

**Minutes for Executive Session Faculty Meeting
December 4, 2018**

The meeting was called to order by Dean Pareja at 3:04 p.m. The following people were present for at least some portion of the meeting:

Faculty: **Maryam Ahranjani, George Bach, Reed Benson, Sherri Burr, Camille Carey, Barbara Creel, Scott England, Steven Homer, April Land, John LaVelle, Jennifer Laws, Ernesto Longa, Nathalie Martin, Serge Martinez, Sergio Pareja, Sonia Rankin, Michelle Rigual, Alexandra Siek, Laura Spitz, Sarah Steadman, David Stout, Carol Suzuki, Sherri Thomas, Cliff Villa, Peter Winograd, Jeanette Wolfley, Christine Zuni Cruz** (*17 needed for quorum; names that count toward quorum in bold*)

Staff: Beverly Akin

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

ANNOUNCEMENTS: Professor Carol Suzuki, as Chair of the Faculty Retention, Promotion & Tenure Committee, noted that the committee will need to review files and make decisions if the faculty decide to extend offers to faculty candidates at a level of Associate Professor or higher. Professor Suzuki asked committee members to complete the Doodle Poll that she had circulated regarding their availability.

ACTION ITEM #1: Proposal to move forward with two hires – Dean Sergio Pareja:

Dean Pareja noted that the Provost has promised us some bridge funding to move forward with a second Civil Procedure hire. The hire would essentially be utilizing Professor Mathewson's faculty line after his planned retirement. Also, he noted that we can choose to move forward with a second Property hire in lieu of a Criminal Law hire if the faculty should choose to do that. There was a motion and a second to move forward with those two hires. The motion passed with one vote against and one abstention.

ACTION ITEM #2: Faculty hiring decision – Faculty Appointments Committee and Dean Sergio Pareja:

Members of the Faculty Appointments Committee reviewed the qualifications of the three candidates for the faculty position to primarily teach in the area of Civil Procedure. Questions and conversation ensued. Because the faculty had already voted at a prior meeting that all three of these candidates were acceptable (40% vote) and that all three should receive offers if we reach their name in going through our ranked list (60% vote), the only remaining issue was that the faculty needed to rank the candidates after factoring in our prior hire in this area. Upon conclusion of the exchange, the faculty proceeded to vote in the following manner:

1. By secret ballot, each faculty member first was asked to select on the ballot only the name of the one candidate whom s/he preferred. The one with the most votes was tentatively ranked first. The one with the second highest number of votes was tentatively ranked second. The one with the least votes was tentatively ranked third.
2. Because the first ranked candidate had a plurality, rather than a majority, the faculty had a second round of voting (runoff round) between the two top-ranked candidates. In the runoff round, the second ranked candidate moved to first place. The other candidate tentatively moved to second place.
3. The faculty then held a runoff vote between the two candidates tentatively ranked second and third. In this runoff round the tentatively third ranked candidate moved to second place and the tentatively second ranked candidate moved to third place.

As a result of the vote, it was decided that, subject to Provost approval, the Dean would offer the position to the top-ranked candidate. If that person doesn't accept, the Dean will offer the position to the second ranked candidate. If that person doesn't accept, the Dean will offer the position to the third ranked candidate.

After the vote, the faculty considered whether the top-ranked candidate would receive an offer at the Associate Professor level. The faculty also considered the length of the candidate's tenure clock. The candidate currently is in his fourth year in a tenure-track position at an ABA-accredited law school. The faculty determined that the top-ranked candidate easily would meet UNM's criteria for Associate Professor. The faculty also supported offering the candidate a two-year tenure clock but giving the Dean the authority to increase it to three years if requested by the candidate. The record was remanded to the Faculty Retention, Promotion & Tenure Committee for further review. Upon a favorable further review by that subcommittee, the full faculty voted overwhelmingly in favor of authorizing the Dean to offer the top-ranked candidate the faculty position at the Associate Professor level with a two-year tenure clock.

ACTION ITEM #3: Faculty hiring decision – Faculty Appointments Committee and Dean Sergio Pareja:

Members of the Faculty Appointments Committee reviewed the qualifications of the three candidates for the faculty position to primarily teach in the area of Property. Questions and conversation ensued. Because the faculty had already voted at a prior meeting that both of these candidates were acceptable (40% vote) and that both should receive offers if we reach their name in going through our ranked list (60% vote), the only remaining issue was that the faculty needed to rank the candidates after factoring in our prior hire in this area. Upon conclusion of the exchange, the faculty proceeded to vote in the following manner:

By secret ballot, each faculty member first was asked to select on the ballot only the name of the one candidate whom s/he preferred. The one with the most

votes was ranked first. The one with the second highest number of votes was ranked second.

As a result of the vote, it was decided that, subject to Provost approval, the Dean would offer the position to the top-ranked candidate. If that person doesn't accept, the Dean will offer the position to the second ranked candidate.

After the vote, the faculty considered whether the top-ranked candidate would receive an offer at the full Professor-level with tenure. The candidate currently is a full Professor with tenure at an ABA-accredited law school. The faculty determined that the top-ranked candidate easily would meet UNM's criteria for tenure. The record was remanded to the Faculty Retention, Promotion & Tenure Committee for further review. Upon a favorable further review by that subcommittee, the full faculty voted overwhelmingly in favor of authorizing the Dean to offer the top-ranked candidate the faculty position at the full Professor-level with tenure.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.