Memo to: All Members of the University Faculty

From: John N. Durrie, University Secretary

Subject: Next Meeting of University Faculty

The next meeting of the University Faculty will be on Tuesday, February 16, at 3:00 p.m., in the Kiva, rather than on the second Tuesday of the month.

JND/ped
To: All Members of the University Faculty  
From: John N. Durrie, Secretary  
Subject: February Meeting of University Faculty

The next regular meeting of the University Faculty will be held on Tuesday, February 16, at 3:00 p.m. in the Kiva.

The agenda will include the following items:

1. Introduction of Dr. Louis Gottschalk, Popejoy Visiting Professor.

2. Recommendation of Semester I, 1970-71, candidates for degrees -- Dean Wollman, Arts and Sciences; Dean Dove, Engineering; Dean Lawrence, Education; Dean Adams, Fine Arts; Dean Behder, Business and Administrative Sciences; Dean Murray, Nursing; Dean Huber, University College; Dean Christopher, Law; and Dean Springer, Graduate School. (List to be distributed at meeting.)

3. Nominations for replacement on standing committees -- Professor Thorson for the Policy Committee.

4. Proposed changes in Faculty Constitution to clarify voting membership on college and departmental faculties -- Professor Prouse for the Policy Committee. (Statement attached.)

5. Resolutions concerning faculty salaries -- Professor Hufbauer for the Economics Department. (Statement attached.)

Also enclosed: Summarized minutes of meeting of January 12, 1971.
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Enclosures
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

FACULTY MEETING
February 16, 1971

(Summarized Minutes)

The 1971 Popejoy Visiting Professor, Dr. Louis Gottschalk, historian, was introduced to the Faculty.

A list of names of those who completed their academic requirements as of the end of Semester I, 1970-71, was distributed. Candidates for bachelors' degrees in the College of Arts and Sciences were presented by Dean Nollman; in the College of Engineering by Dean Dove; in the College of Education by Professor Tonigan; in the College of Fine Arts by Assistant Dean McAee; in the School of Business and Administrative Sciences by Dean Rehder; in the College of Nursing by Professor Hicks; and in the University College (for the B.U.S. degree) by Dean Huber. Candidates for the degree of Juris Doctor in the School of Law were presented by Assistant Dean Geer. Candidates for masters' and doctors' degrees in the Graduate School were presented by Dean Springer. The Faculty voted to recommend the list of candidates to the Regents for the awarding of the respective degrees.

Professor Thorson, on behalf of the Policy Committee, made the following nominations for replacements on standing committees for Semester II: Professor Melada for Professor Southward on the Library Committee; Professor Trilandafilidis for Professor Sam Smith on the Scholarships, Prizes, Loans, and High School Relations Committee and Professor Sabine Ulibarri for Professor Smith as chairman of the committee; and Professor Tonigan for Professor Feldman on the Campus Planning Committee. The Faculty approved these nominations.

Professor Prouse, for the Policy Committee, proposed certain changes in Article II, Section 2, of the Faculty Constitution intended to clarify voting membership on college and departmental faculties. A constitutional amendment being involved, the Faculty approved a motion by Professor Prouse that the proposal be placed on the table for the required thirty days before final action.

Professor Hubauer, for the Economics Department, presented two resolutions concerning faculty salary policy, and he indicated that since the Faculty had had little time for consideration of the proposal he planned to move, after brief discussion, to table any voting on the resolutions until the next meeting. After extensive discussion and several amendments, the Faculty voted to approve the two resolutions in the following form and instructed that they be sent to members of the Legislature:

"1. The Faculty believes that the following criterion should be a long-term guide for formulating faculty salary budgets presented to the Board of Educational Finance by the University Administration: The annual percentage gain in average faculty salaries should be at least (i) the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index during the
previous fiscal year (to compensate for expected inflation), plus (ii) a merit increment equivalent to the long-term percentage increase in real productivity per American worker (currently about 3% per year).

"II. For the fiscal year, 1971-72, the Faculty requests a one-time increase in average faculty salaries of approximately 7%, in addition to the gain prescribed under Resolution I. The purpose of this one-time increase is to compensate for inadequate salary gains between fiscal 1966-1967 and fiscal 1970-1971, viewed either from the cost-of-living plus productivity standpoint or from the standpoint of maintaining the University's position among comparable institutions."

There was brief discussion of the discrepancy, particularly in the past two years, between Board of Educational Finance estimates of enrollment increases and the actual increases, and President Heady said that it might be desirable to move deliberately toward a situation in which the University could protect itself from an actual enrollment which was appreciably greater than that predicted. In this connection, Dean Springer said that as a partial answer to this problem a subcommittee of the Graduate Committee was studying ways of limiting graduate enrollment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

John N. Durrie, Secretary
The February 16, 1971 meeting of the University Faculty was called to order by President Heady at 3:07 p.m., with a quorum present.

PRESIDENT HEADY The meeting will please come to order. We would like to open the meeting by introducing to the Faculty the Popejoy visiting professor, who is with us for several weeks this spring, and I would like to call upon Professor Warren Wag'7r to make that introduction.

PROFESSOR WAGJR We are very pleased to have with us this month and next, as our 1971 visiting Popejoy professor, Doctor Louis Gottschalk.

Doctor Gottschalk is one of the most eminent historians of Europe in the world today. He's a professor emeritus of the University of Chicago and he's been teaching History since retirement at that university, at the university campus of the University of Illinois. Professor Gottschalk has held two Guggenheim fellowships and two Fulbright research awards. He's a past president of the American Historical Association.

In 1953 he was elected a Chevalier in the French Legion of Honor. He is the author of, and classic authority on Jean-Paul Marat, and he's the author of a study of Lafayette in five volumes, with three more to come.


During his residence at U.N.M. as Popejoy visiting professor, succeeding Doctor Harold Taylor, who was our first Popejoy professor last year, as you remember, Professor Gottschalk will make a great many appearances on campus in classrooms, in rap sessions with students, and meeting with history students and faculty and so forth. But I would like to call special attention to three appearances that will be open to the general public, to the whole academic community.
On March 1st, here in the Kiva, at eight o'clock in the evening, that's a Monday, he will address himself to the theme of the eighteenth century Atlantic communities, fact or fiction. I think we are all familiar with the idea of a North Atlantic community, or international community in the twentieth century, but the existence of such a community in the eighteenth century is less often recognized and, in particular, the possibility that the American and French revolutions were actually two different phases of a single great revolutionary movement in the Atlantic world. So that's March 1st at eight p.m. under the sponsorship of Phi Alpha Theta, the history honorary and history department.

Then on Wednesday, March 10th, also at eight p.m. in the recital hall of the Fine Arts Center, Doctor Gottschalk will deliver a public lecture on causes of revolution.

And at three-thirty p.m. on Tuesday, March 16th, comes the discussion of the revival of intellectual curiosity sponsored by the general honors program and Phi Beta Kappa. That will be held in the Simpson Room at the home economics building.

I think we owe a very warm and grateful welcome to Professor Louis Gottschalk. (Applause.)
HEADY We are certainly pleased and honored to have you here. We now have recommendations for candidates for degrees to be awarded as of the end of semester one, 1970-71. Dean Wollman from Arts and Sciences first.

DEAN WOLLMAN Mr. President, candidates for degrees of Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science from the College of Arts and Sciences are listed on pages one through four. They have all been approved by the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences. I move their approval by the general Faculty and the forwarding of their names for the awarding of their degrees.

HEADY Is there a second?

A FACULTY MEMBER Second.

HEADY Any discussion? Those in favor please say "aye"; opposed "no".

Dean Dove, College of Engineering.

DEAN DOVE Mr. President, on pages four and five of the material that the Faculty members have before them, we list eight candidates for the Bachelor of Science Degree in Civil Engineering, thirteen candidates for the Bachelor of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering, and ten candidates for the Bachelor of Science Degree in Mechanical Engineering. These candidates have all been certified by the college Faculty and I move that this Faculty recommend to the Board of Regents the awarding of these degrees.

HEADY Is there a second?

A FACULTY MEMBER Second.

HEADY Those in favor, please say "aye"; opposed "no". The motion is carried.

Dean Lawrence here? Then I think Professor Tonigan is here.

PROFESSOR TONIGAN The candidates for College of Education are listed on pages five through ten. The College of Education Faculty has certified them and I move, on behalf of our Faculty, that this Faculty recommend to the Board of Regents the awarding of these degrees.

A FACULTY MEMBER Second.
HEADY Any discussion? Those in favor, please say "aye"; opposed "no". The motion is carried.

Assistant Dean McRae for the College of Fine Arts.

PROFESSOR MC RAE Mr. President, the candidates for the various degrees offered by the College of Fine Arts are found on pages ten and eleven of your copy. They have all been certified by the Faculty of the College of Fine Arts as having completed requirements for these degrees and I move their recommendation by the Faculty to the Board of Regents.

HEADY Is there a second?

FACULTY MEMBER Second.

HEADY Any discussion? Those in favor please say "aye"; opposed "no". The motion is carried.

Dean Rehder, School of Business and Administrative Sciences.

DEAN REHDER Mr. President, the Faculty of the School of Business and Administrative Sciences has asked for recommendation by the Faculty to the Board of Regents the Bachelor of Business Administration Degree candidates listed on pages eleven and twelve, who have satisfactorily completed their degree requirements. I move the approval of these degrees.

FACULTY MEMBER Second.

HEADY Any discussion? Those in favor please say "aye"; opposed "no". The motion is carried.

In the absence of Dean Murray, Professor Hicks will make the presentation for the College of Nursing.

PROFESSOR HICKS Mr. President, the Faculty of the College of Nursing recommends to this body the candidates listed on page eleven for the Degree of Bachelor of Science in Nursing. I move that this Faculty recommend to the Regents the awarding of this degree.

HEADY Is there a second?

FACULTY MEMBER Second.
HEADY Discussion? Those in favor please say "aye"; opposed "no". The motion is carried.

Dean Huber of the University College.

DEAN HUBER Mr. President, the candidates listed on page twelve of the Bachelor of University Studies Degree are certified to this body as having met the requirements of this body, as laid out for said degree, and I move that you recommend to the Regents those persons so listed for the Degree of Bachelor of University Studies.

HEADY Is there a second to this motion?

FACULTY MEMBER Second.

HEADY Those in favor please say "aye"; opposed "no". The motion is carried.

I don't see Dean Christopher. Is there anyone -- Assistant Dean Geer.

PROFESSOR GEER Mr. President, the Faculty of the School of Law recommends to the general University Faculty those persons listed on page thirteen of the material that has been handed to the Faculty. I move that the persons so named be recommended to the Board of Regents for the granting of degree.

HEADY Is there a second to the motion?

FACULTY MEMBER Second.

HEADY Any discussion? Those in favor please say "aye"; opposed "no". The motion is carried.

Dean Springer for the Graduate School.

DEAN SPRINGER Mr. President, on behalf of the Graduate Committee, I recommend the persons listed on page thirteen through seventeen for the award of their degrees, as recommended, and recommend that the Faculty approve these and recommend award of the degrees to the Regents.

HEADY Is there a second to that motion?

FACULTY MEMBER Second.

HEADY Any discussion? Those in favor please say
"aye"; opposed "no". The motion is carried.

That completes action on the candidates for degrees.

Now I recognize Professor Thorson for the Policy Committee to make some nominations for replacements to the standing committees. Professor Thorson.

