



Some communities thrive, others wither and die. Among the key things that thriving communities do: They remember their dead, especially outstanding exemplars of the best of that community's values. As we at UNM strive to become a better community of learning and research, I begin my remarks today by remembering two recently passed exemplary members of the UNM world, one a faculty member and one a staff member and administrator. Professor Ferenc Szasz was a long-time member of the Department of History, and was much beloved by his students and colleagues. Bob Lalicker was a long-time staffperson and the first director of the UNM Foundation, equally beloved and respected among his colleagues. May we celebrate them both as exemplary representatives of what it means to be a learning and research community dedicated to excellence. Obituaries for Professor Szasz and Mr. Lalicker are attached as appendices.

Comments to the Board of Regents

Richard L. Wood

President of the Faculty Senate

September 14, 2010

[Please read this document, most of it will **not** be presented verbally at the meeting]

In my report, I would like to do three things: First, update the Regents on the work that the Faculty Senate has been doing. Second, describe some of the current dynamics within UNM. Third, I will raise some of the hard questions that I think we *all* need to be wrestling with as we address current and future cuts in state appropriations.

I. Current Faculty Senate Work:

In recent weeks, the Faculty Senate and its various committees have been active on a number of fronts. These include:

Strategic Budget Process: The UNM budget for fiscal year 2012 will be voted upon by the Board of Regents in about six months, via a proposal developed under the authority of the Office of the President. With President Schmidly's endorsement, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee has begun work with the Office of the EVP for Administration and the Office of the Provost and EVP for Academic Affairs to design and implement a "strategic budget process." Such a process would incorporate the faculty's voice into the discussions and decisions that shape the eventual budget proposal. We seek a process that dovetails with the Deans' input into the budget, developed collaboratively with the EVP for Administration and the Provost as they make recommendations to President Schmidly. We intend to pilot this effort this year. This will be critical in striving to

minimize the damage to our academic mission that will be done by the additional 5% cut in state appropriations anticipated for FY2012 (for a cumulative cut of approximately 20% over the last two and a half years).

Academic Prioritization: In order to meet future expected budget cuts, the Provost has announced that all programs reporting to her (degree-granting and non-degree-granting) will be reviewed with regard to their efficacy, efficiency, and centrality to our mission. The faculty have provided substantial input to the “academic prioritization” process she has put forward, and will continue to do so. Ultimately, elimination or consolidation of affected degree programs will be decided by a vote of the Faculty Senate. This is a serious process being undertaken on an extraordinarily ambitious timeline, in order to help UNM adapt to emerging budget cuts.

Faculty Disciplinary Process: At present, UNM policy provides for a disciplinary process for faculty in situations that may lead to loss of tenured status. However, little policy exists for potential faculty disciplinary situations with lesser potential sanctions. The Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee is working on new policy language regarding a disciplinary process relevant for such situations.

Governmental Relations: The Faculty Senate Governmental Relations Committee has held substantial conversations with New Mexico legislators across party lines in a variety of formats, in order to better understand how the Legislature views the University and to better inform the legislators regarding the teaching, research, community service, and creative work of faculty; the variety of contributions we make to helping New Mexico’s communities thrive; and the funding challenges the University faces. UNM’s Office of Governmental Relations has been a key partner in this effort; we look forward to continuing to collaborate with that office, supporting UNM’s legislative outreach in pursuit of full funding for our academic mission.

Regent Selection Process: Faculty leaders have had substantial conversations regarding what a good process might be for helping future governors fill vacancies on the Boards of Regents at New Mexico’s three leading research universities. The meeting materials include the proposed process endorsed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on August 24, 2010.

Diversity and Academic Excellence: A faculty committee made up of Dr. Yemane Asmerom, Dr. Gabriel Sanchez, and Dr. Gabriel Melendez selected the recipients of UNM’s Post-Doctoral Diversity Fellowships, awarded by UNM’s Office of Equity and Inclusion. These important awards bring emerging scholars to UNM as they prepare for their first tenure-track academic appointments. As a result, we have three outstanding new scholars on campus now: Dr. Charles Becknell with a dual appointment with Africana Studies and Language Literacy and Sociocultural studies; Dr. Jessica Metcalf with a dual appointment with Native American Studies and Anthropology; and Dr. Olivia Navarro-Farr with Anthropology. More broadly, I am using my position as President of the Faculty Senate to convene an ongoing faculty-wide conversation on how we can

strengthen the fusion of diversity and academic excellence as the bedrock of UNM's unique mission – and deliver more fully on the promise of that fusion.

UNM Data Analysis: The Operations Committee of the Faculty Senate has been working extensively with a variety of administrative units who analyze institutional data, in order to build data that accurately captures the internal reality of the University, both at present and over the last ten years. We are working with the Office of Institutional Research, the Office of the EVP for Finance, and the Office of the EVP/Provost to do so. Good decisions arise partly from good data, showing the University from different points of view (see, for example, the analysis of rescissions below).

Other: These are only some of the areas in which the Faculty Senate is engaged. Beyond this, important work is ongoing regarding the “special procedures audit” of last Spring, Intellectual Property Policy, Respectful Campus Policy, how UNM fulfills the Core Curriculum, and other issues. In addition, individual faculty members are of course engaged in a huge variety of initiatives. One example: Professor Lisa Broidy (Sociology), Dr. Cameron Crandall (Emergency Medicine), and Professor Stephen Bishop (Foreign Languages & Literature) are working with the GPSA and others to host a UNM conference on domestic violence later this month.

II. Current dynamics within UNM:

Second, I want to highlight what is going on within the University right now. One of the difficulties of governing a large complex organization like UNM is understanding what goes on inside. The view from the top of any organization reveals some things, obscures others. Part of our role as Regent advisors is being sure you have access to some of what is obscured from the top.

On one hand, many things continue as normal within the University: Faculty, part-time instructors, and graduate students are teaching myriad undergraduate students in classrooms, labs, and performance spaces across campus. Students are learning new skills and new ways of thinking. Staff members and faculty are advising them toward graduation. New faculty research and creativity are expanding the frontiers of knowledge and enriching New Mexico's cultural life. All this is what places the University at the heart of New Mexico's future.

On the other hand, the grim reality of budget cuts is biting hard into the University. As the latest rescission in State appropriations becomes a reality, units across campus are struggling to incorporate them, wrestling with how to do so while sheltering our core mission from the worst effects of a cumulative 15% cut in state revenues, with more to come. Make no mistake: In some academic departments – those without much outside funding and/or whose operating budgets have been stagnant for many years – absorbing these cuts is causing anguish. In those departments with more research overhead, differential tuition funds, or other sources of outside funding, the cuts are being made with less pain. But in many departments, the trade-offs are bad and bitter. As an example, I attach a few sample budget-cutting plans from a handful of academic departments, proposed as their strategies for absorbing the current budget rescissions.

