

2-24-2009

Faculty Senate Summarized Minutes, 2/24/2009

UNM Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/fs_minutes

Recommended Citation

UNM Faculty Senate. "Faculty Senate Summarized Minutes, 2/24/2009." (2009). https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/fs_minutes/69

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact amywinter@unm.edu.

FACULTY SENATE SUMMARIZED MINUTES

2008-2009 Faculty Senate
February 24, 2009

The Faculty Senate meeting for February 24, 2009 was called to order at 3:05 p.m. in the Lobo Room of the Student Union Building. Senate President Howard Snell presided.

1. ATTENDANCE

Guests Present: Lecturer Kathy Falkenhagen (UNM Taos), Sari Krosinsky (University Communication and Marketing), Faculty Affairs and Services Director Raqui Martinez (Provost Office), Professor Alfred Mathewson (School of Law), Provost Suzanne Ortega, and Professor Roli Varma (School of Public Administration).

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved with one revision. At the request of the Office of the Secretary, the approval for the January 27, 2009 meeting minutes will be deferred to the March 24, 2009 meeting.

3. APPROVAL OF SUMMARIZED MINUTES FOR JANUARY 27, 2009 MEETING

At the request of the Office of the Secretary, the approval for the January 27, 2009 meeting minutes was deferred to the March 24, 2009 meeting.

4. HONORARY DEGREE CANDIDATE CONSIDERATION

Honorary Degree Committee member Roli Varma (Public Administration) presented the Honorary Degree candidates for consideration to the Faculty Senate for approval. The Honorary Degree Committee is a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Graduate Committee. The senators were given a ballot with candidate biographies on the reverse. The senators were asked to approve, do not approve, or abstain for each candidate and place their completed ballots in the ballot box. Results of the vote will be provided to the Operations Committee, the Honorary Degree Committee, and the Senate Graduate Committee. The candidates will remain confidential and the recipients will be notified after regent consideration.

5. FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

The Faculty Senate President reported on the following:

The new budget process that the regents have proposed will replace the budget summit process.

The University of New Mexico is facing economic challenges, as are all institutions of higher learning in our country. The budget process used for the last 4 years began with a budget summit, followed by meetings with the Finance and Facilities committee, and ended with decisions taken by the full Board of Regents. This process focused almost exclusively on incremental budget and tuition increases to support a high level of spending. This process worked well as long as new revenues were projected. We know that we now face reduced revenues from the state. This will lead to a reduction in spending. The main concerns of the Board of Regents are students and academic quality. If any increase in tuition is necessary, it will be in the single digits.

In keeping with the University's motto "Lux Hominum Vita," and with a shared sense of purpose and duty, the entire university community must ensure that each of the seven members of the

Board of Regents has the most complete, credible and up-to-date financial information available from all sources. Only in this way can the Board of Regents make the necessary but equitable funding decisions for the coming budget cycle.

As you indicated to me, it is your desire to develop and present the FY2010 budget proposal for the Board of Regents' consultation. The Board of Regents accepts this approach with the following format:

1. The proposal will be detailed for every operating unit of the University, including the President's office. Complete rationale and justifications will accompany every recommendation.

For instance, you should develop recommendations for each college and unit. Every manager should be prepared to answer questions.

2. Submit your complete recommendations to constituency groups by March 20, 2009. Constituency groups will have until March 27, 2009 to return comments in writing to the University. The University will review the comments and, if necessary, seek additional information regarding cost figures. All information will be forwarded to the Regents no later than April 1, 2009 to allow time for the Regents to prepare for the April 7, 2009 meeting.
3. Revenue producing areas of the University, such as Auxiliaries, UNMH, Intercollegiate Athletics and parts of the Health Sciences Center need not prepare the same level of detail as those funded primarily through student tuition and I&G appropriations.
4. It will be important to identify each area impacted by legislative funding reductions.
5. The Board of Regents is very interested in identifying funding trade-offs. Please be prepared to identify such options.
6. 6. Following is the order of presentation on April 7, 2009.
 - 1st. Health Science Center and UNMH
 - 2nd. Utility costs University-wide.
 - 3rd. All revenue generating activities.
 - 4th. Student activities funded through student fees.
 - 5th. Research.
 - 6th. Public Service projects.
 - 7th. A complete report on all endowments controlled by the Regents, including a three-year history and an explanation of the valuation of all alternative investments.
 - 8th. Academics and formula distribution. Include workload and enrollment for each college.
 - 9th. Administration.
 - 10th. Miscellaneous
 - 11th. Tuition

The Regents will vote on each item at the conclusion of the discussion on that item. We appreciate your willingness to lead this effort and look forward to a fruitful budget process for FY2010.

