



**Faculty Assembly Meeting**

**MINUTES** **November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2019** **12:30 PM** **GH 207**

<b>MEETING CALLED BY:</b>	<b>Professor John Zimmerman, Faculty Assembly President</b>
<b>MINUTES TAKEN BY:</b>	Keri Stevenson, Faculty Assembly Secretary
<b>FACULTY ATTENDEES:</b>	Antoinette Abeyta, Shawnadine Becenti, John Burke, Lilia Cuciuc, Sonya Damon, Tara DeYoung, Robert Encinio, Sabrina Ezzell, Jim Fisk, Bruce Gjeltoma, Peter Handeland, Yi-Wen Huang, Joe Kee, Jr., Floyd Kezele, Carolyn Kuchera, Tracy Lassister, L. D. Lovett, Jonathan Lumibao, Matt Mingus, Jon Saatvedt, Kamala Sharma, Kristian Simcox, Keri Stevenson, Rachael Stewart, Lora Stone, and John Zimmerman.
<b>GUESTS:</b>	Stephen Buggie, John White

**ACTION** **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** **PROFESSOR JOHN ZIMMERMAN**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	
<b>I move to approve the agenda.</b>	
<b>Motion:</b> Kristian Simcox. He asked to amend the agenda to replace John Burke’s name with his own and Tara DeYoung’s as the discussion leaders for the Adjunct/Overload Pay discussion item. Antoinette Abeyta then asked to include John Burke’s name among the leaders for the Institutional Equity and Fairness Task Force discussion item.	
<b>Seconded:</b> Yes	
<b>Discussion:</b> No further discussion	
<b>Voice Vote:</b> Unanimously approved as amended	
<b>Motion Carried:</b> Yes	

**ACTION** **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** **PROFESSOR JOHN ZIMMERMAN**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	
<b>I move to approve the minutes from the <a href="#">October 18<sup>th</sup>, 2019</a> UNMG Faculty Assembly meeting.</b>	
<b>Motion:</b> Antoinette Abeyta	
<b>Seconded:</b> Yes	
<b>Discussion:</b> None	
<b>Voice Vote:</b> Unanimous	
<b>Motion Carried:</b> Yes	

**INFORMATION**

**FACULTY ASSEMBLY  
PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

**PROFESSOR JOHN ZIMMERMAN**

**Faculty Assembly President Professor John Zimmerman reported on the following:**

Professor Zimmerman asked for a moment of silence for Lorraine Askan Hood, who had worked in IT and had passed away unexpectedly on the thirty-first of October. The Faculty Assembly observed silence for Lorraine and for Jeremy, Angie, and Stephanie, her children employed by UNM-Gallup.

Professor Zimmerman than addressed the resolution the Faculty Assembly had passed last month about scheduling. Its gist was that the final say would be in the hands of division chairs. The executive team looked at it the Monday morning after the October Assembly meeting. The Ops Committee also met with the executive team on Oct. 25<sup>th</sup>. Professor Zimmerman stated that the resolution was received as a professional and well-thought-out document by the executive team, who agreed with its contents. It was late to make radical changes to the spring schedule, so the Ops Committee and the executive team agreed that faculty and administration would communicate more frequently and fully on these issues in future semesters.

When we begin to plan for the summer and fall schedules, Professor Zimmerman continued, the conversation will start in Academic Affairs with the Dean of Instruction and the division chairs. Faculty would also appreciate recommendations from IR, the registrar, and Student Services, but it is necessary for the planning to begin in academic affairs. There are still some problems remaining with the current schedule, but in the future, it will be better.

Professor Zimmerman then announced a chair vacancy for the Teaching Excellence Committee, as Professor Chris Platero has stepped down. The President would like volunteers rather than him having to assign someone as the committee chair, although he has the power to do so. He also asked that potential committee chairs consider representation in terms of division, ethnic, and racial balance on the committee. The chair will likely enter their position next semester.

There were no questions from the Assembly. Professor Zimmerman added, before turning the floor over to Dr. Malm as Chancellor, that he would like to add content to the Faculty Assembly website.