[See appendices for sample departmental budget rescission plans]

How hard can it be to cut 3% of a budget? Well, that depends on the budget, and on how previous budget increases have been shared out across the various units undergoing budget cuts. As shown in the appendices, many departments have few good choices to make: faculty office phone lines will be disconnected, some staff layoffs will be made, some faculty will take voluntary furloughs, and some graduate student support will be eliminated. In the near future, it appears likely that some departing faculty will not be replaced.

It is true that past rescissions have been absorbed disproportionately in administrative support units and special projects. Thus, some are making the case that UNM has little choice but to pass new rescissions down to all units equally. That decision appears set for the current ~3% rescission, and as Regents you are being asked to endorse that decision. Plans also appear to exist to “backfill” those rescissions in the most negatively affected units and/or those with adequate budget-cutting plans. I speak today to encourage the Board of Regents to support the latter plan *and* to support the “strategic budget process” discussed above. The process will be critical as we strive to identify ways to absorb next year’s anticipated 5% *additional* cuts in ways that minimize damage to students’ classroom experience and UNM’s academic mission.

In absorbing those cuts, UNM must recognize that it is *also* true that the significant gains in I&G funding (both state appropriations and tuition) realized by UNM over the last ten years were disproportionately invested in administrative layers beyond academic departments. Recognizing this fact is *not* to pit “academics” against “administration” – at our best, all units are at least *intended* to enhance our academic mission. Rather, in noting the heavy investment in central administrative infrastructure over the last decade, I want to suggest that “across-the-board” cuts may *not* be the best way to shelter our academic mission. Where the heaviest investments have been made over the last decade, bigger ongoing cuts may well be necessary.

I want to be clear: Cuts will clearly be necessary at all levels, including academic departments. We are working hard to identify such cuts, and to implement them. But the heaviest cuts should be targeted where they will do the least damage to our central role in New Mexico: providing the teaching and research for a 21st century economy and a thriving society. Those decisions will require leadership, courage, and insight – from the President, the Provost, the EVP for Administration, and administrators at all levels; from the Chairs and Deans; from the Faculty Senate Budget Committee; and ultimately from the Board of Regents.

Our third area of current activity is in university governance. We are actively engaged with the Office of the EVP for Administration on budgetary matters; with the Office of the Provost/EVP for Academic Affairs on academic prioritization, budgetary, institutional data, and other matters; and with other administrative units on a variety of fronts. Over the summer, before Dr. Schmidly’s departure for medical treatment, we were engaged in his strategic planning efforts and in the Board of Regents’ work to define his criteria of evaluation for the coming year. We thus have “voice” in a number of crucial arenas, and are hopeful that such voice from the front lines of teaching and research will lead to the best possible decisions amidst our clearly deteriorating financial situation. We are not naive: Hard, sometimes excruciating decisions face the University, and having voice does not *necessarily* affect the ultimate decisions. But we are hopeful that it will do so. Meanwhile, we are engaged as responsible partners in university governance, striving to contribute to such decisions – and in the process to lay the groundwork for UNM not simply to survive hard times, but to emerge stronger.

III. Hard Questions:

As noted, we face hard budgetary decisions that will affect our academic mission. I would like to close with some hard questions that I think we must wrestle with as we confront current and future cuts in state appropriations. In raising these questions, I am confident that I will offend the sensibilities of perhaps everyone in the room – including colleagues and friends in the Administration, the students we are here to serve, my colleagues on the faculty, and perhaps Regents who give their time in service to this institution. I do so with deep respect for all those groups, and for the authority and responsibility carried by administrators and regents.

That is the nature of the quandaries we face in hard fiscal times: Hard questions need to be asked. I am in a better position than most to ask them: As a faculty member, I too share in responsibility for UNM's academic mission. As a tenured professor, I can ask hard questions that others may shy away from. And as president of the Faculty Senate, I have the opportunity to raise hard questions publicly.

So here are some questions, which I hope will inform our work in the year ahead. I am by no means the first to raise many of these questions. By raising them all together, I hope to highlight just how serious the internal situation of the University has become in the face of the emerging budget cuts.

1. At what point does the strategy of absorbing permanent budget cuts by reducing College research support and Departmental staff and operating budgets unacceptably undermine the teaching and research mission of New Mexico's flagship research university?
2. Does UNM now offer academic programs that are not central to being a research university, and that we no longer can afford to offer?
3. Does UNM now have administrative offices that are not crucial to our mission and that we can no longer afford to sustain?
4. Given the need to cut *another* \$9 million from UNM's core I&G budget for FY2012, does it make sense to continue the approximately \$1.2 million annual support from our core academic budget to the intercollegiate athletics program?
5. Assuming that the current number of tenured and tenure-track faculty is the *minimum* level that the Regents believe can sustain UNM's viability as a research university (and their expressed desire to "grow the tenure-track faculty"): Is the current mix of senior and junior faculty the right balance for a research university facing deep budgetary challenges? Would an effort to re-balance that mix *both* save money *and* invigorate our academic mission?
6. Similarly, are there savings or better student outcomes to be gained from greater division of labor between UNM and NMSU on academic degree programs? From greater division of labor between the state's research universities and other institutions of higher education?

7. Given the need to cut *another* \$9 million from UNM's core I&G budget (in addition to the current rescission): Does it make sense to use ~\$750,000 in I&G funds to subsidize the operations of the UNM Alumni Association? Or should our current financial crisis be utilized to appeal to our alumni to support their own association?
8. Given the heavy investment in central administration over the last decade, where can further savings be found there as we absorb the coming 5% cut in core academic support from the State?
9. Given the need to cut *another* \$9 million from UNM's core I&G budget (in addition to the current rescission): Does it make sense to use ~\$1,200,000 in I&G funds to subsidize the operations of the UNM Foundation? Or should a higher 'mil rate' be levied on donations to support the Foundation during the run-up to the major capital campaign that should benefit the entire University?
10. In the current climate, would a harvesting of salaries and benefits above some specific range generate sufficient revenue to make a dent in our looming budget cuts? Would such a policy damage the University's ability to recruit the talented administrators needed? Or would it foster continuing and new service in the UNM administration by local talent and others committed to serving New Mexico?
11. In meeting these cuts, how can we protect the lowest paid and most vulnerable employees of the University? How can we protect the access of New Mexico's diverse, best students to a first-rate, research-based and creativity-based education?
12. Most fundamentally: Do the citizens, private sector, and political leaders of New Mexico desire the presence of an excellent research university, of the quality that a higher-wage economy and thriving community require? If so, what trade-offs are necessary to sustain such a university?

Conclusion:

The issue at hand is *not* "protecting faculty" nor even "protecting students." If New Mexico hopes to build the kind of high-wage economy that draws on cutting-edge local research, and if our communities want the kind of thriving cultural life and educational institutions that draw major corporate investment, then we *need* a thriving flagship research university. The issue is protecting that possibility, for the sake of all New Mexicans.