President Snell then presented the statements he made at the Board of Regents meeting on February 10, 2009.

BOR 20090210 Meeting – Outline Faculty Senate Advisor’s Statement

1. Comments about the Regents budget process for 2009-10:

1a. It is helpful to have information available early in the process with a week to provide comments. However, the time available for the UNM administration to actually incorporate those comments into the final budget reviewed by the regents seems very short. Comments are due on 27 March and the administration’s final proposed budget is due on 1 April, two working days later. This provides extremely little time for collaborative dialogue between the UNM administration and those that have been charged with reviewing the budget (constituency groups). If we are seeking productive input that has real potential to contribute to the final budget going forward to the regents, that period of collaborative dialogue needs to be at least 5 working days (10 working days would be best).

1b. The distinction of “revenue producing areas of UNM...” is unclear. The main campus academic programs produced millions of dollars of research funding and are responsible for generating the majority of tuition revenue at UNM yet they appear to be held to a different standard than other components of the UNM community. In the interest of transparency and openness all units of UNM should be required to produce the same level of detail which should be equally distributed for comment and review.

1c. As mentioned above, it is helpful to have the information ahead of time, it is very helpful to have the various components separately reported, and it will be extremely helpful to have a sufficiently long period for collaborative work between the UNM administration and constituency groups to fine tune the budget. It also seems helpful for the regents to see each component’s contribution to the overall budget. However, having each component independently approved by the regents seems cumbersome. If the UNM administration and the constituency groups are able to collaboratively work through the budget and arrive at a mutually acceptable plan, then wouldn’t the regents’ fiduciary responsibility be met by verifying the financial soundness of the complete budget? That would avoid a situation where the constituency groups and the UNM administration work through some initial differences to arrive at a mutually acceptable balance of budget components and then have that balance and collaboration disrupted by passing some components and not others.

2. Comments regarding Main Campus Faculty Contracts & Pay:

2a. As many of us know, correctly summarizing faculty pay at UNM is complex, perhaps only surpassed by correctly summarizing gains and losses in the number of faculty! (we’ll talk about that in a minute). I wish to point out that as of the last summary available from the main campus office of institutional research (academic year 2007-08) over half of the regular instructional faculty on main campus had salaries of less than \$71,000 for their 9 month contracts. The lowest salary was \$32,000 and the highest was \$194,000. Assuming that those salaries increased by 3%, the current estimates would be that over half of the main campus regular instructional faculty would have salaries of less than \$72,000.

2b. Some confusion may exist regarding the number of days in a nine month main campus faculty contract. While it is clear that the contracts are for 9 months that contain 39 weeks and that faculty are allowed 39 days of “consulting” within those 39 weeks, the remainder of the days has been reported as 189 (of which 39 are available for “consulting”) or 195, or unspecified. By working with the Provost’s Office the Faculty

Senate hopes to clarify the confusion. The goal of such clarification is not to address the days available for consulting – that has been established previously.

3. Comments regarding gains and losses of faculty positions at UNM:

3a. At a recent BOR Academic/Student Affairs & Research Committee Meeting, I mentioned that I may have misrepresented faculty growth and loss at UNM. Since that time I've been unable to clearly establish a correct and consistent perception of the pattern. We're working with Mark Chisholm of UNM's Institutional Research Office to develop a historical picture of faculty gain and loss by department. As UNM continues to discuss performance metrics, it will become increasingly important to have information regarding the numbers of faculty by level and by department readily available.

4. The Faculty Senate remains ready and eager to work on these various points with the UNM administration.

President Snell discussed the request made to Institutional Research for a department by department report on the number of tenure and tenure-track faculty. The Office of Institutional Research will compile the requested reports.

President Snell presented the Faculty Senate statement that he will be give at the General Faculty meeting on February 25, 2009.