PROFESSOR THORSON Mr. President, the Policy Committee wishes to nominate the following replacements for the second semester only. In most cases, these replacements are for members of the Faculty that were on those committees who had gone on leave for the second semester.

Professor Melada for Professor Southward on the Library Committee; Professor Triandafyllidis for Professor Sam Smith on the Scholarships, Prizes, Loans and High School and so on -- I never can get all that title straight; Professor Sabine Ulbrici for Professor Smith, who is currently on that committee but will become Chairman of that committee; Professor Tonigan for Professor Feldman on the Campus Planning Committee. That's all the replacements we have.

I would like to move on behalf of the Faculty Policy Committee that these nominations be accepted and these members be appointed to the committees, as indicated.

HEADY Is there a second?

PROFESSOR COTTRELL Second.

HEADY Is there discussion? Those in favor, please say "aye"; opposed "no". The motion is carried.

Next we have proposed changes in the Faculty Constitution to clarify voting membership on College and Departmental Faculties. A memorandum on this from Professor Prouse was circulated at the call of the meeting, as well as the proposed changes in the language, and also I want to remind the Faculty that this is up for discussion today and that final action can only be taken after it lies on the table for thirty days. So it will have to be carried over to the next meeting. Professor Prouse.

PROFESSOR PROUSE I have just two things: This problem was brought to the attention of the Policy Committee by Secretary Durrie a short time ago. He pointed out that quite frequently he has received requests from colleges and departments as to what the specific policies were in regard...
to the voting privileges in colleges and departments. So this change in the Constitution is obviously intended to clarify that.

Since this call to the meeting went out, on a couple of occasions I have had reason to believe the people misunderstood what I thought was clear. The only intention here is to clarify voting on college and departmental faculties. If a college or department were to deviate from the ordinary policy by permitting instructors with less than three years service, and their part-time appointees, to vote in what would have nothing to do whatever with the constitutional provisions in the voting of the General Faculty of the University Faculty. All this does is leave a possibility of extending voting privileges up to the department, not the college concerned.

HEADY This matter is up for discussion or any questions.

PROUSE I should have added -- I move this be placed on the table for consideration at the next Faculty meeting, Mr. Chairman.

HEADY Is there a second to that motion?

FACULTY MEMBER Second.

HEADY Now is there discussion or any questions at this time about the proposal? Yes, sir.

PROFESSOR KYNER Presumably in terms of what is said, it's admissible for a department to allow representatives of the Graduate School to have a vote in the departmental matters?

PROUSE If they hold the rank of instructor.

KYNER I am talking about graduate students without Faculty ranking. If a department decides, with respect to departmental matters only, to allow representatives of the graduate students to have a vote, does this go against the policy you have just --

PROUSE This policy simply establishes voting rights within a department for those people who hold the rank of instructor or part-time appointments.
Therefore, it does not exclude a possibility of students having a vote within the department?

Well, I can simply answer it this way: I know there are some departments that do, indeed, permit their graduate students to do so. That is not the subject of this particular constitutional provision. In other words, it doesn't cover it.

Thank you.

Professor Ju?

I think, to answer this question, the Policy Committee essentially tried to establish the Faculty membership and we are talking about the voting faculty for this particular department and I don't think the body has given the faculty status for graduate students yet, so Professor Prouse's answer is correct, to state that it includes instructors only.

Is there any other discussion on this at this time? Well, we will return to this, then, at the next meeting after the thirty-day waiting period for further discussion and action.

The fifth item on the agenda consists of resolutions concerning Faculty salaries proposed by Professor Hufbauer for the Economics Department.

Attention has been called to the presiding officer that we had a motion to table the proposed constitutional amendment, and it was seconded and it was not voted on. I will now call a vote on the motion to table: Those in favor of the motion, please say "aye"; opposed "no". The motion is carried.

All right, now item five, the resolution concerning Faculty salaries. The text of the resolutions were distributed with the call to the meeting and there is a background statement, which has been passed out here at the meeting. If there are members present who don't have it, I am sure there are extra copies available. I will now recognize Professor Hufbauer to present these resolutions.

Professor Hufbauer: I first would like to say a word about what I consider a constructive format for this discussion, though I am not sure of the procedural...
technicalities. Can you hear me?

I think it would be very useful if we had a discussion lasting not longer than one half hour of the issues raised, and I would particularly like to -- and I think I would like to hear from the people that have been very concerned about these issues and then I think it would be very useful to move to table any voting on the actual resolutions until the next Faculty meeting.

In other words, a discussion of the committee as a whole or the Faculty constitute a committee as a whole, and then a motion to table and then if somebody else does not beat me to it, I will introduce a motion to table it at an appropriate time.

The material is rather complicated and we have just been able to get out the handout today. Many people would like to consider it and, therefore, I think it would be entirely appropriate to defer any voting until a later time.

I would like to hit one or two of the high points of the material I have turned out with the hope, as I said, that some others will discuss the issues. I surely hope that President Heady will comment. He was good enough to speak to the members of the Economics Department on these subjects and gave us a very full background history of what has happened this past year, a history which I think most Faculty members are not aware of. At least we were not aware of it until we talked to him and the administration has done a great deal on these issues, which is simply not known, and he could present that history much better than I can.

Likewise, the Policy Committee has been working on the matter of Faculty salaries, and specifically the budget subcommittee of the Policy Committee has been very concerned about this. Again, their work, I don't think, is generally known and I am hopeful that Professor Christman will perhaps say a word on this. Professor Prouse, as well, for the Policy Committee.

HEADY Professor Hufbauer, I would suggest you do move these two resolutions now and that will put it before us if they are seconded. Then we have a standing rule of limit of forty-five minutes on any one topic, so unless that is
changed at the end of the forty-five minutes we would move on to another subject, anyway. And you, or someone else, make a motion to table at any time you might want.

HUFBAUER In that event, I would like to move the resolutions before you.

HEADY Is there a second?

PROFESSOR GREEN Second.

HEADY All right, Professor Hufbauer.

HUFBAUER Now I would like to limit my brief presentation to pointing out that the Board of Educational Finance has had two standards on the determination of Faculty salaries, and for symmetry that the Economics Department presented tables in the alternative and the first standard that the Board of Educational Finance has pursued over the years is one of comparable institutions.

Doctor Morris Hendrickson -- I don't see him in the audience today -- but he is one of my heroes on this matter because he has put together a very able document from which we have cribbed quite liberally, pointing out the Board of Educational Finance has been rather tricky on this comparable institution question. The group of comparable institutions has changed, and, in particular, it's changed rather peculiarly so that U.N.M. has remained at a midpoint of the current group -- midpoint of comparable institutions. This may be strictly accidental, but some people suspect otherwise.

The other standard, which the B.E.F. refers to from time to time, is the standard of productivity plus inflation.

Now, productivity, to the Board of Educational Finance, means one thing, as far as I can read in their document: the student-faculty ratio. If the B.E.F. has a guideline here, it is that any increase in faculty salaries beyond that amount necessary to compensate for inflation should be limited to the percentage increment in the student-faculty ratio.

In light of this long-standing view, which goes back at least, I think, to about 1951 or so, I looked up, or asked Doctor Hendrickson to give me some figures on this.
In 1951, the student-faculty ratio was fourteen point eight, and now it's twenty-two point one.

In 1951-52, the average salary was five thousand and seventy-three; now it's twelve thousand eight hundred fifty-nine. Now if we had followed the B.E.F. productivity, as defined that way, plus the inflation criteria, the salary today should not be twelve thousand dollars. We are being vastly overpaid. I am sure you will be happy to hear that. It shouldn't be twelve thousand eight fifty-nine; it should be ten thousand seven hundred. It should be two thousand dollars less.

Now I think this, alone, at least to me, points up the silliness of this particular criteria. If we project this criteria for, say, another thirty years to the year 2000, if we are going to keep up with the sort of average standards of living in the economy, the number of students per faculty member, both calculated on full-time equivalent basis, would have to be forty-three, almost double what it is today. I will be happy to belabor the matter further if the need is there.

It does seem to me that going, historically, going forth that you can see this is a most inappropriate criterion for measuring further productivity.

Now let me come to the propositions of Economics Department.

We have also come to a productivity plus inflation argument. I will say there our measure of productivity is, I think, more defensible than the B.E.F.'s measurement. It's an average productivity and the economy as a whole, and we could perhaps get into some reasons for using this figure. We regard it as a relatively good proxy for the productivity of Faculty members, or of academics as a whole then plus the inflation factor.

The other standard that we have proposed is comparable institution, which sounds like just the same the B.E.F. is using. The only difference is we hope to define, if this is going to be the standard, we would like to see it defined and the institutions actually matched and there's to be a some slow improvement factor over time instead of kind of deterioration which we have been experiencing the last four or five years.
You will notice that the second resolution is addressed to the possibility of a catch-up to take us back to where we stood in 1966-67.

Incidentally, either of the standards proposed by the Economics Department means about the same thing over the past four years. I do think that if the Faculty or the Administration is going to adopt this standard, it's got to probably choose one or the other; it's no good saying it will take one when it gives a higher figure, and the other when that gives a higher figure, which the B.E.F. does that. They choose the lower figure.

Well, that's, intellectually, to me, it seems indefensible. We, the members of the Economics Department, would, frankly, recognize that it obviously is much too late in the session this year to do anything about Faculty salaries for 1971-72. Right now the budgets are in the formation for 1972-73, and inasmuch as we are hoping to generate a level of feeling about this, which has an impact, we certainly would not accept it before 1972-73. I think that's as much as I can usefully say at this point.
has declined, inevitably. In the last three years, since I have been here, my classes have -- well, everybody's classes have gotten larger and the feeling that I think many Faculty members have, is that the B.E.F. is not making University policy with an eye towards the real problems that face the student and Faculty member. This shows up in many respects, but it certainly shows up in the ridiculous formula by which the Faculty standards are -- tend to increase insofar as increase of students. The result of this, I think, is clearly a deterioration in the quality of the undergraduate experience and that deterioration, in turn, I think, is a very important factor in student unrest and in the high level of student unhappiness.

So I think this should go beyond just merely an issue of improving our standard of living and, in a sense, goes to the heart of what the University is about, and what the state ought to be paying for and why it should be paying for it.

HEADY Professor Cottrell.

COTTRELL I would like to agree with Professor Merkx on the question of quality of the undergraduate experience here, in particular, because of the teaching loads, but I think this is symptomatic of the overall problem of what the State of New Mexico has been contributing to higher education. Now I am not going to be quite as fatalistic as perhaps Professor Merkx. I have a hell of a time making ends meet on the salary I draw from the University of New Mexico, and it has gotten successively worse over the last four or five years. Some of us have talked about salaries and the deterioration of the salary situation in New Mexico over this period of time, and we see very little hope for change, unless there's a different attitude perhaps with respect to the Faculty and Administration and a major change in the B.E.F.

Some of us talked to the governor, for instance, about the question and he said he would follow the B.E.F.'s recommendations. The truth is this year the optimism that Gary expressed in his memo here on page -- on the first page of his memorandum at the bottom where he says, "We approve the Administration's efforts on the salary question," and talks about this catch-up the B.E.F. has approved for this year where the Board was persuaded to
allocate additional funds, in spite of opposition of the B.E.F. staff. That is in no one's budget in Santa Fe, and so I don't care how many resolutions the B.E.F. passes, whether it's the Board or staff figure, unless they get in someone's budget, either Legislative Finance Committee or governor's budget, it's totally economic and these figures are not in these budgets.