Attachments:

1. Obituary of Bob Lalicker
2. Obituary of Ferenc Szasz
3. Proposed vetting process for future vacancies on the Board of Regents
4. Summary of Department Level Rescissions in one UNM college

5. Several sample departmental rescission plans

Date: Aug 5, 2010; Section: Obituaries; Page: B4

Robert Lalicker

UNM Administrator Built Funding Office From Ground Up

As a naval officer, he earned a Bronze Star in the Korean War

By Lloyd Jojola

Journal Staff Writer

Robert "Bob" Lalicker, a retired University of New Mexico administrator who served as director of development and executive director of the UNM Foundation during his nearly 30-year career at the institution, died Saturday at age 82.

"You might say the greatest thing was 'Bob was a good man,'" said friend Jim Hulsman. "And I think that's probably the highest award you can get."

"He gave to a lot of people as a coach, as a teacher, as a Navy officer, as a fund developer at UNM," he said. "That's giving; that's all giving to people, and I think Bob was one of those guys who just gave 100 percent."

Robert G. Lalicker was born in Cortez, Colo., and lived in Kansas before moving to Albuquerque in 1942.

He made a name for himself as a baseball player at Albuquerque High School. (He was later inducted into the school's Athletic Hall of Honor.)

"He was shortstop for Albuquerque High in 1945 and 1946, and they won the state championship both years," said Hulsman, a former Albuquerque High coach and local sports historian. "He was really a mainstay of that ball club."

Lalicker took his bat and glove to UNM, where he enrolled, and started and lettered on the varsity baseball team for three years.

He served with the Navy ROTC at UNM and, commissioned as an ensign, "he went directly from UNM to Korea as soon as he graduated," said Marjorie Lalicker, his wife.

Lalicker, among his military honors, was awarded a Bronze Star with a Combat V for valor for his service during the Inchon invasion.

"And, you know, that damned guy never told me about what he did," Hulsman said about Lalicker's time aboard destroyers. "But that's typical for veterans. They're very humble about their accomplishments."

"What would his attitude be? It was like, 'That's my job. I was supposed to do this' — and obviously he did something very well."

After his active duty — he still served in the Naval reserve and ultimately retired with the rank of captain — Lalicker returned to UNM.

"His joke was always saying that when he came back to Albuquerque he kept looking in the paper, looking for a job, and nobody wanted shore bombardment," Marjorie Lalicker said. "And so he said that's why he went back to school."

Lalicker earned his master's degree in secondary education.

He was among the first faculty members at Valley High School, where he taught history and was an attendance counselor and assistant coach in basketball and baseball.

Then he moved to UNM.

Lalicker started out in the extension division, headed the placement bureau and helped past school president

Ferrel Heady and also worked with William "Bud" Davis, another former university president.

"The thing that he was most proud of was that they started the Presidential Scholarship fund, they started the Tom L. Popejoy Society and the UNM Foundation," Marjorie Lalicker said.

Davis said Lalicker turned the development office into a "professional operation."

"We had gifts up to that time, but no systematic way of contacting alumni and requesting their help," he said. "He was the first director of the UNM Foundation."

The foundation, the fund raising organization for the university, was incorporated in 1979 and its first board formed the next year.

As Lalicker was quoted as saying in a UNM publication that appeared during the 20th year anniversary of the foundation: "One of the last things I said in my proposal for a foundation was 'Some benefits would be realized immediately, but the major impact would be felt 10 to 20 years in the future.' It came to pass."

Davis also noted that Lalicker "was also very instrumental in developing the Gallup campus. And that was extremely important because it tied in with the program of teaching, granting bachelor's degrees to Navajo teachers, who would then go back to the reservation" as educators.

"I never saw him frown," Davis said. "He was a very happy, outgoing person and always had a big smile on his face. He just had a natural warmth and way with working with people. They not only respected him, they liked him, which was probably far more important."

Lalicker was active in his church, serving as a lector and vestry member, and had been a board member or past president with numerous community groups and UNM alumni organizations over the years. He also was a Charter Bank board member for 17 years.

"He was really a great father and grandfather," said Marjorie Lalicker.

She mentioned that the late, former Mayor Harry Kinney once declared it "Bob Lalicker Day" in the city. And one of Lalicker's more recent enjoyments came when he threw out the first pitch for the recent Lobos baseball season.

"He had practiced to make sure he could get it across the plate — he didn't want it to go into the ground — and he did," Marjorie Lalicker said.

A memorial service took place Wednesday at the Cathedral Church of St. John. Lalicker was interred at Santa Fe National Cemetery.

His survivors include his wife of 56 years, Marjorie; daughters, Terry (Mark) Haley, Jeanette "Gigi" (Frank) Chinisci, all of Albuquerque, and Lisa (Chris) Cook of Danville, Calif.; eight grandchildren; sister, Nancy (George) Shaffer; and many nieces and nephews.



LALICKER

University of New Mexico
Faculty Senate
Memorial Minute for
Professor Ferenc Szasz

Please consider this Memorial Minute for Ferenc Szasz, Regents Professor, who passed away on June 20, 2010, after a brief battle with leukemia.

At the time of his retirement in spring 2010, Professor Szasz was one of the longest serving faculty members on the campus. Born in Iowa in 1940, he graduated first from Ohio Wesleyan University and came to the UNM History Department in 1967 through the University of Rochester in New York, from which he earned a doctorate in American history in 1969. His field was social and intellectual history with a subspecialty in the history of American religion. Over the years, Professor Szasz taught continuously at UNM—outside a few sabbaticals—until his illness forced him into an emergency medical leave in spring 2010.

During his nearly forty-three years at UNM, Professor Szasz taught thousands of students. His U.S. history survey courses burst at the seams nearly every semester, and his two-semester American social and cultural history sequence—a delightful romp from John Winthrop and Cotton Mather to Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln to Lyndon B. Johnson to Ronald Reagan—were ever popular among undergraduates and graduate students alike. No less popular were his classes on World War II and historical biography. Remaining closest to his heart, however, was the field of American religion on which he taught both undergraduate courses and graduate seminars. To this sticky subject, every section of which boasted an expert theologian or two in the audience, Frank always brought exceptional insight, erudition, sensitivity, scholarship, generosity, and patience. He was never doctrinaire. Although he presented his point of view or thesis on any given lecture topic, he ultimately let each individual student work out his or her interpretation from evidence gleaned from lectures and course readings. Nearly every graduated history major whom I have encountered during my 28 years at UNM has declared Professor Szasz the best single classroom instructor he or she experienced at the university.