Faculty Senate Statement - UNM General Faculty Meeting, 2/25/2009

I am speaking to you today as President of the Faculty Senate. While the Senate is a diverse body and Senators have a broad array of opinions about many of the issues that will be discussed at this meeting, we are united in our dedication to the Academic Mission of the University of New Mexico, our students, the public that supports us, and our research and creative endeavors. It is hard to convey the passion, the breadth of experience, and the sense of community shared by UNM's Faculty Senate. Some of us have been at UNM for more than 30 years, some of us are new. Some of us teach classes of hundreds of students while others spend many hours a week working one on one with other students. Some of us manage research labs filled with graduate and undergraduate students supported by multimillion dollar grants while others work within community organizations along side other dedicated students. But all of us are proud New Mexicans who share the belief that UNM ought to be a national leader in the creation, distribution, and application of knowledge via research, teaching and public service. We are also united in our concern that UNM is not reaching that potential and therefore we are here today – to voice our concern.

We are here because many of us feel there has been a prolonged and systematic weakening in UNM's ability to bring quality education to students through close contact with faculty. We are here because many of us feel there has been a prolonged and systematic weakening of UNM's ability to create new knowledge to fill the textbooks of tomorrow. We are here because many of us feel our previous efforts to communicate this concern and work collaboratively to restore the University of New Mexico have not been met with enthusiasm, support, and welcome by our administration. Some of us are here because we feel that the students, staff, faculty, and general public of New Mexico have been misled. Others of us might not make that strong a statement, but we are all here, once again, to help the University of New Mexico back on track.

Have some of us been misled? Our last General Faculty Meeting was called to examine the perception that an increasingly costly upper administration could not be sustained without diverting funds from activities directly supporting teaching, research and public service. We voiced concerns, presented examples, and requested an accounting of administrative costs. The administration convened a committee of administrators with faculty advisors and charged them to

respond to the faculty resolution. The faculty representatives presented a plan of analysis designed to provide a report that would gain the trust and confidence of the faculty, and advised the committee that the report should include salary and all forms of compensation in its analysis. The administrative working group did not use the recommended plan of analysis, and decided to limit the compensation to base salaries and exclude allowances, deferred compensation, and bonuses, suggesting that those forms of compensation were inconsequential. Upon release, the final report has been viewed with mistrust by many members of the faculty. Additionally, the report's potential authority has since been further undermined by news that the at least one member of the administrative committee received an increase of thousands of dollars in deferred compensation shortly before the administration announced a hiring & raise freeze for Main Campus, and during the committee's work on the report.

Along with other examples, that may be mentioned at this meeting, this lack of transparency and openness has led to a sense of mistrust in the administration by many members of the Faculty Senate.

As we have frequently stated, the Faculty Senate is eager to re-establish a sense of community at UNM. We believe that the success of UNM depends upon a truly collaborative decision-making environment focused on academic programs and that the following changes could contribute to a recovery of confidence by the faculty in UNM's administration.

1. The executive structure of UNM should return to a focus on academic programs. Thus, there should be two executive vice presidents – the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Executive Vice President for the Health Sciences Center. Those offices should report to the UNM President. The office of Facilities and Finance should report to those two Executive Vice Presidents.
2. Currently only the faculty and Deans are regularly evaluated by both those they serve and their supervisors. That culture of “360 degree” evaluation should extend through the upper administration and the board of regents.
3. The center of policy development, implementation, and budget design needs to rest with the Deans and Department Chairs.
4. The Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs or a main campus faculty delegate and the Executive Vice President for the Health Sciences Center or an HSC faculty delegate should be voting member of the BOR Facilities and Finance Committee.
5. All searches for tenure-track faculty, Deans, Associate Vice Presidents and above should be national while encouraging applications from qualified members of the UNM community. (This would not apply to temporary positions, such as Chairs in some departments that are filled on a rotational basis from within the UNM community).
6. UNM should establish an annual report of Faculty Retention and Loss that will clearly present numbers and types of faculty gained and lost by each department. Reasons for losses should be included as well as the details of vacant positions waiting to be filled within each Department.

In conjunction with other changes in administrative structure and practices that may be proposed at this meeting, implementing these suggestions could contribute towards a recovery of the faculty's confidence.

We realize that these may not be easy changes to implement and we are ready and eager to work collaboratively with the UNM administration to achieve them.

President Snell presented a list of resources available to faculty at the request of Vice President Eliseo Torres.

The Division of Student Affairs provides opportunities for collaboration, knowledge sharing, and networking for staff on various committees.

Assessment Committee

Chair: Kim Kloepfel (kimmerly@unm.edu)

- Education, discussion and collaboration on evaluation and assessment for departments on mission, objectives, goals and outcomes. To provide accurate and timely information for student needs, program effectiveness planning, decision making, and monitoring programs.