Now it's been indicated earlier that Gary indicated he would like to table this for action for a month. At that time the legislature will have already been recessed. If we think we are doing with respect to the '72-'73 academic year, we might be able to help the problem with respect to the number of Faculty, the student-faculty ratio, as well as the salaries of our Faculty, I think we are kidding ourselves because the biennium budget is basically still followed by the legislature of the State of New Mexico.

They have given a projected budget for '72-'73. It can be changed by the short session in January of '72, but is very unlikely unless there's money in the treasury. There's not going to be any money in the treasury in the State of New Mexico in '72, unless there are tax increases and I don't think we would be in much of a position to be making a strong case for additional funding of universities next year. For the next year, if it depends upon a tax increase.

I think we have a little better chance this year and I feel that it would be wise for the Faculty to take action sooner than a month from now.

It's true that hearings have already started on all of the budgets, but they are not at a point where it's irreversible. I think it might strengthen the Administration's hand, somewhat, if the Faculty expressed themselves. I realize you have a lot of data here that you have not had time to digest. However, much of this data was in an AAUP distribution made at the state conference. It's similar to an analysis made by --- some of it is similar to an analysis made by the AAUP chapter of the state. This has been -- you may not have read it, but it was circulated some months ago and I would substantiate some of the things Professor Hufbauer says: The kind of games B.E.F. has played on us has been that they pick a list of comparative schools and comparable schools and we don't
know what they are, particularly, and then the analysis is made by the AAUP chapter of the New Mexico State, and they point out in answer to a comment made by the B.E.F. which says when you compare the median salary for public institutions in New Mexico to those for the nation, for four-year colleges, New Mexico ranks very well, eleven thousand seven hundred nineteen average compared to the national eleven thousand seven hundred twenty-nine. Now they do not identify these institutions and they certainly are none of them — that we can tell from the standard studies made of these areas. If you take a look at the B.E.F. — or the AAUP compensation study, and I have distributed these to as many faculty as I could on the campus — if you understand that the AAUP doesn’t have any money for reproducing them and sending them around, if you all would pay your dues — well, I will get these circulated to everyone but, according to the total compensation scale, this is, including Professor Hufbauer’s studies, too, for this particular sheet, the AAUP has nine categories for institutions in this country with a little footnote that if your average falls off the chart, you are in category ten.

Well, U.N.M., for full professors, were in category ten on total compensation; for associate professors we are in category ten; for assistant professors we are in category ten; for instructors we are in category ten — the only reason we are probably not lower is because they didn’t make any provision for it.

I think that the Faculty of this University ought to join with some of the groups at New Mexico State, who have been expressing considerable concern about the severe deterioration and they have been supporting their administration at New Mexico State with the kinds of research and documentation and resolutions that I think would be useful. I believe our Administration could use them properly and to our advantage. I think perhaps various members of your AAUP chapter in their contacts could use them to their advantage. So I urge you not to table action today, but discuss it until we get to a point where one or the other of these resolutions would be in order, and I think it would be quite helpful to pass them and our administration would have them in their negotiations with the legislature and with the governor and the B.E.F. and so on.

HEADY I think I would like to take a few minutes now
to make some comments and ask Chester Travelstead and others to supplement what I say.

I think it might be useful to refer to a table, which the Board of Educational Finance presented at the Joint Committee Budget hearings last week, which includes what has happened on average faculty salaries for three years up to and including this year, and then their projections for the next two years of the biennium, which is the period -- which are the two fiscal years that the current legislature is concerned with. These are figures for the six degree-granting institutions. They are not specific figures for the University of New Mexico.

In the 1968-69 fiscal year, the average faculty salary increase was four point six percent. Now that is the crucial year, because that is the year when we lost the most ground. That is the year in which everybody recognized we had an austerity budget. The legislature described it in those terms. There was a good deal of talk about catching up the next time around.

Well, in 1969 and '70, the actual average income increase was five point two percent, and for 1970-71, which is the year we are in, the estimate increase is five point four percent for the six institutions.

The B.E.F. has recommended for fiscal year '71-'72, beginning this July 1, a six point four percent increase, but I should explain in that connection that the B.E.F., for the coming year, as it has done for at least two previous years, has provided -- has classified the institutions into two groups, and we have the distinction of being in the group along with New Mexico State and New Mexico Tech, for which the percentage of increase is lower than it is for the other group.

So this six point four percent is made up of six percent increases for the three institutions I mentioned, including the University of New Mexico, and seven percent for the other institutions with the purpose here being to preserve approximately the dollar differential, the differential in number of dollars between average salaries at the three institutions, as against the other institutions. For the second year of the biennium, the B.E.F. recommendation would be six point three percent: Again, six percent for our category of institutions and seven percent for the other
Now in connection with the deterioration of our situation, we did ask -- and I think this is referred to in the background memorandum -- that the Board of Educational Finance, at its last meeting last May or June, spent most of the meeting on consideration of information which we asked to present about the salary situation and we made that request because we knew that in the usual round of budget consideration, which begins in September or October, leading up to the legislative session, there is never time -- there never has been time for any very full and extended discussion of this matter. So we did have, as I recall, about three hours in which to present the information we had. I think Professor Thorson was at that meeting. New Mexico State had supporting and similar information. I won't go into the details of that. But the intent here, and I think we can succeed in showing it, was that whatever measured against whatever grouping of institutions we might take that would be reasonable, there clearly had been a deterioration in our relative position over a period of three years.

Now the Board of Educational Finance, as far as its policy guideline is concerned, said that its intention in making recommendations to the legislature is that it will try to maintain salaries as of about the average for comparable institutions, comparable institutions across the country.
policy guideline the B.E.F. has set for itself.

Now it seems to me at this point we are probably better advised to push as hard as we can to achieve actual accomplishments of the goal the B.E.F. says it's trying to achieve of being at about the average of comparable institutions. The president of the -- of all of the institutions, in view of this deterioration which we felt affected all of the institutions, requested in the fall when we started the usual round of negotiations with the B.E.F., we requested that there should be a ten percent increase for '71-'72 over salaries in this fiscal year and that for the second year of the biennium, '72-'73, there should be an additional ten percent increase.

The Board had a recommendation from its staff, as I recall, of a four percent increase if there was no adjustment in the overall student-faculty ratio, and if there was an adjustment in that ratio which would be an unfavorable adjustment, we view it, then, that would be regarded as an indication of greater productivity and an increase of six percent would be justified. That was the recommendation of the B.E.F. staff.

Now the Board of Educational Finance, itself, at that meeting responding to the Board's -- the staff recommendation and to the questions from the institutions, decided to recommend six percent for the larger institutions, seven percent for the smaller institutions, and the same on top of that for the second year of the biennium. It's on the basis of those increases that the Board of Educational Finance recommendations to the legislature were conducted and they are contained in the B.E.F. recommendations.

Now as Professor Cottrell has said, the Board of Educational Finance at its December meeting did approve an additional one percent of the education and general budget of each institution. That includes the whole instructional budget, plus the budget for libraries, for physical plant and for Administration with the understanding that the institutions would have some discretion as to how they would use that additional one percent allocation. That one percent is included in the B.E.F. recommendations to the legislature, but it is not included in either the proposed budget of the Department of Finance Administration, which gives the governor's budget or in the recommendations of the Legislative Finance Committee, which also submits
a proposed budget for higher education and other programs. So what the legislature has before it now are three sets of recommendations: One from the Board of Educational Finance, one from the Department of Finance and Administration, and one from the Legislative Finance Committee.

Now I don't know what to say on the matter of effectiveness of any resolution that the Faculty may pass at this meeting as against at the next meeting, or with respect to the fiscal year that's coming July 1, as against the next fiscal year. I think, to be realistic, it has to be said that input into the appropriation processes has mostly already taken place and I have tried to report on what the input has been, as far as Faculty salaries are concerned from the Administration of this University and the Administration of the other universities because we have taken a common vote on this and as we thought it could be -- this could be pushed before the B.E.F., including something I did not mention, and that was the rather -- was a quite extraordinary step.

In the meeting after the B.E.F. had decided on six and seven percent increases, a request that they reconsider a part of this guideline and move to ten percent, or if possible, or at least some distance between six and seven percent and the ten percent we had asked for. The only response was the adjustment of whether or not persons in education in general, which does give us, if the Board of Educational Finance recommendations are, in fact, the basis for appropriations of going a little better than an average of six percent, as far as our Faculty salaries are concerned. But I think at the most it would permit us to go to an average of seven percent and this is problematical because there is certainly no assurance at this point in the game that the B.E.F. recommendations will, in fact, be accepted by the legislature.

I think I will ask Doctor Travelstead if there are other points that he thinks ought to be made that I have neglected or not made at all clear and then I am sure either one of us would be glad to answer any questions you might have.

VICE-PRESIDENT TRAVELSTED Thank you, Mr. President. I will add one or two things, not to make the picture more dismal, because I think Mr. Hufbauer's statement is accurate. I think, as Mr. Hufbauer said in his first paragraph, the
paper he gave you today, the Administration did, indeed, develop a strong case, including all the information that is in that material now. Last June I thought the case was made very well, but making the case and even proving that we were below this group and that group and we slipped in the other group, and I, too, have new summaries here that I have used in the last week at our hearings in Santa Fe, and getting something down about it are two different things.

Now how best we do that, I think, is the problem. How we make them realize that we deserve and should have more consideration I think is the key rather than our arguing here. Certainly I don't care to argue about the position we are in. I think it has deteriorated, and as the President has already said, any group of institutions you take, and it doesn't make any difference, we have slipped in the last three or four years. I think it's significant that after that three-hour session in June, that Mr. McConnell, the first time I have ever heard him admit this, in the four years I have been listening to those, did actually admit that we slipped and below the medium. We have been saying this to him for three years and he was using sort of an unidentified group of institutions and we could never pin him down. But at the end of the meetings, those of you that were there when he was pushed on the question of, "Have we or have we not slipped, Mr. McConnell," says, "Yes, we have slipped."

Now that's not much of a concession, but for Mr. McConnell, that's giving his life away.

HEADY I might add, Chester, that even at the budget hearing last week when he was arguing for the extra one percent increment of the B.E.F. he also said then it is accurate that our institutions have fallen below the average figure that we have tried over the years to keep them at. But, again, I agree with Doctor Travelstead that we can take a great deal of satisfaction that Doctor McConnell, at least, is willing to say that now, which he hasn't said until recently.

TRAVELSTEAD Again, we made this — all these gains are small, but I suppose we have to take consolation in these small gains because there are so many other things to discourage one that for the first time that I have heard the B.E.F., including Mr. McConnell and the B.E.F. came to an agreement that this institution and New Mexico
State University ought to have the same student-faculty ratio; the last several years they have presumed and operated on this -- I think it's presumption rather than assumption -- that somehow the technical work, the nature of the work that's on that institution, demands a lower student-faculty ratio. We upset this case, I think, very well. I say "we", Morris Hendrickson did most of the work and Sherman Smith made an excellent case to the B.E.F. and is committed to that as we work to it in the next year or two. They could not accomplish it this year. I am talking about the same student-faculty ratio plus moving to the bringing of those two institutions together this year, next year.

According to the present recommendation, New Mexico State University will have one less Faculty member than we did this year. That's how the way they are moving affects that institution this year. We are going to have fifty-five more Faculty members than we had this year.