**INFORMATION**

**CHANCELLOR'S  
REPORT**

**DR. JAMES MALM**

Dr. Malm reported that his office has identified and negotiated with a candidate who will join the UNM-Gallup campus as Senior PR Specialist. Her name is Traci Hutson Morris-Irvin, and she brings 25 years of experience to the job. She will receive a formal introduction from Dr. Malm's office shortly.

The UNM-Gallup campus has also sent our five-year financial plan to the main campus. Dr. Malm stated that it does not show much growth right now. The executive team has projected flatline enrollments, partially because our county population shrank by .06% in the last decade. We also have competitors. Navajo Tech University, universities in Colorado and Arizona, and Diné College are all drawing from the same smaller group of students. The demographic trough we are currently in is expected to continue until 2025. However, the five-year plan predicted that we will increase revenue and will have to raise tuition a couple of percentage points more every year, along with raising faculty salaries.

Dr Malm also gave an update on the campus's five-year-capital plan. This is focused on buildings, and will work more on refurbishing existing buildings than constructing new ones.

Dr. Malm's final update was about the campus's investigation of scheduling software, notably Ad Astra. We will also be looking into academic catalog software.

The faculty had no more questions, so Dr. Malm finished his report, and Professor Zimmerman turned over the floor to Dr. Daniel Primozic, Dean of Instruction for UNM-Gallup.

**INFORMATION**

**DEAN OF INSTRUCTION'S  
REPORT**

**DEAN DR. DANIEL  
PRIMOZIC**

Dean Primozic congratulated Dr. Antoinette Abeyta on a grant she had earned to do environmental investigation of the flooding of the Mississippi. Dr. Abeyta will be traveling to Louisiana with several students to complete this work in the near future.

The Dean then updated the Assembly on the search for new Education Specialists for the CAL. A Math Education Specialist has been chosen, while the English Education Specialist candidates will have interviews next week. The Dean thanked those who have volunteered at CAL while the center goes through the hiring process.

The Dean has also moved the program prioritization deadlines forward into either December or the spring. He believes the process is too important to rush. It will be done carefully, and it will need a methodology that has not yet been determined. This was originally going to be done by the end of the present semester to inform the CCTI people what would go into the new building, but they have now made the decisions.

Dean Primozic also announced a catalog revision for UNM-Gallup. Although we will be bringing in new catalog software, the chairs will have the revision in process before then.

The Dean had shared an article on adjunct pay and working conditions from the *Chronicle of Higher Education* that he urged faculty to read.

Dr. Primozic also gave an update on the articulation agreement between NTU and UNM-Gallup. It has been sent out to faculty to give them a glimpse of it. The Dean emphasized that this is a one-way agreement, rather than two-way; NTU has agreed to accept UNM-Gallup's credits easily, but we do not necessarily accept theirs.

The next part of the Dean's report concerned placement exams. The Dean believes these are currently faulty with concern to the scoring cuts in Math and possibly English. The Dean will be working with division chairs and coordinators to correct this, but he wants all-faculty input on the matter as well.

The Dean then announced that Faculty Development Week in the spring semester will have a celebration of faculty research. Faculty who are interested in talking about their research should contact him. As well, he updated the Assembly on the progress of the Process Technology and Mechanical Program that is being established by Professor Jon Saatvedt.

The Dean reached the end of his report and asked for questions, but faculty had none. Professor Zimmerman turned the floor over to Mr. Robert Griego, CFO of the University of New Mexico-Gallup.

**INFORMATION****CFO'S REPORT****MR. ROBERT  
GRIEGO**

CFO Griego led off his report by discussing his work on the five-year financial plans. They will be published on the CFO's website. Currently, his office has been concentrating on the construction of the new building, and progress is going well. They are coming across less rock than expected, which is one reason for being ahead of schedule. Mr. Griego added that some of the amenities that had had to be cut from the building plan because of the anticipated cost of dealing with the rock will be added back in. The grand opening will be in April, thanks to the delivery of a prefab building near this time.

Mr. Griego then discussed the five-year capital plan. Ron Petranovich will put together a group to discuss the plan, and such questions as the replenishing of the old building with new programs.

Finally, Mr. Griego spoke about technology. He said that the cameras have been useful for the security officers. Cameras that are old will be replaced soon. He also said that all the rooms in the Nursing Building will be upgraded with big-screen monitors, microphones, speakers, and cameras. They hope to have additional technology for classrooms next year when they have secured more funding.