Despite his gentle manner, Frank was one of the wild men of the UNM classroom. To his classroom histrionics, he brought a little bit of Mr. Green Jeans, a dab of Milton Berle, and a thick smear of Red Skelton, a personal favorite of his. Frank's hair, an unruly thicket resting atop a lanky, six-foot-plus frame, made flamboyant and comedic every set of eyewear that I ever saw him set on his nose in the twenty-eight years that I knew him. During lectures, he rattled his collar (like Red), flipped his tie (like Oliver Hardy), cleared his throat (like Milton Berle), and finished each lecture with a joke (like Rowan and Martin), sometimes corny but always hilarious. The source—and we always wondered where he found his jokes, particularly before the advent of the web—was endless. Frank's lively, humorous presentation made his students want to come back for more history. He made learning a joy.

Frank was no less a scholar than a teacher. During his first decade at UNM, he focused on his teaching career and on being a father and husband to his family, but once he began publishing in earnest, his many books and articles arrived at frequent, regular intervals, and he became one of the most prolific scholars in the History Department. His

first monograph, *The Divided Mind of Protestant America*, published in 1982, was followed during the next twenty-eight years by nine additional books, both historical monographs and edited collections of essays. These historical works reflect Frank's wide-ranging interests that embraced religion, science and technology, historical biography, popular culture, and literature. Published in 1984 by UNM Press, his monograph, *The Day the Sun Rose Twice: The Story of the Trinity Site Nuclear Explosion*, has been his most popular work and steadiest seller. The publication of his most recent work, *Abraham Lincoln and Robert Burns: Connected Lives*, coincided with the bicentennial of Abraham Lincoln's birth. That project united his ongoing interest in the history of Scotland and Scots with his strengths in American social and intellectual history. From his hospital bed at UNMH, Frank completed the draft of what may be his final book, a study of atomic comic books published in the decades following World War II. During his convalescence in the hospital and at home, he drafted a manuscript exploring Lincoln and religious faith.

Over the years, Frank also published a large volume of scholarly and popular articles, particularly in a genre that he loved: biography. This past summer, the *New Mexico Historical Review* published his last article, "Fred Harman, Red Ryder, and Albuquerque's Little Beavertown," an exploration of the Red Ryder comic strip that Fred Harman illustrated and penned here in Albuquerque and that was spun off into movie serials, a brief television show, a famous BB gun, and young adult novels, and that was turned into a short-lived theme park in east Albuquerque.

At heart, Frank remained a gentle and good soul. He was ever genial and generous. No rancor passed his lips in departmental meetings or personal conferences. At worst, he would wrinkle his brow, lower his eyes, and shake his head when irritated or angered by university or departmental affairs. Only once did I see him genuinely mad. Some two years ago, I met him in the hall following a meeting of some sort. He turned to me, swelled gently like a ship's sail filling with the breeze, rose softly on the swell of his anger, and quietly and humbly declared himself on this issue. Just as gently, he furled his sail, glided off the swell, bid me a good day, and went on his way.

Thank you Frank for demonstrating to us how to serve the university and regional community as a teacher, scholar, mentor, leader, and friend, and occasionally how to get mad and get on with our lives. We, the UNM faculty, students, and staff, give our profound thanks for your service to us and this community. We will miss your humor, wisdom, and friendship.

Durwood Ball, Associate Professor
History Department
University of New Mexico



To: Regents of the University of New Mexico
From: Richard Wood, UNM Faculty Senate President
Date: September 7, 2010
RE: Regent vetting proposal

On August 24, the UNM Faculty Senate endorsed the following proposal for a vetting process for future Regent nominees at The University of New Mexico; it will next be forwarded for consideration by the Faculty Senates at New Mexico State University and the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology.

As always, glad to meet or talk on the phone if further conversation is warranted. rlw

Proposed Process for Vetting of Regent Nominees:

The process for vetting Board of Regent nominees would proceed in two stages:

- A. Formation of a Committee on Regent Appointments (CRA) at the relevant institution;
- B. CRA vets Regent nominees, as advisory input to the Governor.

These two stages would be carried out as follows:

- A. Formation of a Committee on Regent Appointments (CRA) at the relevant institution:
 - A1. When a vacancy on the Board of Regents occurs or is anticipated, the Governor or his/her designee will notify the Regents President, the University President, and the President of the Faculty Senate at the relevant university that a Committee on Regent Appointments (CRA) is to be constituted.
 - A2. Governor or his/her designee formally announces that, in light of an anticipated or actual vacancy on the Board of Regents of a research university, a Committee on Regent Appointments is being formed, and announces that CRA will accept nominations and evaluate nominees for the relevant institution.
 - A3. Governor or designee makes public announcement of a reasonable period for nominations to serve on the Committee on Regent Appointments. Committee on Regent Appointments should include:
 - a. Exceptional faculty members recognized as outstanding in their disciplines and as responsible university leaders, striving for diversity of disciplines, social background, and representation of the main divisions of the relevant University; and
 - b. Distinguished members of the University's constituencies in the external community, including scientific, cultural, business, and/or community

representation. Committee members will be sought who are familiar with higher education generally and research universities particularly.

The overall committee should include equal numbers of faculty and community members, and should include members from diverse ethnic/racial backgrounds, from urban & rural areas, and from a variety of political viewpoints. No more than one of the faculty representatives may hold a position at the level of dean or above.

- A4. Each nominee to the CRA is asked to submit a summary of his or her qualifications and interests. Governor or his/her designee (Secretary of Higher Education or other) consults with the University President, Provost, President of the Faculty Senate, and Chairperson of the Committee on Governance to form the CRA of 8-10 members and a Chairperson from the slate of nominees. CRA is officially constituted via a joint public announcement by the Governor and the CRA Chairperson, with such announcement making clear that the CRA will provide public advisory input to the Governor in his or her selection of Regents.

B. Vetting of Regent nominees by Committee on Regent Appointments:

- B1. Once constituted, the Committee on Regent Appointments consults with the President of the Board of Regents and the upper University administration regarding areas of expertise currently needed on the Board of Regents. Once this has occurred, CRA maintains no further contact with University administration, in order to prevent appearance of impropriety. CRA writes a description of general qualifications desired and a specific “needs assessment” regarding the areas of expertise, representativity, and other salient factors relevant in choosing nominee for this particular regent position. CRA makes public the general qualifications and needs assessment documents, and submits them to the Governor.
- B2. Governor, in collaboration with CRA, formulates a public call for regent nominations consistent with needs assessment. The Office of the Governor and the CRA jointly solicit nominations statewide, with a reasonable deadline and necessary documentation stipulated.
- B3. Committee on Regent Appointments reads and evaluates nomination documents and recommends three nominees from which the Governor is asked to choose. If Governor rejects all three, CRA submits three more recommendations; this process continues until regent nomination is made by the Governor.

Note: If more than one position on the Board of Regents is to be filled at a given time, the same process will be followed, but the number of nominees recommended by the CRA will be multiplied appropriately: If two positions are available, six nominees will be recommended to the Governor; if three positions are available, nine nominees will be recommended.