Now we have got some other dark spots, but I think we are beginning to make some progress.

I have one other comment, which may be helpful. Maybe Karl Christman would like to comment on this about the role of that committee. Mr. Hufbauer suggested this earlier, but we have tried to involve that committee and hoped to do it more. The most recent meeting with the committee -- and that's all I want to refer to now and Karl may want to elaborate on this and other meetings that we have had -- we came back to this subcommittee now on budget, the subcommittee of the Faculty Policy Committee, after the Las Cruces meeting where the one percent was passed. Now, this was the Board acting in essence in response to the staff's recommendations and they were saying, "You are really too tight on it; you are too stingy. We think there ought to be some additional money." Then the motion of one percent, which for us amounts to two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars, is this one percent of the education general, not of the total budget. Another motion was made for one and a half percent, which if it had passed, would have been another one hundred ten thousand for us. But it failed by one vote.

So when we came back in December we put before this subcommittee of the Policy Committee some options of how
we would use that two hundred twenty-five thousand dollars, if, indeed, we got it and it's still an "if". If you read the paper this morning, you are not much encouraged about holding the line. Mr. Mershon is talking about taking away. I don't know how they can take away from what they have got there, but I suppose they can.

But when we came back to this committee, we talked to this committee and I think that either Peter or Earl may wish to talk about the priorities we discussed, whether faculty salaries are the four categories, Faculty salaries, the library, the G.A. and T.A. situation, and I don't want to get in detail about that because the new ratio hurts us next year on this. That's another whole dismal chapter that I don't want to go into now.

But that is a category we could give some relief to in part by some of this money and, four, there's non-academic salaries. This includes the custodians and different people in supporting positions in this institution, and we are still twelve to fifteen percent behind the Albuquerque market in that group. So these are not very good cases, whether you take the left arm or the right arm, but this committee did respond, and maybe one of them would like to summarize their feelings at that time because they felt that Faculty salaries and the library should get to the top of this heap, whatever we are able to do. I think that's all that I want to say.

PROFESSOR CHRISTMAN This subcommittee has been operating for about two and a half years now and we are feeling our way, being a new committee. We have been advised and apprised of all of the things that are going on as soon as possible by the Administration, and we have responded with whatever we felt the Faculty might feel towards these various things.

Yet this meeting that has just been referred to, we met on the average of four or five times a year. Part of the whole budgeting process, and part of the problem that we are running into right now in considering this proposal, is the timetable involved. There is a tremendous amount of lead time on all this information going in and on being able to effect anything very much.

I am going to yield the floor to Professor Prouse.
because I happened to miss that one meeting where all the good stuff came up. That was during this last December. I can tell you what happened. I did want to say that we met with Professor Hohbauer and Economics Department and his colleagues and made them -- apprised them of all the information we have, and in a sense, I would suppose this was a joint proposal though we didn't really vote on it in any fashion. I just have had a very brief time to review it to date, but it seems to contain all the information that all of us have on the problem, so then to that extent, it's a very thorough proposal.

With your permission I would like Professor Prouse to give you a first-hand report of what happened in that Christmas meeting.

PROUSE Well, I know that Marion was there, as well, and he's a member of that committee. I will answer in a round-about way, if I may.

As you know, under the constitution, the Policy Committee is empowered not only to consider matters of general educational policy but to consult with the Administration in the development of the budget with special attention to the policy questions and the distribution,\(\ldots\). We have it -- the subcommittee on the budget is that committee which the Policy Committee has used as a sort of study group. And that is to deal directly with the Administration on these matters.

We have had difficulty in the past because the Policy Committee traditionally organizes itself in September, which is a bare three or four weeks before the request of this institution has to go to the Board of Educational Finance and it's too late. We have to say that the Administrators have been very careful about meeting with us, but the effect has been nil because these meetings have turned into reports of what's already been done.

So what we are trying to do is look forward because the input in regard to allocation of resources in terms of Faculty opinion, has to be done this spring and this summer. Indeed, partly in view of this fact, the Policy Committee, at its last meeting, agreed to elect its new chairman at the spring meeting, so he can function during the summer because these months are now becoming important
as well.

Now as to the particular meeting of the budget subcommittee, we met with Vice-Presidents Travelstead and Perovich and we were told the possibility of this additional money and what it should -- what should be done with that would be. They gave us what they thought would -- were the four points. We discussed the possibility and we discussed this at length. It became very obvious that some of the things around this campus that we cannot do everything at once, we can approve one thing at a time, and when we put Faculty salaries in the number one priority position, it was on the grounds that since we are operating each year on a percentage formula, anything we do this year will help next year and so on.

It wasn't a one-time improvement. There was a kind of cumulative effect. I would like to ask Marion if he would like to add anything, since he was in that whole discussion.

COTTRELL The only thing I would like to add to that is the fact that your Faculty Budget Subcommittee did not put Faculty salaries first priority until we had complete assurance from the two vice-presidents that they could get a ten percent raise for non-academic employees. So it wasn't a total selfish activity on our part. They assured us through their manipulation of budget this -- that they could get a ten percent raise for non-academic employees and we said, "Okay, the Faculty comes next and we would like to have that as the top priority."

HEADY I would like to comment on that point, too.

PROUSE Good point.

HEADY Because I think the Faculty should understand that poor as our position is with the larger Faculty salaries, we are in an even poorer position as far as non-academic salaries are concerned. For the last two, I think, three years, our first priority pitch to the B.B.P. has been a greater percentage increase in the nonteaching, non-academic salaries and this -- this year we presented evidence to show, despite considerable percentage increases over the last couple of years, we are still average thirteen or fourteen percent below the labor market in the Albuquerque area. We asked for a twelve percent adjustment factor.
The B.E.F. has actually allowed eight percent because of turnover in those ranks, as Mr. Cotterell said, and we think if we get that many dollars we would probably be able to give about a ten-percent increase to most -- to the continuing non-academic staff.

Now the other point I think you ought to know about, because it says something about the perspective in which this matter is viewed in Santa Fe, is that for at least three years in a row now the general position of the state, with regard to professional salaries in the state service, is that no office holder will get more than a five-percent adjustment from one year to the next in his salary.

Indeed, one year the Appropriation Act -- and it applied to us that year -- said that the average will not be above five percent for such positions, including Faculty positions, and at one point in the consideration of that session there was a strict limitation that no individual would get more than five percent.

This policy is, indeed, with very few exceptions, being applied in Santa Fe to the professional positions in the state service. One instance of that is that the Board of Educational Finance, at its December meeting, in considering what it would recommend in the way of a salary adjustment for its own executive secretary, put it at five percent. I mention this because, from the point of view of many people in Santa Fe, going to six or seven or anything above that looks like specially favorable treatment to Faculty members, as we see it.

There is a good big education job to be done there, as you can see. I believe that the forty-five minutes is about over, and I should ask if you want to move to suspend the standing rule.

PROFESSOR SCHMIDT: I would like to speak briefly just in favor of --

HEADY: Would you like to move that we extend the time, first?

SCHMIDT: Oh, excuse me. Yes, I move we extend the time for --
PROFESSOR COOPER Second.

HEADY Those in favor please say "aye"; opposed say "no". The motion is carried. Professor Schmidt.

SCHMIDT As I listened to Professor Cottrell earlier, I am persuaded that we should try to do something now in terms of the fact that the legislature is in session, and, in connection with that, I would like to make an amendment to Roman numeral two on the Hufbauer proposal, and that amendment is simply to revise the dates on that so in the first line 1972-73 becomes '71-'72, and down six lines lower than that, 1971-72 becomes 1970-71.

COTTRELL Second the motion.

HEADY It's been moved and seconded that in the first line of resolution number two, 1972-73 be changed to '71-'72, and in the third line from the bottom, 1971-72 be changed to 1970-'71. Discussion?

COTTRELL May I speak to it a moment?

HEADY Yes.

COTTRELL I would like to ask that we pass this with the understanding that it's too late to do anything with the resolution, '71-'72, and the resolution stands for '72-'73. But we are not going to forget it simply because it was passed a year too late to do anything about it.

TRAVELSTEAD Mr. President?

HEADY Yes.

TRAVELSTEAD I don't want to speak against the amendment. I want to speak about the practical aspects. Whatever our day in court is, it was last October, and then we got a reaction from the staff. We put in our request after developing the budget and, by the way, it wasn't mentioned but that subcommittee did meet again in September before we sent to the B.E.F. to try to give us...
any further guidelines, and I agree with Mr. Christman and Mr. Prouse that the timetable can be improved there, but we sent it in in October. The staff reacted to it. They adopted the guidelines. We protested the guidelines and got a slight improvement in December, and that was our last B.E.F. We had asked for ten percent each of the two years.

The next step, formal step, in which we could have been involved and were involved was last week on Tuesday and Wednesday when the Joint Committee, Finance Committee of the House and Senate, held hearings on higher education. Mr. McConnell presented the case and I think, even though the B.E.F. recommendation was higher than what his staff originally had recommended, that he presented a fair case for the B.E.F. at that time.

We got in a word or two only by circumvention because we are not -- we were not invited guests to participate at that time. But that hearing was the formal hearing for higher education and now the thing is internal within the legislature.

I am saying merely if this passed, the chances of getting a real effective input, I am not quite sure how or where it could be done, even though it would be -- I would be quite glad to try. I am sure Sherman would.

I want the Faculty to realize these practical aspects of the '71-'72 session.

HEADY I would like to make a comment, too, Marion: The form of the resolution, whatever year it applies to, I assume is in the form of a recommendation to the Administration, but it does say the Administration should do something, or such and such. I think for the reasons that Doctor Travelstead has mentioned, that even if the Administration should respond completely to what is suggested here, any way of doing it that means much is now past.

COTTRELL I realize that.

HEADY There will not be any later opportunity for any presentation to any official body of the legislature by the Administration. There is opportunity for some lobbying of legislators.
My other comment -- and I want to be quite frank about this -- is that I have real reservations, which I would have to think about before trying to resolve, as to whether there is any point this year in trying to persuade the B.E.F. and the legislature that in one year they should give a seven percent increase, top to bottom, a cost of living increase and a productivity increase preferably adding up those two things to nine percent, or something in that order, because we are now talking about a percentage increase in Faculty salaries one year to the next, of fifteen, sixteen, or seventeen percent, in toto.

Now you can say it doesn't hurt to ask, but there's also the question: What does it accomplish to ask? There may even be the question as to whether there would be an adverse effect, rather than a constructive effect, from such a request.

Now my own feeling might be that from what you want to do for the fiscal year that is coming up July 1, it may be better for the Faculty to go on record as to its views and make its recommendation to the legislature and circulate such a resolution, than to do it the way the resolution now reads of recommending to, or asking the Administration to take this action.

COTTRELL It is for us to resolve and relay this directly to the legislature.

HEADY Yes, I think that as far as impact on any new approach at this time is concerned, that maybe has more promise than instructions to the Administration at the date when the whole machinery has been passed, the point is past at which the Administration can take action.

COTTRELL I recognize this. The reason I supported the motion, though, it brought something into focus for us trying to act this year. I had felt for some time that this would be the most favorable year in which we could take some action to make some significant gain. In the future, in the next couple of years, it will not be possible unless there's a tax increase and I think that this would -- you know, this year they have talked of it and it isn't there. They find out, but they talk of a surplus, and being generous and looking at a number of programs. They haven't funded them yet, but this was the
year to take action and the one reason I support Paul Schmidt's amendment -- and as I earlier stated, I did not want us to put this away and talk about the second half of the biennium. I think we should act now. There are a number of legislators who are sympathetic to this, at least if we have a resolution and send it to them.