This was the end of the CFO's report, as the faculty had no questions. The executive team departed, with a final reminder of the time and date of the fall graduation: Saturday, December 14th, 10:00 AM, in the Kenneth Holloway Auditorium at Gallup High School.

Professor Zimmerman thanked the executive team, then turned the floor over to Dr. Matt Mingus and Dr. Tracy Lassiter

**DISCUSSION ITEM****SAC POLICY****DR. MATT MINGUS &  
DR. TRACY LASSITER**

Dr. Mingus and Dr. Lassiter began the discussion on the SAC policy. They stated that it is important to give feedback on the current policy so as to provide guidance for the Dean of Instruction. They also wanted an open conversation, and so invited those who might be uncomfortable with speaking up in an open forum to send e-mails about the issue.

Dr. Tracy Lassiter raised some questions about the SAC policy that might offer considerations for the future. For example, she stated that the English Coordinator position was application-driven, and that some of the other SACs have an application or vetting process, but not every single one does. We should discuss whether every SAC position should be open so that all could apply. Second, what would be the outcomes and work expected? How would they be evaluated? We need to have clearer standards since the Dean had changed his mind on SACs at the beginning of the semester. He had promised leadership training and workshops on campus for those who might have SACs in the future, but that had not happened.

Not receiving a SAC could affect growth opportunities of faculty who do not receive them. We might discuss, Dr. Lassiter said, whether undergoing leadership training should be a prerequisite for a SAC payment. We should also keep in mind that current duties for a SAC-affiliated position might change in the future. For example, the English coordinator currently helps with scheduling, but that might end when we have software that can help with those tasks.

Dr. Mingus and Dr. Lassiter then opened the floor to discussion. The first question was whether the

Dean was working on a way to justify the SACs. Faculty replied that he might be, but he had stated that the SACs would be cut in the future. Other faculty pointed out that the more recent policy (see attached) is supporting the SACs.

Assembly members discussed the fact that different colleges handle the SAC policy differently. We have doubled the amount from what some positions are other colleges offer.

One faculty member asked whether SAC offers will be part of the collective bargaining process in the future. The response was that it was possible, but not in the same way that the Assembly was currently discussing them.

Other faculty discussed the fact that working title and clear duties and responsibilities should be part of the policy, along with the standardized pay scale. The Dean's letter to the Provost (see attached) does not specify these criteria. For equity purposes, there should be a clear process for evaluation. Also, just because the SACs are equal in pay doesn't mean equity pertains to all aspects of them.

One faculty member said that our heavy teaching load means that we should not be supporting SACs. Another option would be course releases as opposed to SACs. A question then arose as to whether someone would have a SAC or a course release with a 4-4 load, and whether if, were SACs abolished, a position like a coordinator might have a three-course teaching load instead. The answer was that it could be possible.

SACs, one Assembly member stated, are an easy solution because they are financial. Getting rid of them in favor of course releases would perhaps work against the institution by depriving students of teachers.

Nothing, the Assembly was reassured, would be finally decided today. This was a fact-finding discussion; voting will need to be part of some later Assembly meeting.

One person said that it was hard to commit to something long-term with collective bargaining in the air, which was acknowledged. Questions about the union then succeeded, with one concern as to whether the Faculty Assembly will still be distinct from the union. The answer was yes. One faculty member asked whether there will be a way to talk about the SAC policy with the union representatives, and others said that there will be different memberships between the Assembly and the union. Workplace conditions will probably be handled by the union, while the Assembly covers academic affairs.

Professor Zimmerman then asked whether the Assembly wanted to cover the SAC policy in a more formal capacity in the spring, and faculty indicated their approval. The discussion proceeded to the next item on the agenda, Adjunct/Overload Pay.

**DISCUSSION ITEM ADJUNCT/OVERLOAD PAY**

**DR. KRISTIAN SIMCOX &  
PROFESSOR TARA DEYOUNG**

Dr. Simcox and Professor DeYoung began their discussion with an article that says students taught by adjuncts can have negative effects—because the adjuncts are treated badly and their classes suffer as a result, not because part-time faculty are bad teachers. From here, they led into talking about stagnant part-time faculty pay on the UNM-Gallup campus, and whether part-time instructional pay is a point the Assembly wants to take up formally.