Banner User Group (BUG)

Chair: Cindy Mason (clmason@unm.edu)

- Initially started to educate and network on the financial transactions put into practice with the Banner system. The topics have expanded to Banner HR, budget and salary planner, and self-service access. As new enhancements and upgrades are implemented, they will be discussed in this group.

Facebook User Group (FUG)

Chairs: Matt Maez (maez@unm.edu) and Ryan Lindquist (depar@unm.edu)

- Pursue opportunities to connect with students and campus departments using Facebook. There is idea sharing, social networking, educational and training sessions on tools and tips, and strategic planning on how this tool can be used effectively for communication and marketing.

Marketing & Branding Committee (MBC)

Chairs: Dorene DiNaro (ddinaro@unm.edu) and Jayson Capps (jcapps@unm.edu)

- Started as two groups: 1) a webmaster user group to review and collaborate on departmental websites, and 2) a marketing user group to coordinate and network on marketing efforts and events. These two groups were recently combined to share resources and provide continuity and planning within the Division on these efforts. Meetings are 2nd Tuesday of each month at 2:00.

Parent User Group (PUG)

Chair: Laurie Mellas (lmellas@unm.edu)

- Coordination and collaboration in the Division regarding programs and information for UNM parents.

Student Affairs Information Technology (SAIT) Committee

Chair: Robert Christner (rchris@unm.edu)

- Coordination with the Division with UNM ITS regarding information technology, goals and objectives, priorities, infrastructure, software, workstation and web standards, security policies and management, and disaster recovery planning.

6. PROVOST'S REPORT

Provost Suzanne Ortega reported on the following:

Provost Ortega thanked President Howard Snell for inviting her to attend this meeting and for working with all of the Faculty Senators on a productive approach to building trust. Communication is a source of trust and actions speak louder than words.

As of February 19, 2009, the shortfall that the state will recover from the UNM budget is \$5,309,300. From the Provost's units, which includes all academic deans, there was only a 0.22% harvest taken. Vacancy savings was \$774,000. The first effort was to preserve the academic integrity of the university. She stated that deans were given the most flexibility to pull funds from whatever account they choose for the budget rescission.

There has not been a single search affected by the pause and hold on hiring. All searches are on track. Vacant faculty positions remain at the college level and do not revert back to the Provost. Progress is being made, but there is a history of need built up in the departments.

The Provost is trying to address specific concerns that have come through the Faculty Senate.

The Provost has formed a Budget Parameters Planning Group. There are two vice presidents, deans, department chairs, faculty, and students on the committee.

There is a Provost's Committee looking into instructional capacity. President Elect Doug Fields is on this committee.

CONSENT AGENDA

7. FORMS C FROM THE CURRICULA COMMITTEE

The following Forms C were approved by voice vote of the Faculty Senate:

- New Major in Chemistry, College of Arts and Sciences
- New Minor in International Management, Anderson School of Management
- New Degree, MS in Speech-Language Pathology, College of Arts and Sciences
- Revision of Concentration in BA Linguistics Signed Language Studies, College of Arts and Sciences
- Revision of AA in Pre-Business Administration, UNM Los Alamos
- Revision of AA in Pre-Professional Elementary Education, UNM Los Alamos
- Revision of AA in Southwest Studies, UNM Taos
- Revision of BA in Design for Performance, College of Fine Arts
- Revision of BSN Basic Entry and Second Degree Option, College of Nursing
- Revision of Certificate in Pre-Professional Elementary Education, UNM Los Alamos
- Revision of BBA Marketing Management Concentration, Anderson School of Management
- Revision of MPA-Human Resources Management, School of Public Administration
- Revision of MA Comparative Literatures and Cultural Studies, College of Arts and Sciences
- Revision of Major in of BA Chemistry Pre-Graduate School Concentration, College of Arts and Sciences
- Revision of Major in BA of Languages, College of Arts and Sciences
- Revision of Major in BS of Chemistry, College of Arts and Sciences
- Revision of Major in BS Civil Engineering, School of Engineering
- Revision of Major in BS Construction Management, School of Engineering
- Revision of Major in BS of Nutrition and Dietetics, College of Education