I think there are enough that are sympathetic to this situation that we are in that we can be assured that there will be something. There may not be anything gained and I would agree with you, Mr. Heady, that, you know, I am not optimistic and don't expect a resolution to mean we get seven percent plus a cost of living raise. If it did, we would pass this every week. But I do think there is something to be gained in going on record, despite the poor state of the public education funds and salaries in this state. The more significant gains have been made in the last few years when the public school teachers began speaking out on this. Not just the administration. I grant you there are politically more of them and there's twenty-five thousand of them compared to twenty-five hundred in round figures of college faculty.

So the legislature has responded perhaps a little better. But I think one of the problems that the legislature in New Mexico will face this year, with this little bit of extra money, however low it appears to be, they will try to oil those wheels that are squeaking the loudest and I think it's time the Faculty of the University did a little squeaking and this is the reason I am supporting the motion on this.

HEADY Professor Rothenberg.

PROFESSOR ROTHENBERG I hate to get up because last time I got up and sat down, I tore my pants, and in view of my economic position, that came hard. I mean, you know, I mean then (laughter).

Well, I proposed during the time the gas company turned the gas off, it was either the pants or the gas and keeping decent or having --

FACULTY MEMBER Point of order, Mr. President.

ROTHENBERG Before we get to the point of order, what puzzles me in this whole talk -- and I am not
approving Administrative secrets, committee secrets, is this? I look at my classes and those of my colleagues and they are bunched with a hundred and fifty, two hundred, upper division courses, and how far does the legislature intend to push this productivity jazz? I don't know a student by name anymore. I used to know them by number, but that's impossible now. We talk about a teaching ratio of what? One to thirty? I see two hundred in front of me. Where is the thirty jazz? This is what bothers me: How far can this go on? So I think we should put in a squawk, loud and clear, and noisy, and to hell with the consequences. We can't do any worse.

(Applause.)

HEADY Professor Merkx.

Merkx I would like to add on your suggestion, or request Professor Schmidt, to add to his amendment, the following language: That we strike the phrase in part two "the Administration should seek" and replace that by the words "the Faculty requests".

SCHMIDT I would be glad to accept that.

HEADY Does the seconder of the motion accept?

COTTRELL Yes.

MERKX As long as we are cleaning the language, we should clean up part one, whichever alternative we adopt, to read instead of the administration should adopt, to read simply the Faculty believes the following criterion should be used as a long-term guide. Then we will select that criterion, whichever criterion comes up.

HEADY This is in the first line?

MERKX First line.

HEADY "The Faculty believes--" as a guide. I presume this is premised on the supposition we will choose one of the criteria today.

HEADY May I suggest, since we are considering an amendment to the resolution two, that we go ahead and change
that and then we can come back to any amendment in resolution one.

The proposed amendment would now change the date, as previously mentioned, and the language in the first line to read: "For the fiscal years, 1971-1972, the Faculty requests a one-time increase", and so on. Is there further discussion of the amendment? Professor Cohen.

PROFESSOR COHEN: I have no objection to the changes in the dates and I support those and I have no objection to making an immediate effort to contact sympathetic legislators. But, beyond that, I think there is something very important that must be said and I think it underlies the overall question of why was it that we, in the Economics Department, bothered to go through all this exercise at this time? We felt that, despite the best efforts of the Administration, the salary policy has drifted and that to recover, we needed something like a once-and-for-all seven or eight percent on top of the fiscal increases that we have been getting.

We felt further that we had to generate some enthusiasm, some political pressure, to start a movement, a discussion or publicity that would take in not only this University, but all universities. I believe it was our feeling that if we had any luck, and we kept it up, perhaps in three or four years we might get this restitution.

If we don't do anything, the restitution will never come. If we begin now, eventually it may come. I am not too concerned -- well, I am concerned -- about the immediate effect, but I want to stress the point that if we do go to the legislature now and nothing comes of it, in our thinking, the thinking of the Economics Department, this is only a first step and I would hope that negative results would not lead to such discouragement that the situation returned to the drift that has characterized the overall picture for the last three or four years.

I frankly feel it's going to take us at -- three or four years to get back to our peer-group comparison situation.
I will support your immediate efforts, but we are trying now to generate enthusiasm for a long-run effort to get where we should be.

HEADY Is there further discussion on the proposed amendment? Are you ready to vote? Doctor Travelstead.

TRAVELSTEAD In view of what I said earlier, I think the suggestion made by Mr. Merkx will make more sense and we will have more opportunity of input there, given the time and circumstances now than effort to be channeled through the Administration. I think this would improve it, and then you can go directly from the Faculty and at least be assured that it's a new kind of input. As a permanent kind of policy, I think that the Administration has the responsibility and -- to this Faculty to fight and be your spokesman and do the best we can.

But I think you know the given circumstances; to send it direct to the legislature might be very helpful.

HEADY I think from the earlier discussion, it ought to be plain to everybody that there isn't any real discrepancy where we would end up between this proposal and what the Administration had been trying to accomplish over a two-year period. So there isn't really any difference of opinion, I think, about what the objective ought to be. Is there any further discussion? Professor Prouse?

PROUSE A minor point in line three of the resolution it says "selected under" and should read "stated in" as I presume we are going to pick (a) or (b). It says "prescribed by the long-term guide selected under", and we haven't selected anything.

HEADY Well, do you want to keep -- do you want to change it as you suggested to state in resolution one, or do you just --

PROUSE There is an alternative point. I am not suggesting this is what we ought to do, but there is another possibility of striking everything after "7%" and have the rest of that sentence --

(There was a general calling of "no".)
PROUSE I didn't say I wanted it. I said you could do it.

HEADY Well, that -- at this point we have the proposal of Professor Schmidt, as he agreed to change it, unless you want to make a motion for -- all right.

WOLLMAN I would like to propose an amendment, that in resolution two it would read "in addition to the gain prescribed under resolution one".

HEADY You accept that, Professor Schmidt?

SCHMIDT Yes.

HEADY You all understand that change? Are you ready to vote on the amendment as it now stands? Those in favor please say "aye"; opposed "no". The amendment is carried.

Now I think we should proceed to decide whether we want to vote on the resolution two, as amended. Is there discussion on that? Those in favor please say "aye"; opposed "no". The motion is carried.

Now do you want to take action on what was numbered one here? Resolution number one? Professor Merkx.

MERKX My impression is that, in terms of the general drift, of relatively downward drift, of the Faculty salaries in the last fifty years, we would do better under (a), but I think realistically we should take (b) because the legislature won't let us get ahead of the Faculty salaries, nationally, anyway. So I would be interested in Professor Hufbauer's and the Economic Department's opinion on this. But it seems to me that probably (b) is more realistic than (a).

HEADY Professor Hufbauer?

HUFBAUER Can I speak to that a moment? We did consider that at great length and we started off with (a) and then we added (b) and made it the Board of Educational Finance current predictions as an alternative.
My own feeling on it is that a better selection could be made by a small group, a committee, and we originally specifically had in mind the subcommittee on the budget. But that is not stated in the resolution for other archaic reasons.

Actually, going over this and deciding, now I think there are a couple of considerations in the decision and one of them is how the numbers come out, historically. We have given it for a year, but maybe you would like to go back fifteen or twenty years and see what that means.

The other thing, and I think this is more important, probably, because I think, historically, there may not be too much that you, as members, can nail the B.E.F. down to. But at the time they are considering these things, this is very much involved and has the kinds of data available and kinds of lags in the data. Now the B.E.F. standard, I think the lag or the lags are greater in the data coming in, and, therefore, room for — well, you can call it from their viewpoint to mystic projections is larger than under standard (a) because the kind of data under (a) is collected with a one-year lag, but with standard (b) we start discussing the groups and so on and it might be a longer lag.

Now I don't think necessarily that means we are back to (a) but I think these are the kinds of things best considered by a small committee going over it, especially a committee familiar with the ways the B.E.F. handles it. What you can nail them down to. We have not been able to nail them down on (b) although the Administration has tried for several years.

THORSON I would like to agree with Professor Merkx, and this is because this peer group, as Mr. Travelstead indicated, is awfully hard. It keeps shifting. It's amorphous and, besides which, these figures they are based on are AAUP figures. The year Marion voted the University of New Mexico standing that that should not be published in the late April, which is already a dead issue for this year's budget by a long way, but then to try and pull out of that mass, it's just too much possibility of stalling. I don't want to put it negatively or slippage.
So I would say definitely that since the statistics on which proposition (a) or (b) are made would be available and would be theoretically available early in the fall or even in the summer for preparation, that we should stick to (a).

HEADY Professor Merkx.

MERKX I am persuaded by that argument and it seems to me since this is the opening gun, or an opening campaign, that for the purposes of this Faculty recommendation that we are making today, that we should change one. I, therefore, move the following: That we change that language in sentence one, as I suggested earlier, and the criterion we pick (a). We certainly agree for next year to revise this, as we wish. The language would read: "The Faculty will use the following criterion as a long-term guide," et cetera, and then (a) as a criterion, but strike the (a).

HEADY Let me read this first paragraph to be sure we are in agreement. "The Faculty believes that the following criterion should be a long-term guide for formulating Faculty salary budgets presented to the Board of Educational Finance," and then it would be followed by what was in paragraph labeled (a) and what follows that, or -- and the other paragraph is eliminated, right?

MERKX Right.

HEADY Is there a second to that amendment?

COTTRELL Second.

HEADY Is there discussion on the amendment?

Professor Ju?

JU Well, not to discuss on the amendment. Something that bothered me on the (a) part is the productivity and the only thing I have heard about productivity is from Professor Hufbauer is measured by the number of students and Faculty ratio in the wildest estimates and the B.E.F. will interpret a three percent increase in productivity to increase our Faculty-student ratio every year by three
HEADY Well, I think one thing I am certainly going
to predict is that if we take this as a thing we certainly
are going to be asked, and I suspect you anticipate this,
"what is your evidence that the national increase in real
productivity in the country applies at the University as
well, and what is your measurement for that?" It certainly
is true that up to this point, insofar as the B.E.F. staff
has had a measure of productivity, it has been student-
faculty ratio and the greater that becomes, the more
productivity as far as B.E.F. is concerned. It is not a
measurement of productivity that we would be able to happily
demonstrate, but what I am saying is that I think we have
to -- we will probably be asked for something more than
just a reference to long-term percentage increase in real
productivity for the American worker. Professor Stumpf.

PROFESSOR STUMPF I would like to return to a point
Professor Rothenberg made. I have been around academic
institutions long enough to know this and no one's ever
explained to me, so please explain: Why is it t h at I
teach one hundred fifty to two hundred students per
semester, yet the student-faculty ratio is one to twenty-
five or one to thirty? It's a simple question and I
just don't understand it.

HEADY The academic vice-president has answers
to such things.