When the pay remains low, Dr. Simcox and Professor DeYoung explained, the faculty suffer from overexploitation of their labor. This can include low pay for teaching summer classes, as well.

Some full-time faculty have mentioned difficulties with retaining quality adjuncts because of the pay problem. This pay is significantly lower than that of other colleges. Some adjunct faculty have reported that it hasn't increased in a decade, not even being adjusted for inflation.

Professor DeYoung presented the Adjunct Task Force's ideas about how to respond to the situation. We should make paths to full-time employment for part-time faculty clear. This could include full-time faculty mentoring adjuncts. The task force also believes that professional development opportunities that are available to full-time faculty should be made available to adjuncts, and that some pay should be made available to adjuncts who have spent time preparing for a class that is only canceled days before it begins. There should be regular pay increases, and the task force suggests a pay schedule based on seniority.

Dr. Simcox and Professor DeYoung then opened the floor for general discussion. The first question concerned the reason for the pay cut. Another Assembly member pointed out that technically the pay cut hasn't been implemented yet; due to the recent union vote, we cannot make such a change to pay until the process is more advanced.

Others brought up special problems with cuts to the summer pay. It might decrease the number of classes offered, as faculty might think summer teaching is not worth it when the pay is so low. Particularly, Business and Applied Technology faculty can get better jobs during the summer in their specialties, such as welding or automotive technology, which means they may not be teaching, and are likelier not to with such low pay.

The discussion then turned to what should be done about the situation. One person pointed out that the main campus has much greater adjunct pay, \$4000 per class and up. Others agreed that a formal resolution should be written up by the Ops Committee. Some stated that adjunct pay should be the same across the board between branch campuses and the main campus, but then again, it will be once the union negotiations have happened. On the other hand, we can make some changes now, like passing a resolution and asking the Faculty Professional Development Committee to start accepting adjunct applications for travel and other aid. Some faculty suggested that adjuncts could write up a resolution and bring it to the Assembly.

The Assembly offered some other suggestions and elaborated on ones that Professor DeYoung had read, such as a way to start moving long-time temporary faculty to full-time positions, and stating support for offering perhaps a fourth of what adjuncts would have been paid when a class was canceled. Assembly members felt that this would compensate adjuncts and deter needless listing of too many course sections on the schedule. They pointed out that both students and part-time faculty suffer when there are last-minute class changes.

One Assembly member asked about the names of faculty union bargaining advisors for the adjunct unit. However, others stated that there are none yet and that this is far in the future.

Discussion turned back to a resolution on adjunct pay. One faculty member pointed out that the campus is working from a position of financial strength. For example, we had a \$500,000 increase this year to cover salary raises. Others were in favor of changing the adjunct pay resolution to be more radical, such as asking for back pay. Research has been done by the Adjunct Task force on looking at pay for part-time faculty at comparable institutions, which could strengthen the resolution.

No other faculty had questions, so Dr. Simcox and Professor DeYoung ended their report and the Assembly moved on to the discussion about the Institutional Equity and Fairness Task Force.

**DISCUSSION ITEM**

**INSTITUTIONAL EQUITY  
& FAIRNESS TASK FORCE**

**DR. ANTOINETTE ABEYTA  
AND DR. JOHN BURKE**

Dr. Abeyta and Dr. Burke began the discussion by talking about the questions they hoped the task force could help answer. What are ideas on how to evaluate equity and inclusion in the future of UNM-Gallup? Faculty have made changes to representation (by gender and race as well as division) on committee rosters, and we should make other changes in the name of equity

Dr. Abeyta and Dr. Burke also discussed how equity might apply to adjunct pay, general faculty recruitment, and hiring. For example, job descriptions can be written more carefully before being posted so that we have a more diverse pool of applicants. This would include equity of both gender and ethnicity.

Faculty asked whether this was connected to the diversity initiative also taking place on campus. Dr. Abeyta and Dr. Burke replied that we already have a Diversity Committee; the Institutional Equity and Fairness Task Force will be more scientific and gather data that will look at coordinator positions, barriers to getting hired, and other issues. Someone else then asked whether this concerned campus climate, but Dr. Abeyta and Dr. Burke clarified that it was about gender bias and racism. However, conversations derived from other issues, such as pay, have raised concerns about implicit bias.