- Revision of Major in BS of Construction Engineering, School of Engineering
- Revision of Masters OLIT, College of Education
- Revision of Minor in Astrophysics, College of Arts and Sciences
- Revision of MA in German Studies, College of Arts and Sciences
- Revision of Minor in Construction Management, School of Engineering
- Revision of Archeology Concentration in MA/MS Anthropology, College of Arts and Sciences
- Revision of MA Comparative Literatures and Cultural Studies Concentration, College of Arts and Sciences
- New Concentration in MA of Comparative Literatures & Cultural Studies, College of Arts and Sciences
- New Concentration in BA/BS Anthropology, College of Arts and Sciences
- New Subject Code Associate of Science in Nursing, UNM Taos
- New Subject Code in Arabic, College of Arts and Sciences
- Name Change of Concentration in PhD of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Pharm Econ and Policy Outcomes, College of Pharmacy
- Name Change of Emphasis on MS of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Pharm Econ and Policy Outcomes, College of Pharmacy
- Name Change of Concentration in MS of Pharmaceutical Sciences Toxicology, College of Pharmacy
- Deletion of Concentration in BA/BS Anthropology, College of Arts and Sciences
- Deletion of Concentration in BA/BS Anthropology, College of Arts and Sciences
- Deletion of Concentration in PhD/MA/MS Anthropology, College of Arts and Sciences
- Deletion of Concentration in PhD/MA/MS Anthropology, College of Arts and Sciences
- Deletion of Concentration in BS of Mathematics, College of Arts and Sciences

AGENDA TOPICS

8. FORM D FROM THE CURRICULA COMMITTEE

Lecturer Kathy Falkenhagen (UNM-Taos) presented a new Associate of Science in Nursing for UNM-Taos. This program will be modeled after the one established at UNM-Gallup. It is intended to start in Fall 2009. There is a severe nursing shortage in Taos. The community is behind the plan as is the Nursing Program on main campus. The new associate degree in Nursing at UNM-Taos was unanimously approved.

9. CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHARGE REVISION

Campus Development Advisory Committee Chair Alf Simon (Architecture and Planning) presented the following revision to the charge of the committee. After brief discussion, the charge was unanimously approved.

Campus Development Advisory Committee

Revised 02/09

Mission

The Campus Development Advisory Committee (CDAC) advises the UNM administration on issues relating to the physical environment of the campus as they contribute to and affect the mission, goals and quality of life at the University. The CDAC serves as a forum for the communication and exchange of ideas and proposals regarding development on the campus and its impact on the campus community, the surrounding neighborhoods, and the City of Albuquerque.

The intent of the committee's involvement is to carry out intelligent and representative reviews of proposed projects, and to offer constructive comment and recommendations directly to the administrative group managing the projects as well as serving as an advisory body to the Provost and Faculty Senate.

Scope of Committee Reviews

The CDAC reviews initiatives that will result in a physical alteration to the campus fabric. The types of projects that fall under the Committee's review include:

- Site selection for new buildings or other space development
- Placement of new buildings on a site
- Site development for buildings or landscape architectural projects such as plazas, open space areas, recreational areas, pedestrian zones, parking lots
- General character, size, massing and materials of proposed new buildings
- Proposed alterations to historic elements of the campus
- Plans for changes to the patterns of access and circulation systems on campus, and as these connect to city systems
- Issues regarding the Campus Master Plan

Evaluative Criteria

The CDAC reviews proposals to consider the general 'fit' between the project and a range of contextual conditions, including:

- The health and safety of students, employees, visitors and residents of the campus
- Potential impacts on movement, visual accessibility and environmental conditions in the surrounding context in which the project is proposed
- The degree to which the proposal incorporates sustainable practices in site and building development
- The aesthetic impact of the proposed development
- The impact of the proposed project on the Campus Master Plan and future development considerations

Committee Procedure

- The Committee reviews proposals in the preliminary phase of the design process at stage when suggestions and recommendations can still be incorporated. They receive information on the projects again at the completion of the design development stage.
- The Institutional Support Services (ISS) Division and its project managers bring projects before the committee at the appropriate stages of development.
- The Committee reports in an advisory capacity to the Provost, Faculty Senate Operations Committee and Vice President for Institutional Support Services through the Faculty Committee Chair
- ISS provides staff support for the Committee.
- The Committee will meet monthly (generally, on the 2nd Thursday of each Month).

Committee Representation

- Seven faculty members are appointed by Faculty Senate, five from the main campus (including one from the faculty of Architecture and Planning), and two from the north campus.
- Three student representatives, one from the Associated Students of UNM (ASUNM), one from the Graduate and Professional Student Association (GPSA) and one from the Residence Halls Student Association.
- The Administrative members shall be the Vice President for Institutional Support Services; the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs; Vice President for Student Affairs (including representatives for student development and the accessibility resource center), the Vice President of the Health Sciences Center; and the Administrator of the UNM Hospital. Any of the administrators may be represented by individuals under their supervision who are designated at the first meeting of each academic year.