TRAVELSTEAD What you are doing, the ratio set by
the B.E.F. for next year is twenty-two point four, Harry,
and this is arrived at by taking the total hours earned
by students at this institution, all the part-time and the
full-time, and dividing it by sixteen and you have
a faculty divided that way the full-time faculty into that
six-two. Now, why some have a hundred and fifty is because,
in order to do that, in order to have graduate work where
we have dissertations and five-hundred-level courses and
six-hundred-level courses of two, three, five, six, eight
and ten, it means that the lower division courses -- I am
not commending education but I am saying this is the way
it comes out, but that's the reason; that's the reason
psychology class has six hundred in it in the lecture hall
and many people think this is a few too large and I am sure
you would like to have a small one, but that’s where it averages out at twenty-two point four. When you have all of the graduate work mentioned in there, it comes out about there.

Now this is tied in with a single funding, which we have been fighting against for several years. We are trying to get differentiated funding and allocations for a student in a program by a level. It’s not done yet and that is what is killing us.

STUMPF Chester, can’t you jockey with these figures? They fiddle with them all the time. Why can’t you?

TRAVELSTEAD We fiddle all the time. That’s how Rome burned.

STUMPF Well, the comparable institution concept that Ferrel Heady is talking about, I think he has a very different thing in mind. He said the major institutions or the land grant colleges -- I forget how you put it -- in fifty states, you have a very specific set of institutions in mind and I assume it’s true that they shift this set of institutions on us all the time and it’s hard to nail down McConnell what set of institutions he is talking about and this sort of game. I mean, it upsets me a little bit and why can’t you play a few games?

TRAVELSTEAD Well, the shift, part of it, is not the whole trouble. The fact is, if you take the student-faculty ratio and some of this they don’t want to advertise because some studies that Mr. Hendrickson made, you will remember, Mr. Hendrickson, when you conclude with G.A.’s and T.A.’s, along with the full number of full-time Faculty of this institution compared with representative institutions all over the country, twenty-two point four or sixteen point eight, when you do add the G.A.’s and T.A.’s, is nothing we want to advertise too much because there are too many institutions worse off than we are and we haven’t wanted to fiddle in that direction.

STUMPF All right, go somewhere else.

HEADY We are willing to explore any possibilities you can suggest to us.
STUMPF: I am not a mathematician, but I bet this ratio could be worked on.

HEADY: Professor Cohen. We are supposedly debating the proposed amendment at this point.

COHEN: I would like to point out some things in reference to (a), and while I favor it, I think there are certain things that ought to be made very clear to the Faculty. In (b) you are tying your salary destiny to a group of universities. In (a) you are tying it to what happens in the economy as a whole. In the present year, if we are under (a) the salary increment won't be much different than the six percent plus the cost of living, say. The cost of living has gone up about six percent, productivity gains in the economy will be very low this year of one point four. We could come out with about a seven point four. You do get erratic shifts from year to year in annual productivity figures, and the general way of dealing with that is to tie your increment to trend productivity over the past five years rather than the act of any given year.

You asked the question how do you defend our increments being based upon national productivity? What we are proposing under (a) actually is the United Automobile Workers-General Motors contract of about 1951. This was a formula for non-inflationary wage settlements. The cost of living, to keep you even with what had happened, your share of national productivity and there's four percent more to be gained in the economy. So your legitimate share of that, regardless of your industry or your company, is four percent. What we are saying is not that U.N.M. is four percent more productive, but if the economy is four percent more productive, this is how we ought to share in it in a non-inflationary basis. This also was the formula that was incorporated into the Council of Economic Advisors' Guideposts in 1962. We are hitching ourselves to a sort of general formula that has been used widely in collective negotiations and in government policy determinations. It has nothing to do with the productivity of this institution.
HEADY Is there further debate on the amendment?

(There was a general calling to vote.)

HEADY Are you ready to vote on Professor Merkx's amendment? Those in favor please say "aye"; opposed "no". The motion is carried.

Now that disposes of both motions, Mr. Hufbauer, does it not?

TRAVELSTEAD That was the amendment. You have the main resolution.

HEADY Is there debate on the resolution, as amended? Those in favor please say "aye"; opposed "no". The motion is carried.

We have now adopted both resolutions in revised form.

Is there any other business?

GREEN Just a point of information. I have heard, and I believe it is a number of years now, the Bureau of Educational Finance with its formulas for distributing money has consistently underestimated the increased enrollment of the University of New Mexico and we have been -- have we been able to get back any of that?

HEADY That is not quite accurate. If you will --

GREEN That's why I asked.

HEADY If you will take the period of four or five years, the years are about even when the Board of Educational Finance has overestimated on enrollment with the years where it has underestimated. But it's true that the mistakes by way of underestimation have been greater during that period and it's certainly true that the biggest mistake of all is one that was made for the year we are currently in.

The Board of Educational Finance predicted, and all of the calculations were based on this, that our increase last fall over the previous fall would be six point nine, I believe, and it was actually fifteen or a little less,
depending on whether you take head count or FTE, and 
our increase for the spring semester, for which we 
just registered, shows, I believe, a seventeen percent 
increase in the head count and an equivalent increase 
on FTE basis over last year.

What we are very concerned about at this time, 
this was the second year in a row that there had been 
an underestimation by about half of our actual increase. 
What we are very concerned about now is that for the 
third year in a row there may be a similar under-
estimation and the Board of Educational Finance is 
predicting a six point three, is it, John, something 
like that? Six point eight increase next fall for us. 
We said we thought the calculations ought to be based on 
a ten percent increase, but we have to concede that 
everybody is guessing about this.

GREEN The thing is that that is a rather bad 
guess, that for this last year and the year before, and 
our Faculty's salary position has deteriorated over a 
number of years. I have run through the figures, too, 
and we have taken care of that, it seems to me, that 
these student's position here has also deteriorated very 
badly on account of this. Students do not get into 
classes they are put into -- they are put in classes 
that are inappropriate, classes that they do not want.

HEADY If you take --

GREEN We must do something about this, it seems 
to me, even to stay where we were. We have to make up 
these bad guesses.

HEADY Even if you take this crude measure of 
student-faculty ratio, we are, in fact this year, in a 
considerably worse position than anybody planned for us 
to be. You see --

GREEN They refused to admit they were wrong and 
we have gone down and even if they guess right next year, 
the students are not going to be in any better 
position because the past hasn't been.

HEADY There has been some discussion on some sort 
of a contingency appropriation which can then be made
available to the institutions that actually have larger enrollments than predicted. Whenever that question comes up, the legislators say "Well, there are also years when we over-predict your enrollment, and in those years, are you prepared to return the dollars that were calculated for students who don't show up?"

I probably know what our response to that is: Very difficult to do that. It would be very difficult to do it.

It is also difficult to make really effective use of extra dollars, even if they are available, at the last minute, when students show up who were not expected, although something can be done there.

Now I think what -- I think what we are faced with is a combination of difficultly of prediction about this enrollment because what is being predicted here is a multitude of decisions made by individual students as to whether they will go to school, and, if they do, where they will go. The mistake was not as much in the overall enrollment in the system as it was in the states. In what particular institutions the students would go to. Coupled with that is the situation where there are no effective controls, no t even any planned controls, that affect the options that are open to the individual student. He is really a free agent in deciding what -- which institution he wants to go to.

So I think to cope with the situation we are going to have to move forward and we have been talking about doing this, and maybe we ought to deliberately and as rapidly as possible do it, move toward a situation in which we protect ourselves from an actual enrollment that is appreciably or greatly at least, in essence of what was predicted and what was provided for in the budget.

Dean Springer.

DEAN SPRINGER In connection with Professor Green's point, which I fully appreciate and support, I would like to suggest that with the help of the graduate school we ought to look very carefully about what and how many we admit to the departments, because this is where all the
predominant load comes on Faculty time, and it may seem strange for a graduate dean to advocate reduction of his own empire, but I wish to be on record as urging you to think very carefully on how you do it.

Now we have a subcommittee of the Graduate Committee working on a detailed study of how this could be accomplished. But it seems to me that this might be a good opportunity to say to the Faculty as a whole that this is one place where several of our departments, a dozen of them, have taken the extra time and care to look over their applicants with great care, the ones that we don't screen out in my office you can screen out in your department to see that you don't go beyond all bounds where you simply no longer are capable of giving individual care to individual graduate students.

We are getting into a position now where we are very close to litigation with several students in several departments who feel they have been lost in the shuffle and I am very much concerned about this. To me, it's a natural outcome of this short fall of funding, and the ten percent increase in enrollment at the graduate level.

HEADY Professor Stumpf, did you want the floor?

STUMPF In addition to graduate work, you said that we might put this mechanism into effect, or we might think about it, of limiting this enrollment. You did use that term, to protect ourselves against this sort of thing?

HEADY No, I think I did say; by controlling the enrollment --

STUMPF Can we do that? Is it mechanically --

HEADY -- there is no legal prohibition against it. We are doing it. There are some formidable mechanical difficulties in working out and carrying out a system and there are some tough choices that have to be made about the basis upon which you make your choice, type of applicant, academic standing, field of study, and so on. If we were to move toward that objective, what I am trying to say is there is a whole series of prior decisions that would have to be made and machinery for carrying them out.

STUMPF Are we doing that now?

HEADY We have not made a firm decision about doing
it and I think maybe this is something that we ought --
that the Faculty ought to devote its attention to in
a concentrated way. I don't know whether it should be
the Faculty Policy Committee or the Curriculum Committee
or in the general discussions of the Faculty. But I
think this is a burning, current issue, as I see it, as
what should we do, if anything, to try to prepare ourselves
so that we can protect ourselves against a repetition of
last fall next fall, or at least the fall after that if
we decide we don't want to do that, and can't do it by
next fall.

Dean Wollman.

WOLLMAN I had the feeling in your earlier recitation
of the sequence of events that the staff of B.E.F. played
a very strategic role and that at one point their recommenda-
tion with respect to budget seemed to be flagrantly in
violation of their own particular long-standing guidelines.
Do you have any understanding of what it is that has
determined their recommendations to the Board of Educational
Finance?

HEADY Well, I can only speculate a little. I guess
the main response I would make to that is that, in part,
this whole process we are talking about is a political
process and at least one small feature of that may be that
the Board of Educational Finance likes to be able to be
a little more liberal than its staff has been and its
staff likes it -- likes for it to have that opportunity.
I think that is possibly part of the explanation. I didn't
say it was to be a thought. I am trying to speculate
what part of the reason may be. Professor Thorson.

THORSON I would like to ask for a point of personal
Privilege. I see by the flight to the door that we
are going to adjourn. After we adjourn, I would like
to address the Faculty about thirty seconds.

HEADY After formal adjournment?

THORSON Yes.

HEADY We are just engaged in general discussion
at this point, I guess. Professor Schmidt.
SCHMIDT We passed two resolutions on the part of the Faculty and I wanted to ask the officers that they be forwarded to the appropriate people. I assume it would be done but I would like to remind you.

HEADY Surely. Professor Cooper?

COOPER We have been talking here this afternoon about political process, and political process as it affects your and my lives. Doctor Travelstead has pointed out that the Administration has fended for us in Santa Fe with the legislature and before appropriate bodies. Today we have agreed to augment that process by sending a resolution to the appropriate people in Santa Fe. I think there's another step that we, as a Faculty, ought to start thinking about and that is some kind of mechanism, to more intimately involve legislators in our problems in our concerns. After all, we are a special interest group, and the plumbers of New Mexico are represented in Santa Fe by their group and they represent the plumbing legislation, plumbing laws, and the like.