One faculty member noted that, despite asking for it, SafeZone training had not been brought to the campus, and the LGBTQ+ center has been shuttered. Another one said that we could still get the SafeZone training on campus, although the center had been closed.

More discussion followed on how to hire more diverse applicants. This might, for example, include taking off required years of experience in certain postings. However, it will still be separate from the work of the Diversity Initiative. The task force will attempt to determine whether processes like hiring are being unintentionally biased and exclusive. To a question as to whether the task force's work would focus on the faculty, Dr. Abeyta and Dr. Burke agreed that it would stay concentrated there, for now. Hiring processes in the past for executives have been biased; more faculty are now being hired, and we should have people on the search committees who can have training in gender and race bias.

One Assembly member asked whether we could get data from HR on rejected candidates to have a better idea of the pool we have been working with. However, others replied that we do not have that data. Another suggested creating flexibility in the search process, such as allowing candidates to have six months less than the required years of experience. This will depend on the hiring officer. For example, if we have another Dean's search, Dr. Malm could let the committee write the search criteria for the Dean or he could do it himself. Most were agreed that faculty should have a stronger voice in the hiring processes.

A faculty member argued that there is already language appearing in all the postings that requires them to be unbiased. Despite this language, others saw problems with some of the requirements, such as mandating a candidate to have three-five years as a full professor when those who have that experience are mostly white men. One person felt that the chance to revise the job description should happen before it is posted. Others offered ideas for advertising faculty jobs in publications that serve

vulnerable communities, and electing Native and Business and Applied Technology faculty to the Assembly Operations Committee. With this, the discussion wrapped up, and Professor John Zimmerman reclaimed the floor.

**INFORMATION    COMMITTEE REPORTS    COMMITTEE CHAIRS**

DISCUSSION

**President Zimmerman asked for committee reports:**

**UNM-G Senator to Albuquerque:** Dr. Tracy Lassiter gave a report, which concerned the Albuquerque Faculty Senate’s response to our spring scheduling issue. She stated that Dr. Finnie Coleman drafted a Faculty Senate resolution that pushed back on the schedule and which went to the UNM-Gallup administration. We received unanimous support from the Faculty Senate. This was a significant issue, especially with the amount of main campus support received.

**Budget Review Committee:** Dr. Bruce Gjeltema gave the report. The committee has been considering ways to impart faculty influence to the budget. They will be setting up a survey to get faculty input by the end of the year. They will want to know about people’s personnel needs and budget needs in their areas, as well as required equipment. This will sometimes include decisions that have to be made two or three years ahead of time; thus, the projected budget should also include money for supplies. Dr. Gjeltema also spoke briefly about the program prioritization issue as a delicate one that should really belong to faculty, and expressed his concerns about the possible flatline growth indicated in the CFO's budget report.

**Teaching Excellence Committee:** This committee had no report, but Professor Zimmerman once again encouraged an applicant for chair to come forward.

**Constitution and By-Laws:** This committee had no report.

**CARC:** This committee had no report.

**Faculty Committee on Student Affairs:** This committee likewise had no report.

**Curricula Committee:** Dr. Carolyn Kuchera reported that the committee was currently looking over the articulation agreement between UNM-Gallup and Navajo Tech University.

**Library Committee:** The library reminded the faculty that the Holiday in New Mexico event is coming up. The library intends to participate. The date for the event is Thursday, December 5th.

**Strategic Planning Committee:** Dr. John Burke gave the report. The committee has created a list of the top three priorities among faculty from the survey they sent out, but now has to gather further faculty feedback. The division reps will distribute another survey and carry the new information back to the Strategic Planning Committee. They will try to improve the face-to-face feedback rate.

**DISCUSSION**

**ANNOUNCEMENT**

**VARIOUS**

DISCUSSION

**Professor Zimmerman opened the floor for announcements:**

Faculty were reminded again of the date and time of the December graduation, and that the Holiday in New Mexico event would start at 5 PM on Thursday the 5th of December.