The following individuals will have non-voting membership on the committee:

- The UNM Directors of: Planning and Campus Development, Physical Plant, Real Estate, Office of Capital Projects, UNMH Facilities Services, the University Architect, University Landscape

Architect, University Planner, Campus Chief of Police, Parking Services Director, and Campus Safety Director

- Three representatives from the City: one each from the Planning Department; the Public Works Department; and the Transit and Parking Department
- Four representatives from neighborhood associations that are located in the four quadrants (north, east, south and west) which are contiguous with the main and north campuses; these four neighborhood representatives will be selected by the Federation of University Neighborhoods.

The Committee is chaired by a faculty member elected by the faculty members from among voting committee members. The Vice President for Institutional Support Services shall co-chair the committee.

10. CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

Campus Development Advisory Committee Chair Alf Simon (Architecture and Planning) presented a brief report on the committee.

The committee was previously called the Campus Planning Committee. There is community representation on the committee. In the past, meetings were cancelled even though there was a lot going on around campus.

The committee spent last semester re-inventing itself. Its new roles are spelled out in the revised charge. The committee reviews the master plan, the North Campus plan, and the South Campus plan. The committee will remain a Faculty Senate Committee. The committee has been reviewing every major project on campus.

The committee does not have the ability to approve or not approve projects. The committee has the power to make recommendations.

Minutes will be submitted after each meeting.

11. PROPOSED STUDENT ABSENCE POLICY REVISION

Policy Committee Chair Nikki Katalanos presented the following revised Student Absence Policy submitted by the Athletic Council for senate approval. After brief discussion, the senate voted to refer the revised draft for review by the Undergraduate Committee, the Curricula Committee, and the Teaching Enhancement Committee.

The Athletic Council would like to recommend the following changes be made to the Pathfinder and to the Faculty Handbook. The old policy on p. 58 of the Pathfinder and excerpted from the Faculty Handbook is as follows (with our recommended strikeout):

FHB D170 Student absences

Students are expected to attend all meetings of the classes in which they are enrolled. No extensions of the vacation periods are given to any students, regardless of the location of their homes.

A student with excessive absences may be dropped from a course by the instructor with a grade of W/P or W/F. The instructor may also assign a failing grade of "F" at the end of the semester. Instructor drop request forms are available at all academic department offices.

Absences due to illness, ~~or to authorized University activity such as field trips, athletic trips etc.~~, are to be reported by the student to his/her instructor(s) and to the Dean of Students Office. If a student is unable to contact his/her instructor(s) the student should leave a message at the instructor's department. The reporting of absences does not relieve the student of responsibility for missed assignments, exams, etc. The student is to take the initiative in arranging with his/her

instructor(s) to make up missed work, and it is expected that the faculty member will cooperate with the student in reasonable arrangements in this regard.

We would like to add the following:

OFFICIAL ABSENCES

Students who are required or expected to represent the University of New Mexico at University functions and University related extracurricular activities (eg, professional meetings, debate competitions, workshops, field trips, research activities, athletic competitions, sport club events, judging events, fine arts events, etc) shall have the opportunity to make up any assignments or examinations missed as a result of officially sanctioned events unless the absences are excessive and adversely impact the learning environment. It is the responsibility of the student and the sponsoring UNM organization to provide official written notification to the instructor, and receive approval from the instructor, within the first two weeks of class stating the date(s) of the anticipated absence(s) and the nature of the official University activity requiring the absence(s). When official events arise during the semester, official written notification must be provided at the earliest possible date before the authorized absence, stating the date(s) of the anticipated absence(s) and the nature of the official University activity requiring the absence(s). Instructors shall make a good faith effort to accommodate students with equivalent work. The student must also recognize that some classes or class-work (seminars, small labs, etc) cannot be made up. When disagreements regarding this policy arise, they may be appealed following the steps outlined in the Pathfinder under Student Grievances, Article Two on Academic Disputes.

12. NEW BUSINESS AND OPEN DISCUSSION

Operations Committee member Mary Lipscomb requested that the Office of the Secretary remind the committees to send in their minutes and agendas monthly.

There was a motion passed for Professor Andrew Burgess (Philosophy) to craft a statement from the senate for the upcoming accreditation visit.

13. ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted,

Rick Holmes
Office of the Secretary