09/01/2010

| College of Arts and Sciences FY11 Budget by Department/Program/Center | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| | 2000-Fac Salary | 2020-Admin Prof | 2040-Techn. Sal | 2060-Sup Staff Sal | 20A0-GA TA Sal | 20J0-Stu Sal | Operating | Total Budget | Total Revised Salaries | Total Revised Operating | Required cut |
| African American Studies | \$275,753 | \$40,800 | | | \$6,996 | \$2,781 | \$13,000 | \$371,830 | \$363,906 | \$13,000 | \$12,676 |
| American Studies | \$660,198 | \$39,404 | | | \$101,425 | \$2,614 | \$13,093 | \$886,734 | \$734,527 | \$11,446 | \$25,087 |
| Anthropology | \$1,670,030 | \$80,097 | \$92,631 | \$50,070 | \$236,789 | \$16,446 | \$68,415 | \$2,302,878 | \$2,196,616 | \$62,419 | \$75,972 |
| Ortiz Center | | | \$26,035 | | | | \$14,965 | \$41,000 | \$26,035 | \$14,768 | \$1,372 |
| Biology | \$3,292,108 | \$738,302 | \$141,412 | \$149,686 | \$802,504 | \$34,591 | \$217,660 | \$5,473,729 | \$5,188,332 | \$191,415 | \$180,924 |
| Chemistry | \$1,501,096 | \$509,138 | \$68,738 | \$139,136 | \$702,543 | \$136,000 | \$205,090 | \$3,335,057 | \$3,149,899 | \$189,513 | \$112,306 |
| Comm & Journalism | \$1,239,621 | \$50,000 | \$79,473 | \$25,305 | \$260,759 | \$5,257 | \$51,195 | \$1,711,610 | \$1,656,837 | \$51,195 | \$57,442 |
| E & P S | \$1,495,992 | \$407,112 | \$97,806 | \$34,731 | \$233,550 | \$43,000 | \$133,933 | \$2,540,203 | \$2,374,728 | \$121,899 | \$83,963 |
| Natural Science | \$46,900 | | | | | | \$41,200 | \$88,100 | \$46,900 | \$41,200 | \$2,963 |
| Economics | \$1,290,906 | \$0 | \$26,770 | \$61,598 | \$204,051 | \$10,088 | \$45,490 | \$1,638,903 | \$1,468,110 | \$45,490 | \$50,903 |
| English | \$1,975,145 | \$74,199 | \$126,291 | \$59,321 | \$963,272 | \$6,398 | \$74,614 | \$3,416,670 | \$3,413,643 | \$58,207 | \$116,760 |
| Feminist Research | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$19,969 | \$672 |
| Foreign Lit and Lang | \$868,271 | \$40,016 | | \$40,408 | \$235,180 | \$9,220 | \$27,067 | \$1,221,662 | \$1,191,368 | \$24,067 | \$40,876 |
| Geography | \$425,256 | \$39,954 | | | \$44,169 | | \$15,876 | \$618,255 | \$602,379 | \$12,905 | \$20,692 |
| History | \$1,656,450 | \$48,524 | | \$100,219 | \$361,462 | \$12,806 | \$46,364 | \$2,225,825 | \$2,087,662 | \$46,364 | \$71,768 |
| WWA | | | \$22,222 | | | | \$3,900 | \$26,122 | \$22,222 | \$3,774 | \$874 |
| CAW | | | \$0 | \$7,826 | | | \$8,000 | \$15,826 | \$7,826 | \$7,924 | \$530 |
| Language Learning Ctr | | \$127,338 | | | | \$10,495 | \$6,436 | \$146,460 | \$137,833 | \$5,743 | \$4,829 |
| Linguistics | \$786,981 | \$41,238 | | \$57,455 | \$85,020 | \$3,024 | \$22,286 | \$1,002,004 | \$886,977 | \$17,558 | \$30,420 |
| Math and Stats | \$2,387,903 | \$206,290 | \$41,858 | \$66,887 | \$754,004 | \$34,116 | \$76,306 | \$3,616,764 | \$3,562,541 | \$69,485 | \$122,147 |
| Maxwell Museum | \$151,692 | \$482,224 | \$30,881 | \$23,537 | | \$20,921 | \$33,452 | \$742,707 | \$729,483 | \$29,883 | \$25,538 |
| Medieval Studies | | | | | \$6,857 | | | \$6,857 | \$6,857 | -\$33 | \$229 |
| Meteoritics | \$2,494 | \$250,104 | \$34,322 | \$15,350 | | | \$10,776 | \$313,046 | \$302,270 | \$9,272 | \$10,477 |
| Philosophy | \$842,219 | \$45,530 | | \$25,279 | \$148,546 | \$5,231 | \$21,761 | \$1,089,766 | \$1,013,830 | \$16,531 | \$34,652 |
| Physics & Astronomy | \$2,506,581 | \$190,452 | \$281,050 | \$77,269 | \$459,483 | \$60,882 | \$156,935 | \$3,763,108 | \$3,581,408 | \$139,033 | \$125,120 |
| CAIS | | | \$21,441 | | | | \$0 | \$21,441 | \$21,338 | \$0 | \$718 |
| CQuIC | | | \$25,915 | | | | \$29,596 | \$55,511 | \$25,915 | \$29,329 | \$1,858 |
| Political Science | \$1,168,955 | \$44,558 | | \$27,300 | \$208,975 | \$18,756 | \$39,914 | \$1,511,516 | \$1,556,250 | \$35,695 | \$53,538 |
| Psychology | \$1,814,212 | \$240,103 | \$111,798 | \$155,788 | \$367,373 | \$13,868 | \$112,218 | \$2,821,381 | \$2,723,651 | \$103,018 | \$95,062 |
| Religious Studies | \$173,429 | | | \$29,757 | \$26,690 | \$1,117 | \$14,037 | \$245,030 | \$229,816 | \$14,037 | \$8,201 |
| Sociology | \$1,197,765 | \$42,000 | \$37,319 | \$33,800 | \$220,700 | \$6,828 | \$34,897 | \$1,577,209 | \$1,508,171 | \$34,897 | \$51,894 |
| Spanish & Portugese | \$971,316 | \$48,070 | | \$88,933 | \$555,025 | \$12,214 | \$33,402 | \$1,791,960 | \$1,782,907 | \$32,021 | \$61,037 |
| Spech and Hearing | \$406,091 | \$251,607 | | \$26,601 | \$54,540 | \$6,033 | \$16,162 | \$761,034 | \$744,872 | \$12,505 | \$25,471 |
| Woman's Studies | \$44,200 | | | \$32,376 | \$29,320 | \$2,083 | \$13,324 | \$121,363 | \$112,979 | \$12,741 | \$4,228 |
| Total | \$28,851,564 | \$4,037,060 | \$1,265,962 | \$1,328,632 | \$7,069,233 | \$474,769 | \$1,621,364 | \$45,521,561 | \$43,458,088 | \$1,477,270 | \$1,511,198 |

Note: Rows do not necessarily add horizontally due to omitted adjustments.

