

University of New Mexico School of Law
Faculty Meeting Minutes
December 13, 2005

Present: Marsha Baum, Norman Bay, Barbara Blumenfeld, Kip Bobroff, James Ellis, Denise Fort, Laura Gómez, Em Hall, Evan Hobbs, Steven Homer, Scott Hughes, John LaVelle, Antoinette Sedillo Lopez, José Martínez, Alfred Mathewson, Margaret Montoya, Jennifer Moore, Mike Norwood, Ted Occialino, Marilyn O’Leary, Sergio Pareja, Carol Parker, Liz Rapaport, Suellyn Scarnecchia, Rob Schwartz, Carol Suzuki, Gloria Valencia-Weber, Sherry Wolf, Christine Zuni Cruz

Students: Shelby Bradley, Brendan O’Reilly, Ed Perea

Staff: Peggy Lovato, Theresa Montoya, Sandra Bauman

The meeting was called to order at 1:37 pm on Wednesday, December 13 2005. Dean Scarnecchia welcomed Scott Hughes back and explained the meeting plan.

- I. Gloria Valencia-Weber, brief Faculty Appointments Committee report, describing:
 - A. The committee’s charge, as they defined it.
 - B. Recruitment sources.
 - C. The process involved in narrowing down to current candidates.
 - D. Acknowledgement of hard work of committee members, Sherri Wolf, Barbara Blumenfeld, Chris Fritz, Alfred Mathewson, Christine Zuni Cruz, Gloria Valencia-Weber, as well as support by Theresa Montoya, Peggy Lovato and Dan Noyes.
 - E. Explanation of student evaluation materials in packets, directing questions to Alfred Mathewson. Prof. Mathewson affirmed no “red flags” for any candidate.
- II. Brief discussion about what SOL and Natural Resources is looking for in new hire.
 - A. Dean Scarnecchia invited each faculty member with direct interest in Natural Resources curriculum to present his or her perspective on SOL needs in this area.
 - B. In addition, Dean Scarnecchia summed up the practical aspects the SOL wants: interest in students, scholarship, advancing UNMSOL’s image, and being an individual or unifying force towards strengthening the Natural Resources program.
- III. Dean Scarnecchia explained the process for casting a “straw vote.” Ballots were passed out; time was given for those present to vote; ballots were collected for tallying.
- IV. Announcements
 - A. Dean Scarnecchia passed around the December, 2005, issue of “Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education,” which featured a two page spread on Antoinette Sedillo Lopez.

- B. Antoinette Sedillo Lopez has received word that the low-income tax clinic has approved funding again this year.
- V. Presentation of Draft Curriculum – Mike Norwood
- A. Dean Norwood passed out hand-outs, explaining that the picture of the curriculum presented is not aspirational, simply where we are now and what we think will happen in the next two years. The current picture does not include the two new hires. The hand-outs show:
 - 1. A list of courses approved by the curriculum committee by category (A, B, & C – which “have bite”). The committee wants to open up the process of category assignments.
 - 2. An “attempt” at staffing: who is teaching what, and trying to match talents and interests with the needs and obligations of the curriculum. (Tenured faculty first choice in staffing A’s and B’s.)
 - 3. Whether there are sufficient writing seminars to meet the writing requirement: who’s doing what when.
 - 4. Where are the gaps?
 - B. Dean Norwood asked the faculty to review, evaluate and provide feedback on the information over the course of the next few weeks.
- VI. Elimination of Second Reader requirement – Mike Norwood
- A. Mr. Norwood succinctly presented both sides of the issue that had been discussed at the last faculty meeting (11/22/05), and that had been shared with him since.
 - 1. Reasons to retain second reader requirement:
 - a. Keeps folks honest
 - b. Maintains high standards
 - c. Allows for sharing of knowledge
 - d. Builds collegiality
 - e. Gives students better experience
 - f. Possibly too early in cycle of upgrading WR to make significant change
 - 2. Reasons to allow second reader to be optional requirement:
 - a. Seminar format
 - b. Mixed experience with second readers
 - c. No clearly defined role for second readers
 - d. Requirement resulted in last minute scrambles
 - e. Insufficient faculty buy-in
 - B. Vote called to modify writing requirement making a second reader an option decided by the first reader. If passed, the change would go into effect as of the fall semester, 2005-2006 (i.e., immediately).
 - 1. Votes made by show of hands, both in favor and against.
 - 2. Motion passed; the requirement will be modified.
- VII. Faculty Appointments Discussion and Vote
- A. Results of initial straw vote written on board for evaluation by group.
 - B. Discussion ensued about candidates, both individually and comparatively.

- C. Second straw vote was taken.
- D. Additional discussion and two more straw votes followed.
- E. A motion passed giving the Dean the ultimate hiring decision between three equally rated candidates.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:11 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra Bauman
Administrative Assistant to Dean Suellyn Scarnecchia