Dr. Antoinette Abyeta also announced that UNM-Gallup had received a \$200,000 grant to take eight students to Louisiana to look at the Mississippi Delta and its ongoing disappearance. They will be paid to do field work and are also doing a 10-week summer research opportunity. They will present their work at a national conference next year. Other students will be presenting at the American Geophysical Union conference during finals week.

UNM-Gallup will also be bringing in national testing for students to get early eligibility in Nursing, even for nurses who have not yet finished their clinicals. This will bring students into the field faster.

**ACTION ITEM**

**ADJOURNMENT**

DISCUSSION	
<p><b>Motion to adjourn:</b> Antoinette Abeyta  <b>Seconded:</b> Yes  <b>Voice vote:</b> Unanimously approved  <b>Motion carried:</b> Yes</p>	
<p><b>Meeting adjourned at 1:57 PM, by Faculty Assembly President Professor John Zimmerman.</b></p>	
<p><b>Recorded by:</b> Keri Stevenson, Faculty Assembly Secretary on November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2019.</p>	

## **Attachments**

### **C180: Special Administrative Component**

Approved by: Faculty Senate

Effective Date: August 27, 2013

Responsible FS Committee: Policy and Operations

Office Responsible for Administration: Office of the Provost and HSC VC Academic Affairs

Revisions to the Policy Rationale, Policy Statement, and Applicability sections of this document must be approved by the full Faculty Senate.

#### **Policy Rationale**

This policy is designed to ensure appropriate oversight, fairness, and transparency in the establishment and allocation of Special Administrative Components. A Special Administrative Component (SAC) is a salary amount, in addition to base salary, which is designed to provide incentive to and compensation for a faculty member who is willing to take on extra administrative duties. This policy is applicable to SACs and other similar salary components that are paid to faculty members for carrying out certain specified administrative duties.

#### **Policy Statement**

SACs cannot be paid for work that is considered a normal part of faculty service workload, for example, serving on search committees or other assignments that are limited in scope and time, and for which special qualifications are not required. All SACs are incorporated into faculty contracts, and thus are ultimately approved by the Office of the Provost or the Chancellor for Health Sciences as a part of the faculty contract approval process.

Colleges and other administrative units which award SACs must have written policies that specify the type of administrative work for which a SAC may be awarded; how the compensation is determined, including a standardized payment scale to ensure equity; and established SAC terms and criteria for renewals. These policies must be approved by the Office of the Provost or the Office of the Chancellor for Health Sciences, and be available for review in the offices awarding the SACs (e.g. offices of the chair, dean, director or other administrator).

#### **Applicability**

All UNM academic faculty and administrators, including the Health Sciences Center and Branch Campuses.

Revisions to the remaining sections of this document may be amended with the approval of the Faculty Senate Policy and Operations Committee in consultation with the responsible Faculty Senate Committee listed in the Policy Heading.

Revisions to the remaining sections of this document may be amended with the approval of the Faculty Senate Policy and Operations Committee in consultation with the responsible Faculty Senate Committee listed in Policy Heading.

## **Definitions**

**Special Administrative Component (SAC).** A SAC is a component of a faculty member's salary that is paid to the faculty member for carrying out certain specified administrative duties that are in addition to the faculty member's non-administrative duties.

## **Who should read this policy**

Professors and academic staff  
Academic deans and other executives, department chairs, directors, and managers  
Administrative staff responsible for academic appointments

## **Related Documents**

Faculty Handbook:  
C50: Faculty Contracts  
C140: Extra Compensation Paid by the University  
Related HSC Procedures

## **Contacts**

Direct any questions about this policy to the Office of the Provost or the Office of the Chancellor for Health Sciences, as appropriate.

## **Procedures**

1. SACs are generally built into departmental budgets and based on historical labor-cost calculations. In some cases they are set by negotiation to persuade a faculty member to assume a particular responsibility. For administrative efforts within an academic department, the chair normally sets the value of each SAC, and the college or school deans review and approve the departmental SACs; for deans and directors the Provost or the Chancellor for Health Sciences sets the value of the SAC. For SACs awarded in independent centers and institutes, and for cross-college activities, SAC recommendations may be made collaboratively by appropriate administrative officers; these recommendations require approval by the Provost or the Chancellor for Health Sciences. The Chancellor for Health Sciences may define different procedures and guidelines for HSC SACs provided they are consistent with items 2, 3, 4, and 5 below.