English Department
I & G Budget AY10-11

Salary Budget

| | |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Faculty | \$ 2,110,475.00 |
| Graduate Students | \$ 963,272.00 |
| Staff | \$ 259,811.00 |
| Work Study | \$ 6,398.00 |
| Total salaries | <u>\$ 3,339,956.00</u> |

Operating Budget*

| | |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| Main operating | \$ 14,407.00 |
| Faculty travel & dev | \$ 43,800.00 |
| Total operating | <u>\$ 58,207.00</u> |

Total I & G \$ 3,398,163.00

3.2% of total I&G \$ 108,741.22

2.41% of total I&G \$ 81,895.73

← **Current expected rescission
actually > \$116,000**

*Previous budget cut of \$16,407

| | |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| Main operating | \$ 13,407.00 |
| Faculty travel & dev | \$ 3,000.00 |
| | <u>\$ 16,407.00</u> |

September 1, 2010

TO: Brenda Claiborne
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

FROM: Charlie Steen
Chair, History Department

SUBJECT: Proposed budget cuts, revised plan.

The History Department is fully aware of the fiscal crisis affecting all public institutions and will make adjustments in its present budget to help in the reduction facing the College and University. However, we do so with caution and reserve, worrying that the teaching mission of the Department and the College will be affected. Our plan is to have the following cuts:

1. History will remove phones from all faculty offices, leaving them for those who have direct student contact (undergraduate and graduate advisors) and for the institutes and centers that have contact with the public on a regular basis. This will save \$10,800.

2. The Department will cut into the budget for readers assigned to large classes, trimming two-thirds of the funding available. This will save \$8000.

3. History will reluctantly eliminate three and one-half Graduate Assistantships for MA students, reducing the support for students at that level by half. The cut will save \$40,054.

4. Cutting the operational budget by half for a saving of \$13,000.

Consequences:

1. The loss of phone service places barriers between faculty and students and also limits contact with the public. The latter is what is most troublesome since a large segment of the public that contacts the Department does not rely on computers or wireless instruments. History will keep phones in the main office, the Review, the Center for the Southwest, and the Medieval Institute, all points of contact with the general public. Given the nature of our budget, History had to reduce phone service even though the effect on communication will be harmful. Some in the Department are active in raising money for programs and they will feel the impact the most. So will those who seek information or who simply wish to engage in a conversation with a faculty member. This will be a loss, but the phones had to be included to prevent greater losses in the other categories.

2. The consequences of reducing the number of readers is two-fold. First, this increase the time between when a written assignment is turned in and when it is returned to the student. Pedagogically this is unsound since students forget how they approached a problem and there can be no direct response to how they should have organized their thoughts and expressed them. We are firm in requiring that students write essays in History courses, feeling that writing is vital to

every aspect of what we do and what the students should achieve at the University. The effect on Learning Outcomes is thus something that we must consider. This problem is all the more clear because of the great growth in student enrollment.

3. The elimination of the GAs hurts education twice, affecting the experience of undergraduates in large courses and reducing the quality of the university experience for the graduate students. Learning to teach and being available for students is a great part of the experience offered in the graduate program. Failing to have that interaction is a true negative quality. While hard to measure, the value of the contact between GAs and students in a large class has always been important. New students feel free to approach them with problems of every sort and benefit from review sessions and personal conferences available from GAs. These cuts will also undermine our ability to recruit and retain the best graduate students and will thus have a detrimental effect on the quality of our graduate program

4. The Department will switch to electronic communication with students in classes at the upper-division level and will continue to have hard copies of material for the large freshman and sophomore courses. Beginning students are less certain and need solid points of reference. The disadvantage for all students is that cutting paper makes more ephemeral the goals, skills, and processes that History wishes to advance. The rubrics of Student Learning Outcomes are best described in handouts that can be referred to frequently in class. The large classes are where we must be most persuasive and direct in pointing these out repeatedly.

To: Brenda Claiborne, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
From: Mark Peceny, Chair, Department of Political Science
Re: FY 11 Budget Rescissions (REVISED)
Date: 8/31/10

The Department of Political Science has been asked to cut \$52,672 from its FY 11 budget. Since more than 80% of that budget goes to faculty salaries and decisions on potential faculty salary cuts are likely to be taken at a higher level in the university, we focused on the remainder of the budget. We could meet our target by some combination of cuts in operating expenses and GA lines and/or by staff reorganization. I will now address the impact of cuts in each of these areas on the teaching and research missions of the department.

Operating Expenses: \$11,711 in Budget Cuts

If we sacrificed our entire \$35,695 annual budget for operating expenses, we would still fall well short of our rescission target for FY 11. We already sacrificed part of our operations budget to meet our initial budget cutting targets for FY 11. Because we believe that participation in scholarly conferences is an essential activity for faculty at a research intensive, flagship university, we are already planning to squeeze whatever we can out of this smaller operating budget to help support conference travel for our faculty, with a maximum reimbursement of \$1,000 per person for the year.

In this context, there are only two specific items that we believe we can cut from the operating budget. Together, they would amount to \$11,711 in cuts, approximately one-third of our operating budget. First, if we removed all of our telephone landlines except for three phones in the general offices of the Department of Political Science (for the Chair, Department Administrator, and Administrative Assistant II), we could save \$8,696 per year. No one is enthusiastic about losing our phone lines because we recognize that this will make us less accessible to students and the community. We are confident, however, that this choice would not damage our teaching and research missions as much as other alternative rescissions.

Second, if we did not hold our annual departmental convocation, we could save \$3,015. We treasure the opportunity to celebrate the success of our graduates each year, but at least at the point of convocation we have successfully completed our mission. Every other cut to our increasingly diminished operating budget could damage our ability to get our students to the point of graduation.

2.5 GA Lines: \$43,355 in Budget Cuts

After cutting more than a quarter of our operating budget, we would probably have to cut two and a half graduate assistantship lines to meet the rest of our budget cutting target. That would

reduce our GA lines from 14 to 11.5. We are certain that a reduction in GA lines of this magnitude would have a catastrophic effect on our very successful graduate program. The choice of how to reallocate our reduced GA support places in stark relief the difficult choices UNM faces during this budget cutting process.

As the accompanying document notes, between 1997 and 2008, Ph.D. students from UNM's Political Science Department have won more prestigious National Science Foundation and/or Social Science Research Council dissertation fellowships than all but three political science departments in the nation (Michigan, Berkeley, and Duke). In 2009-2010, Steve Samford continued this record of success by winning NSF, SSRC, and Fulbright Awards to support his research. Our students have won these prestigious awards in competition against departments that typically have two or three times the number of tenured and tenure track faculty as UNM. Since 2000 our Ph.D. graduates have received tenured or tenure-track offers from Duke, Washington, Penn State, Missouri, Texas A&M, Vermont, LSU, Tulane, Miami, Arizona State, South Dakota, Bucknell, and Marquette. In the past year our students earned jobs at CIDE, one of the most prestigious institutions of higher education in Mexico, and the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth.

