. Approval of Agenda
3. Faculty Senate President’s Report
4. Special Legislative Session in October
5. Institutional Support Services
6. CARS Presentation
7. Faculty Trends
8. CDAC Resolution
9. New Business and Open Discussion
10. Adjournment

TYPE OF ITEMS/PRESENTER(S)

Action

Action

Information Douglas Fields
Discussion Marc Saavdera
Information Steve Beffort
Information Steven Rugala
Information Howard Snell
Action Douglas Fields/Mary Lipscomb

Notes:
1. All faculty are invited to attend Faculty Senate meetings.
2. Full agenda packets are available at http://www.unm.edu/~facsen/
3. Questions should be directed to the Office of the Secretary, Scholes 103, 277-4664