2. The Office of the Provost or the Chancellor for Health Sciences has the responsibility to approve all SACs. Therefore, guidelines governing the creation and administration of SACs are set by those offices. The following guidelines set the appropriate values, eligibility requirements, and processes for initiating and terminating SACs. Equity considerations and the tracking and reporting of SACs are functions of those offices as well. The Associate Provost for Academic Personnel or the HSC Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is charged with implementing and monitoring these guidelines.

3. Colleges and other administrative unit policies should include the following:

a. The work and title for which the SAC is awarded should be specified (this should make clear the duties and responsibilities connected with this work).

b. A compensation amount should be assigned to the SAC; this amount could be based on the following factors: the numbers of people being managed (faculty, staff, graduate/undergraduate students); budget; grants administered by the unit; and special programs or projects which have impact and contribute to the larger University mission. If other factors are used, these should be clearly identified.

c. The compensation amount referred to in 3.b. should derive from a general standardized payment scale; the amount of the SAC should reflect the factors identified in 3.b., and in the interests of equity should be awarded consistently. (The amounts could be a set dollar amount or a range, or the SAC could be a set percentage of base pay.)

d. The term of the SAC should be defined, and criteria for renewals should be clear. Once the term of service is complete, the SAC will also end.

4. In practice, when a SAC is awarded, the request to create the appropriate faculty contract should include a brief description of the specific qualifications of the individual for the carrying out the duties and responsibilities as described above. That request should also include the term of the SAC.

5. At the end of each fiscal year the Office of the Provost or the Office of the Chancellor for Health Sciences will submit a report to the Faculty Senate Operations Committee that lists all SACs. This report will be posted on the Provost's and Chancellor's websites. The report will include each faculty member's name, college or school, amount of SAC, and purpose of the SAC.

### **History**

August 27, 2013 – Approved by the Faculty Senate.

Dean of Instruction Office

To: James Paul Holloway, Provost & Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Barbara Rodriguez, Sr. Vice Provost

From: Daniel Primožic, Dean of Instruction

Re: Amended UNM Gallup SAC Policy

Date:

October 2, 2019

In accordance with Faculty Handbook Policy C, 180 "Special Administrative Components", The UNM Gallup Campus submits the following policy.

### **Rationale**

This policy is designed to ensure appropriate oversight, fairness, and transparency in the establishment and allocation of Special Administrative Component (SAC). A SAC is a salary amount, in addition to faculty base salary, designed to provide incentive to and compensation for a faculty member who is willing to take on extra administrative duties.

### **Policy Statement**

SACs cannot be paid for work that is considered a normal part of a faculty workload. SACs are approved by the Dean of UNM-Gallup based on recommendations from Division Chairs or based on need as determined by the UNM Gallup Dean of Instruction. All SACs are incorporated into the faculty contract, and thus are ultimately approved by the Office of the Provost. Proposals for SACs will specify the work for which the appointment is intended and the title (if any) associated with the assignment, as well as the amount of additional compensation.

### **SACs for UNMG**

#### 1. Service:

- a. Faculty Assembly President - \$5,000
- b. Chair of the Curriculum - \$5,000
- c. Chair of Assessment - \$5,000
- d. Secretary of the Faculty Assembly - \$2,000
- e. Chair of Distance Learning Committee - \$5000

#### 2. Coordinators of disciplinary groups within a Division:

- a. Fine Arts, Humanities & Social Science, English Coordinator - \$5,000
- b. Mathematics, Physical & Natural Sciences, Math Coordinator - \$5,000
- c. Division of Business and Applied Technology:
  - Automotive Program Coordinator - \$5,000
  - Construction Program Coordinator - \$5,000
  - Cosmetology Program Coordinator - \$5,000
  - Welding Program Coordinator - \$5,000
- d. Education, Health & Human Services, EMS Coordinator - \$5,000

3. For regular F9 Faculty members who serve in interim appointments as Division Chairs (due to retirement, leave, or resignation of the incumbent, etc.), compensation will be determined at the discretion of the Dean and approval of the Provost. A Summer Administrative Agreement may also be assessed.