In order to sustain this record of excellence, we need to be able to offer GAships to as many students as possible. A significant reduction in assistantships would harm our program at all stages. The fewer GAships we can offer, the fewer new students we will be able to attract. Without sufficiently large and strong entering classes, our program will erode over time. Once students join our program, we assign nearly all of our GAs to individual tenured and tenure track faculty members, who form one-on-one research mentoring relationships with the students. These relationships have been and continue to be important relationships in which students often join their faculty members as co-authors on articles published in refereed journals. Mentorship relationships forged during GA assignments have been and continue to be a crucial part of our extraordinary success in producing excellent Ph.D.'s who have become leaders in their fields. Students that have these experiences are more likely to be successful at obtaining grants for their own research and are more likely to be successful at publishing their research while still in graduate school, enhancing their success on the increasingly competitive job market. Research support provided by these students has also, of course, helped our faculty conduct cutting edge research in the field. Reducing the number of GAships will also affect our ability to help students complete their Ph.D.s. At our present level of GAships we can provide partial support to some of our more advanced students to delay the point at which they would need to be supported completely by teaching two courses per semester on the part-time instruction budget, a transition that inevitably delays students' progress toward degree completion. In addition, this would happen at a time when we are being asked to increase the class caps for the courses they are most likely to teach.

We believe strongly that research excellence and excellence in graduate training must be a central mission of any flagship school. If we are not fulfilling this mission to the best of our ability, we are not providing the state of New Mexico what it deserves from its flagship institution. To achieve this goal, we need to be able to recruit promising new students into the graduate program by offering them GAships, and we need to be able to maximize the number of GA lines used to build mentorship relationships between faculty and graduate students, while

supporting cutting edge faculty research. Cutting GA lines will have a devastating effect on this mission.

We reached our present level of 14 GA lines in 2005, when the College provided two additional GA lines to Political Science as part of its Success Initiative to improve student performance in lower division courses. We used those lines to completely revamp POLS 110 The Political World. Under the leadership of our two outstanding Lecturers, first Professor Ellen Grigsby and then Professor Peter Kierst, we transformed this course by adding discussion sections led by our graduate students to the lectures offered by Professors Grigsby and Kierst. To my knowledge, this class, which served 268 students in 2009-2010, has not reappeared on the list of courses with high failure rates since we instituted these changes. Students consistently report great satisfaction with the instructor, the GAs, and the course. Many students become our majors because of their experience in POLS 110. For a larger group of students that are using this course to fulfill their core curriculum requirements, POLS 110 is likely to be the only course they will take at UNM that provides them with a basic political education. By attending the class and leading their own discussion sections, our graduate students are provided with a mentored teaching experience, before being thrown directly into the classroom teaching a 200 level course, which had been and to some extent remains our practice. We can emphatically report that the Success Initiative has led to success in this instance.

If we decide to allocate all of our GA resources toward building our research capability and graduate program, we would relinquish our Success Initiative GAs as part of our budget cuts. At the least, this would probably require us to go back to the old purely lecture format for the course, a format that even with our best instructors, often led sections of POLS 110 to end up on the list of courses with the highest failure rates. We could also discontinue offering the course altogether. The Provost has made a compelling case that UNM often loses money on 100-level courses because of how introductory level courses are treated in the state funding formula. The President has suggested that UNM needs to rely on CNM to offer many courses like this, broad introductory service courses that are not integral to our department majors. If the university decides to reduce the GA lines available to Political Science by 2.5 lines, we may decide that it is best for the university and department to discontinue teaching this course, despite the fact that it is in the core curriculum. As Professor Kierst has reminded us, however, “this course gives the only education in political vocabulary and understanding that many students will ever receive. Without it, hundreds of UNM students every year would graduate having had no exposure to political concepts, terms, thoughts at all. Given the perilous times in which we live, and the paramount importance of a politically informed populace, that strikes me as unacceptable for the state's largest university.”

If we were to be reduced to 11.5 GA positions, but keep the success initiative GAs in the classroom teaching POLS 110 discussion sections, we would be down to 9.5 GA lines providing mentoring in research and support to faculty members. At this point, we become deeply concerned about our ability to sustain our excellence in the research and graduate student training that has been and should continue to be a core mission for a department in a flagship university.

Staff Reorganization: No Cuts

Our Graduate Secretary, Beth Leahy, stepped down from her position on August 10. Because we had a vacant position, we have thought deeply about whether we could survive with less than a full-time person in that position. We have been in conversation with our colleagues in Sociology and Economics about the possibility of sharing a staff member between two departments. Sociology has a staff member who might be interested in working half-time in Political Science and half-time in Sociology, while Economics has a vacant position for a grants coordinator. At this point, we have decided that either of these options was unlikely to work effectively given the different skill sets and job requirements needed by the different departments. In addition, Sociology and Economics are programs of roughly equal size as Political Science, yet both have three staff positions, while we have two. For our department to function properly, our Department Administrator cannot be the first point of contact for everyone who comes to or calls the department. In either of the staff-sharing options, she would be in that situation half of the time, which we fear would be unsustainable. This would especially be the case because we eliminated our work study position in the last round of budget cuts and are thinking of routing all phone calls for faculty to the main office (due to cancellation of all faculty telephones). In addition, while some tasks can be easily outsourced, the success of our graduate secretaries has been based on a deep knowledge and familiarity with our students. It is unlikely that a part-time person could build the same kinds of relationships essential to the position.

Finally, Beth's position pays \$27,300 annually. Either of the staff-sharing possibilities could save a maximum of \$13,650. Staff reorganization could at best substitute for one half of a GA line in budget cuts. The costs to our graduate program to having 20 hours less of support each week would probably exceed the gains of saving that half a GA line. Saving half a line would not make the difficult tradeoffs between undergraduate education and graduate research easier to overcome. Therefore, we decided to post the ad for Beth's replacement this week and do not see any feasible scenario for further consolidating our already very lean staff.

If we do try to save that half a GA line, we will do so with a further cut of \$6,579 in our operating budget. These additional cuts would mean that we had slashed our operating budget, a budget that has not increased in absolute terms in three decades, by more than half in FY 11.

Concluding Thoughts

Over the past dozen years, the number of tenured and/or tenure track faculty in Political Science has decreased from 18 to 14.75. The budget line for faculty salaries has been nearly flat in absolute terms. Meanwhile, our student credit hour production and number of majors have increased by about 75% and our graduate students have been successful in national dissertation fellowship competitions with students from Michigan, Berkeley and Duke. During this same time, administrative expenses at UNM have increased dramatically. The number of administrators from grades 15 to 19 has increased by 130% since 2000, according to a study prepared by the President of the UNM Faculty Senate. At our departmental level, we have been doing more with less for more than a decade. We stand ready to continue to do what we can to help UNM weather this budget crisis. However, we insist that the general administration continue to make the necessary disproportionate cuts to its non-academic spending so that we

aren't forced to decide whether to leave our first year undergraduates underserved or damage our successful graduate program.

Finally, should any UNM administrator at any level be accepting a raise when we are facing such draconian cuts to essential programs? This is a conversation that we need to have in the College and at the University more broadly. I would prefer to give up the 3% raise I am receiving as a department chair before any of my colleagues face reductions in their own salaries or before I break a promise of support to any of our graduate students. With a cut of 2.5 GA lines, I will have to break some promises in the spring.

To: Brenda Claiborne, Dean of Arts and Sciences
From: Beverly Burris, Chair of Sociology
Subject: Rescission Scenarios for Sociology Department 2010/2011
Date: September 2, 1010

Amount to be cut this fiscal year: \$52,005

I. Operating Budget

| | |
|-----------------|----------|
| Current budget: | \$34,897 |
| Proposed cut: | \$25,000 |
| New budget: | \$9,897 |

We will cut the majority of our office phones, expecting to save approximately \$7,000 a year (\$5,000 this fiscal year) and will cut the rest of our operating budget by \$20,000, planning to pay for most of our supplies and expenses out of non-recurring funds (F&A accounts, EU money generated by new online courses, etc.).

Impact on Department: This cut would mean that the department would have to generate most of its own operating budget in the future. I would like to point out that our operating budget is already substantially smaller than comparable departments in A&S, and is even smaller than the budgets of some smaller departments (e.g. Political Science, which has fewer faculty, fewer staff, and which generates far less SCH than Sociology). Perhaps these inequities in operating budgets should be considered and addressed in lieu of across-the-board cuts.

Although at the moment we have some EU and F&A money to offset this cut, these revenue streams are unpredictable in future years. Moreover, EU and F&A money do not always get transferred to the department in a timely fashion. This cut means that the department will not be able to update computers or other equipment as they break or become obsolete (and many of our computers and other equipment are already old and nearing obsolescence), which could adversely impact faculty teaching and research productivity. In addition, the departmental office might not always be able to afford paper, Xeroxing, or other essential supplies and services if the alternate revenue streams (EU, F&A) were to be interrupted or delayed.

II. TA/GA lines

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Current budget: | \$220,630 |
| Proposed cut: | \$22,000 |
| New budget: | \$198,630 |
| Tuition savings (est.) | 5,000 |
| Total savings | \$27,000 |

We will cut our TA/GA budget by \$22,000, approximately 1.5 GA lines. This will also save approximately \$5,000 in tuition.

Impact on Department: This cut will reduce the ability of our department to attract and retain graduate students, and will undermine the graduation rate for some of our current graduate students (who will lose funding). Moreover, it means less GA support for teaching in a time when we are being asked to raise course caps, making such support even more important to the maintenance of quality teaching and respectable graduation rates. If faculty members are forced to teach more students with less GA support, their research productivity is likely to decline. This cut, in conjunction with higher course caps, will therefore tend to limit classroom creativity, reduce graduation rates for both graduate and undergraduate students, and undermine the research productivity of faculty and graduate students alike.

III. Possible Alternate Scenario: Job-Share for Admin Assistant 3 position

The department is willing to consider sharing up to half-time our current Administrative Assistant 3 position. The current occupant of this position (Dona Lewis) is also open to dividing her work hours between Sociology and another unit, assuming that a mutually acceptable arrangement can be found. We have been discussing this possibility with various units in A&S, and it appears that such an arrangement might be possible with Religious Studies. However, we are not yet in a position to be able to say that this job share is probable; at the moment it is only a possibility.

If we are able to work out the job share with Religious Studies, it would be a 60/40 split, with Sociology retaining the 60% share. This would generate approximately \$13,520 (40% of the current \$33,800 salary). If a job-share arrangement could be worked out with another unit on a 50/50 basis, this could generate \$16,900 for Sociology. If a job-share arrangement can be finalized this year, we would use the savings to reduce the cut to our operating budget.

Note: Human Resources should be attempting to facilitate such job shares within the university, rather than having individual units charged with finding appropriate job sharing arrangements.

Impact on Department: This cut would significantly increase the workload of the DA and Academic Advisor, forcing them to do additional job tasks which are not part of their job description. In practice, this would likely mean that much of the support that front office staff provides to students and faculty would be compromised, further eroding the teaching and research mission of the department and the university.

IV. Revenue Generation

My department has asked me to convey to you both our apprehension about the effect that a cut of this magnitude will have on our department's academic mission and our hope that methods of revenue generation will be explored before such draconian cuts are implemented. In particular, a substantial number of the Sociology faculty believe that a well-designed Retirement Incentive program (that would be IRS approved as tax-deferred) could save the university millions of dollars in the next few years, thus alleviating the pain of current and future budget cuts. Pursuing new revenue streams and creative restructuring of the university would, in both the short and long term, protect the teaching and research missions of the university while the proposed cuts are certain to have a significant adverse effect on our academic mission.

UNM Department of Physics & Astronomy

Here some quick #s, rounded off since I don't think the last \$ matters much for this:

Fac salaries: \$2.5M

Staff salaries: \$561.K

TA salaries: \$460.K

Undergrads: \$25.K

Operating: nominally \$157.K (w/o any travel support),
and after the last rescission we really only got \$139.K

3.2445% cut amounts to a little over \$120.K (actual cut is \$125,000)

From ross@unm.edu Wed Sep 8 07:58:58 2010
Date: Wed, 8 Sep 2010 07:55:05 -0600
From: Timothy Ross <ross@unm.edu>
To: President of the UNM Faculty Senate <fspres@unm.edu>
Subject: Fwd: Rescission

>Rich,

Here is the response I got from my department chair on how the Civil Engineering department will handle the 3.2% cut.

Tim

>Date: Tue, 07 Sep 2010 14:52:18 -0600
>From: John Stormont <jcstorm@unm.edu>
>To: Timothy J Ross <ross@unm.edu>
>Subject: Rescission
>X-Junk-Score: [IIIIIII]

>

> Tim

>

>We are simply assigning our carry forward balance as our means to
>address the rescission - it turns out that nearly all of our carry
>forward will be spent down by the rescission. This reduces our
>ability to hire graduate assistants, student graders, and adjuncts
>who may have expertise in specific areas. Without carry forward,
>we do not have the resources for cost-sharing as a means to compete
>for research and equipment grants. Our carry forward provides a
>cushion for the department office operations and laboratory
>maintenance.

>

>

>John

--

Timothy J. Ross, PhD, PE
Professor and Regents' Lecturer, Department of Civil Engineering
University of New Mexico
Centennial Engineering Center, Room 3049
Albuquerque, NM 87131
Webpage: <http://www.unm.edu/~ross>
Phone: (505) 277-3459
email: ross@unm.edu