The Association of General Contractors has a very substantial group in Santa Fe to keep legislators informed about various kinds of bills. Our special interest is that of advancing higher education in this state, and I am sure that most legislators are very curious when they think about us as a University. I don't think the reputation for looking down our noses is fully deserved, it's certainly not the majority, but it is also true that there can be many misunderstandings, or worse, plain failure to understand some of the things we are talking about here today.

The consequences of time are appropriations to enrollment without any consideration of the manifest problem that it poses, which we see like a graduate student costs us a lot more to get a doctoral man educated than a professional. These kinds of problems, I don't think our Administrators have the time to explain these kinds of details. Not as well as they might be. It seems to me we need to figure out some other way of approaching legislators in perhaps a more informal basis. By a systematic basis so that some of these kinds of things can be continually reported. After all, the major legislation is not passed in the two-month session in Santa Fe; lots of those things happen before. They are
going to start happening again after the legislature closes. I would hope that our Policy Committee might take a long look and see how or some way we might augment what the Administration is doing. So a clear message gets transmitted to Santa Fe and, in turn, we can see more clearly what it is that those fellows perceive that maybe needs some light shed.

HEADY Professor Prouse.

PROUSE Mr. Hufbauer and Connie Brown of the Economics Department have worked on this salary question, Mr. Thorson and Mr. Cottrell and his colleagues have worked on this question. The budget subcommittee has worked on this question. We have now passed a resolution and want a statement and I would like some clarification as to how we are to carry this out. May I assume that the Policy Committee should go ahead and work with these people altogether and see what we can do in regard to this transition?

HEADY Professor Thorson?

THORSON I wanted -- I want, to respond briefly. Jim Cooper, I don't think my remarks aren't appropriate in the Faculty meeting and I would rather speak after the Faculty meeting about what is being done and what I am going to ask you to do.

HEADY Professor Merkx?

MERKX I simply say to Professor Prouse that if you people have any ideas on ways that we can help, let us know.

HEADY Is there any further discussion? Is there a motion to adjourn?

THORSON So move.

HEADY Seconded, and we will stand in adjournment.

Adjournment, 4:55 p.m.
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<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Antonio Marchlondo</td>
<td>Psychology &amp; Chemistry (BA)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consuelo Montoya</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Dunn Nickerson</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles John Novak</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Eugene Palmer</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard George Pettit</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal Rodriguez-Hens</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willette G. Senter</td>
<td>Dietetics</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Thomas Slinde</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred William Soever</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Wells Tikkensen</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Arthur Wagner</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Frederick Vatkins</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Edward Witt</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernani Perreira Zavler</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Salph Yeomans</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Astronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davin Anthony Zamora</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Colleen McMahon</td>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Classics</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Anderson Morgan</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Jane Harris</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Bachelor of Science in Chemical Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan Lee Bender</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Frederick Coleman</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdu Zahir Ali Khan</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo A. Larrañaga</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan Lee Bender</td>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Classics</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; S Thomas Lee Paez</td>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Classics</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Eugene Brussel</td>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Classics</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Wesley Trask III</td>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Classics</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Earl Zuber</td>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Classics</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summa cum laude in Civil Engineering

Summa cum laude in General Studies
Certified Candidates for Degrees, 1970 Fall

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering

Victor Endo
Joseph Ross Hobart
Michael James Huddak
Dieter Karl Kemp
Arthur William Feltier
Daniel Stuart Revel
H. Vance Riley, Jr.

John Fred Rivera
Alice Brush Robinson
Gary Ray Sloman
Raymond Alan Snyder
Jerry Dennis Thompson
Fredrick John York

Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering

Roland Ernest Baars
Kenneth Malcolm Ball
Robert Henry Davis
Elmer Ray Gerk
Donald Arthur Lobato

Joseph Xavier McCormack III
Adi Bhujkeshew Nahta
Gregory W. Rogers
Lawrence Willis
Patrick John Neal

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Bachelor of Arts in Education

Elenie Marie Arias
David Hayes Babb

Major
Speech
Social Studies
Composite
Comm Arts Composite
Art Education
History
Social Studies
Composite
English
History
Comm Arts Composite
History
Comm Arts Composite
Art Education
Social Studies
Composite
Comm Arts Composite
and English
Comm Arts Composite

Minor
History
English
Athletic Coaching
None
Sociology
None
Library Science
Economics
None
Anthropology
None
History
None
None
None
None

Curric
Sec Ed
Sec Ed
Sec Ed
Sec Ed
Sec Ed
Sec Ed
Sec Ed
Sec Ed
Sec Ed
Sec Ed
Sec Ed
Sec Ed
Sec Ed
Sec Ed
Sec Ed
Sec Ed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Curric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Pickett Harnish</td>
<td>Comm Arts Composite English</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter James Henderson III</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Political Sci. and Middle</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Moore Hiller</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buss Foster Ingersoll</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Ann Fleming Jaynes</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Jenkins Johnson</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Andrew Laga</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Hoffman Langley</td>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Sharon Lazorkis</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Andrew Lewis</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Marie McCann</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>Special Edu.</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl A. Macaluso</td>
<td>Comm Arts Composite English</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Susan Magneson</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathrynn Elaine Toledo Manuello</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen L. Marino</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Fay Mohney</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard D. Montgomery</td>
<td>English and Philosophy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Robertson Murphy</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Perry Roe</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Thompson Olson</td>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Art Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles M. Ramsey</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Lee Rhoten</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil Lee Rockhold, Jr.</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Elizabeth Rutherford</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuelle Dolores Schreiner</td>
<td>Comm Arts Composite English</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Bartlett Seaman</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Joan Statkus</td>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Aileen Stephens</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mease Virginia Stevens</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Kay Taylor</td>
<td>Comm Arts Composite English</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Maureen Thompson</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Doreste Torres</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Armando Valdez</td>
<td>Comm Arts Composite English</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Frank Vales</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Havens Van Den Avyle</td>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Art Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Claude Wright</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Art Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Curric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola Harsh Adams</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Music Educ</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Jo Allen</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Mus Ed</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Marie Larson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Library Science</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>Sociology and</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordelia H. Arellano</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Psychology Comp</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Sanheim Berg</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Delma Bizsrell</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Language Ed</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherrill Logan Block</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Constanta Boucher</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Marie Buffington</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Tillston Hurt</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Harrell Campbell</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>General Science</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Kansasmohr Ciasia</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>General Science</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Scott Clapper</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>General Science</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Long D'Angelo</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>General Science</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Kirkpatrick Denton</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>General Science</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Oliver Edgington</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>General Science</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Elizabeth Ellis</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pray Anne Ellison</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony J. Ebymanos</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Ann Eystone</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara D y FitzGerald</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Earli Fluke</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynda Slade Fouler</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Marie Futrell</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Blair Gamble</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Antonio Gauna</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Rice Graham</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matilda Eaton Groebler</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Starbuck Groom</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Dixon Gutierrez</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Alicia Haggard</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Ellen Harris</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bette Jean Helskia</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Mary Jordan</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Hull Kewalce</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Leslie Rite</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corby Allen Knight</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Ann Kronig</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Paula Loy</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella Armijo Lajan</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred William Habry</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Louise Haas</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Louise Cameron</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>El Ed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bachelor of Science in Education (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alice Priscilla Martinez</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Art Education E1 Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Lorraine Miera</td>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>Home Economics Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Paul Miller, Jr.</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Social Studies E1 Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Elizabeth Moore</td>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Green Nunn</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Recreation E1 Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Jane O'Velley</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Dramatic Art E1 Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Angela Ortiz</td>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>Special Educ Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Elizabeth Perry</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Economics Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmelo John Raimondi</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Social Studies E1 Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvatore James Raimondi</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxine Dunham Ross</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Social Studies E1 Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Kate Salfield</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Ann Smith</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Home Economics E1 Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Rodriguez Soussa</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Art Education E1 Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard James Stueber</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Art Education E1 Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Wohm Thesis</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Spanish E1 Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Thomas Velasquez</td>
<td>Life Science Composite</td>
<td>English Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Gaskin Ward</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Home Economics E1 Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Jean Williams</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>None Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Lee Williamson</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Early Childhood E1 Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Lynn Worthen</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Education E1 Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Harumi Yabumoto</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Physical Educ E1 Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Ann Yarasheaki</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Speech Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Wade Zarn</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Art Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Estelle Zints</td>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>Early Childhood E1 Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Elizabeth Zints</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Education E1 Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Educ E1 Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>History Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bilingual Educ E1 Ed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bachelor of Science in Health and Physical Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robin Annette Carlson</td>
<td>Health &amp; Physical Educ</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Miguel Espinosa</td>
<td>Health &amp; Physical Educ</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Delgre Miller</td>
<td>Health &amp; Physical Educ</td>
<td>Physical Educ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Thomas Moyer</td>
<td>Health &amp; Physical Educ</td>
<td>Athletic Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Louis Ortega</td>
<td>Health &amp; Physical Educ</td>
<td>Coaching and Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carey Dean Sigler</td>
<td>Health &amp; Physical Educ</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Mitchell Taccetta</td>
<td>Health &amp; Physical Educ</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Bachelor of Science in Home Economics Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toni Tully Barrow</td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>H Ec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Fifield Deans</td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>H Ec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Carol Finlay</td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>H Ec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Harrison Harris</td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>Business Educ</td>
<td>H Ec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen Elizabeth Holden</td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>General Science</td>
<td>H Ec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Ann Johnson</td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>H Ec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Rita McGovern</td>
<td>Home Economics and</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>H Ec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Howard Shepard</td>
<td>Dietetics</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>H Ec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Sydney Stowe</td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>General Science</td>
<td>H Ec Ed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Bachelor of Science in Industrial Arts Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walter Scott Darr III</td>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George T. Fisher III</td>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh B. Gordon</td>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Randel Kay</td>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Elwyn Floor</td>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Andrew Price</td>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert William Range</td>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Lynn Toale</td>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabil Douglas Wenasay</td>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sec Ed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Bachelor of Music Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Giffin Counselman</td>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Music Ed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Bachelor of Science in Physical Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Michael McConnell</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Leon Moore</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Roberta Horehouse</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judi Ann Nickerson</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bachelor of Arts in Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Curric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Ellsworth Cooper</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earel Christyne Kavanaugh</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Theodore Larsen</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Marie Lingo</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Rudy Trujillo</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Randal Wilkinson</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bachelor of Arts in Fine Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Curric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katharine Elcia Beebe</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Ann Carpenter</td>
<td>Dramatic Art</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Elizabeth Hagood</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loraine Shield Schoenfeld</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Ann Schneider</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bachelor of Fine Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Louise Burnett</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Linden Carlow</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard John Degulis</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luclle Felicia Doorsky</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Koch Hawley</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justine S. Kahn</td>
<td>Dramatic Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Joseph Lantz</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence Lee Nighbert</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Allan Russell</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Howard Snyder</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrian Leona Tuffe</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Diane Kania Walkington</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rudolph Willig</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Noseher Baumgardner</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bachelor of Music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Curric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kay Gill Shaffer</td>
<td>Gail Angela Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summa laude in Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Certified Candidates for Degrees, 1970 Fall

COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS

Bachelor of Music Education

Thomas Jerome Kelly
Virginia Elizabeth Moore

COLLEGE OF PHARMACY

None

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES

Bachelor of Business Administration

Harold John Richard Becker, Jr.
Roger Charles Bell
Ronald William Chapman
Clifford Michael Chrissinger
Floyd R. Correa
Frank A. Cronican, Jr.
Thomas Cortice Franks
Richard Edwin Giles
Robert Gene Gilmore
Michael John Glennon
David Ernest Grabe
Geoffrey Elliott Griswold
Cerry Michael Huber
James Clair Huburt
Rudy Joe Jaramillo
Ronald M. Knights
Richard John Kubis
Jeffrey Burns Martin
Daniel Joseph Mayfield
Kevin Dennis Murphy
Stephen Dudley Nolan
James Terrell Ray
David William Rea
Stanley David Regensberg
Christopher Arthur Roybal
Charles Paul Schaefer
Francis Don Schreiber
Floyd Leroy Segura
Steven Allan Seiden
Wiliam A. Shrenk, Jr.
Gilbert P. Silva
Gerald John Slomianski

Concentration
Marketing
Industrial Administration
Industrial Administration
Industrial Administration
Industrial Administration
Industrial Administration
Marketing
Marketing
Accounting
General Business
Industrial Administration
Industrial Administration
Industrial Administration
Marketing
Industrial Administration
Industrial Administration
Marketing
Industrial Administration
Marketing
General Business
Industrial Administration
Accounting
Industrial Administration
General Business
Industrial Administration
Industrial Administration
Marketing
Business Administration
Industrial Administration
Industrial Administration
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor of Business Administration (Continued)</th>
<th>Concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Daniel Stephens</td>
<td>Industrial Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Arlen Tanner</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Leon Thompson</td>
<td>Industrial Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald H. Umbrage</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Louis Valentini</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Leroy Vigil</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Florio Vigil</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore James Wroman</td>
<td>Industrial Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Jay Weir</td>
<td>Industrial Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waymon Carl Whitemore</td>
<td>Industrial Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLLEGE OF NURSING**

Bachelor of Science in Nursing

| Susan Ann Simons Canetrom                  | Clara Anne Tessman      |
| Dorothy Matthews Hughes                    | Diana Lupton Wakashige |
| Nancy Hedges Rockman                       |                           |

**UNIVERSITY COLLEGE**

Bachelor of University Studies

| Charles Ormond Atwood                      | Thomas William McCollum  |
| Marion Corke Bailey                        | James Edward McCreight   |
| Roger Alan Bargas                          | Katherine Meadow         |
| Robert Roland Becker                       | Terry Ryan Meier         |
| Gordon Kent Benson, Jr.                    | Robert Ray Mhoon         |
| Martin Howard Bolkess                      | Stuart Allan Murray      |
| George Douglas Browning II                 | Martha Hill Mufer        |
| Bruce MacGregor Burwell                    | Frank Leroy Otero       |
| James William Buesse                      | Ernest Julian Padilla    |
| Drusilla Dean Arthur Campbell              | Daniel John Panbeauf    |
| Scott G. Cary                              | John Robert Pautech, Jr.|
| Bob Alfred Christianson                   | Ted Grant Pennington    |
| Janice Elaine Clancy                       | Cynthia Kay Petey        |
| Douglas James Crandall                    | Richard Norton Preecey   |
| Kristi Allen Crowrower                    | William Hanlon Putman    |
| John Paul Degner                           | Gregory Allen Ramsey     |
| Charles Edward Dyer                        | Margaret Louise Reed     |
| Virginia Keen Edwards                      | Allen Bernard Shier      |
| Joan Konopak Eng                           | John Michael Stivinski   |
| Katherine Weathert Emns                   | Orlando Stevens          |
| Mary Seth Frankenfeld                      | Stephen Tillman         |
| Carmen Linda Gonzales                      | Norma Bye Stonebrtius    |
| Clarice Campbell Girdner                   | Dennis Martin Styrsky    |
| Lawrence Damon Gore                        | Thomas Charles Taylor    |
| William Lewis Hibbs                        | Christopher Yale         |
| James David Johnson                        | Charles L. Weaver        |
| Robert Charles Keilner, Jr.               | Thomas Wilson Wolfe      |
| Karen Anne Kolins                          | Mary Katharine Bright    |
| Gerald Anthony Rowly                      |                           |
| Edmund Joseph Lang                         |                           |
| Mary Catherine Langley                     |                           |
| Frances Vargas Lants                       |                           |
| Ricky LeRoy Laub                           |                           |
| Albert Lloyd Hustel, Jr.                   |                           |
Certified Candidates for Degrees, 1970 Fall

SCHOOL OF LAW

Juris Doctor

Graham Edward Evans
Vincent Lee Knight
Arthur David Melendres

James Browning Malcoock, Jr.
Edward Reed Ziegler

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Doctor of Medicine

None

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Master of Arts

Constance Lee Adam
Mary Innis Archer
Benjamin Baca
Joseph C. Baillio
Sam Baptiste
Sue Anne Baranchik
Jerry Montgomery Barker
Dari Vance Beane
William Michael Beneke
Judith Gayle Booth
Nancy Trigg Brown
Walter Rayly Buck, Jr.
Betty Moore Burford
Mary Jean Burns
Ray Lee Caldwell
Sam Abbott Carnes, Jr.
John Orlando Chavez
Gregory C. Cleveland
Barbara Borruss Clute
William Guard Craig
Jane Adele Anderson Denham
John Norley Desauer
Wilfred Eriacho, Sr.
Susan Jane Farrington
William Eugene Francis
Benjamin Garcia
Lutcher Clemente Garcia
John Thomas Golden
Harold Leon Gordon
Nery A. Smith Hubble
Margaret Glenn Johnson
Helene Ostrander Johnson

Major
Latin American Studies
Guidance
Special Education
French
Spanish
Spanish
Art Education
English
Psychology
Art
Guidance
History
Speech
Spanish
Political Science
Political Science
Spanish
Anthropology
Special Education
Guidance
Elementary Education
Anthropology
Art Education
Latin American Studies
Educational Administration
Guidance
Guidance
Spanish
Anthropology
Elementary Education
English
Elementary Education
Certified Candidates for Degrees, 1970 Fall

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Master of Arts (Continued)

Oren William Key
Mary Clinton Linnesman
Jose Orlando Lobato
Jack Armand Martinez
Mary Elizabeth McDonald
Edward Alan Mers
Susan Beth Miller
Edward Jack Mulkey
Carolyn Thompson Parrish
William Nickman Pickens
Juan Estanislao Portorreal-Gonzales
William B. Pringle
William Henry Prior
Jamal Henry Daniel Pritchenard
Suzanne Latreee Ralls
Patricia Gonzales Sacoman
Thomas Joshua Sager
Lena Louise Parrish Santamaria
David Scherra
Joel Mitchell Schroeder
Franz Sensano Undinines
Kermit Carole Wood Smith
Lois E. Wood Starkey
John Sherrod Taylor
Henry Evans Thomas Jr
Anthony Steve Tiano
Guillermo Trejo-Mejia
Howard Trusch
Louise Berg Tucker
Robert Kenneth Vierra
Bevere Erasbrack Walker
Fay Marion Weber
Herret Urban White
Belva Virginia Whitfield
Alice Mauck Wood

Major
French
Psychology
Guidance
Latin American Studies
English
Guidance
Political Science
Mathematics
Secondary Education
History
Educational Administration
Guidance
History
English
Special Education
Secondary Education
Mathematics
Latin American Studies
Latin American Studies
Elementary Education
Educational Administration
French
Elementary Education
History
Latin American Studies
Speech
Spanish
Philosophy
Elementary Education
Anthropology
Educational Administration
Guidance
Secondary Education
Speech
Elementary Education

Master of Science

Thomas Curtis Adams
Richard Hugh Allen
Vald William Arendt
Prabhan Kumar Bagchi

Major
Physics
Civil Engineering
Geology
Civil Engineering
Certified Candidates for Degrees, 1970 Fall

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Master of Science (Continued)

Paul Randell Barnes
Peter Allen Betz
Charles Leroy Braun
Stan Lee Brooks
Clarence David Brown
James Douglas Causey
Chen-Chi Peter Chang
Paul E. Christensen
David Richard Cobb
Douglas Wakefield Croucher
John Lewis Darling
Romeo Deliberis

Arun Kumar Dhaman
Benjamin Lloyd Dow, Jr.
Alan Lee Dudley
John Nelson Edwards
Thomas Robert Ferguson
John Elliott Hill
Carroll F. Partee Holbrook
Robert Spencer Hotchkiss
Alicia Ann Jeung
Raymond Jeffery Laurence, Jr.
David Alan Linton
Harold Gene Longbotham
William Douglas Love
Paul Anthony Lovoi
Vinsanai A. Mithani
mani Natarajan
Marshall Lee Pendergrass
Cholamme Rajeghi
James Hugh Buttle
Roger William Tallon
Dimetri T. Tzitoff
Marilyn John Witt
Richard Alan Bugerman
Paul Nathaniel Bonaparte
Chung-Ten Huang

Major:

- Electrical Engineering
- Electrical Engineering
- Mechanical Engineering
- Mechanical Engineering
- Health Education
- Geology
- Electrical Engineering
- Mechanical Engineering
- Civil Engineering
- Nuclear Engineering
- Biology
- Physics
- Mechanical Engineering
- Nuclear Engineering
- Physics
- Mechanical Engineering
- Physics
- Biology
- Physical Education
- Mechanical Engineering
- Biology
- Mechanical Engineering
- Physics
- Physics
- Mechanical Engineering
- Electrical Engineering
- Physics
- Nuclear Engineering
- Chemical Engineering
- Nuclear Engineering
- Electrical Engineering
- Mechanical Engineering
- Electrical Engineering
- Physics
- Mechanical Engineering

Master of Arts in Teaching Business Subjects

Sue Ann Soellers

Major

Business Subjects
Certified Candidates for Degrees, Fall 1970

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Master of Arts in Teaching Home Economics

Allie Belle Loomis

Master of Arts in Teaching Science

Demosthenes Stephen Metarelis

Master of Business Administration

Jamieson K. Duesel
Gerald Edward Gorken
Ronald Lee Holverson
Frederick Arnold Leckman
Donald Louis Mackel
William Allan McManus
Daniel Ormond Morehouse
Paul William Onstad

Doctor of Education

Benedict Emanuel Coren
Stephen Grant House
William D. Smith

Major
Curriculum and Instruction
Administration and Supervision
Curriculum and Instruction

Doctor of Philosophy

Margaret Eleanor Ackerman
Sarah Lee Meyer Christiansen
Howard James Clifford
Bobby Gene Congdon
Jerry Wilson Cooney

Major
Chemistry
Mathematics
Chemistry
Education: Curriculum and Instruction
History
### Certified Candidates for Degrees, 1970 Fall

**GRADUATE SCHOOL**

**Doctor of Philosophy (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Thomas Fink</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Lee Forsythe</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Fain Gisinowitz</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Casey Hancock</td>
<td>Romance Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall George Hansis</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Fleming Hayes</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kermit F. Henriksen</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Biernoff Hiet</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Gale Jackson</td>
<td>Education: Curriculum and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Francis Kanipe</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Conrad Krenetsky</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin Mansfield Lemax</td>
<td>Education: Pupil Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Lucano</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Ann McKee</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janis North</td>
<td>American Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Nye</td>
<td>Romance Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Carl Oliver</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis A. Pérez, Jr.</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Keith Quiring</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter John Roth</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Dodd Russell</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald William Shaffer</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surendra Pratap Singh</td>
<td>Romance Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Dale Spall</td>
<td>Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Michael Tolman</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Morrow Turner</td>
<td>Education: Foundation of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony F. Veneruso</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chien-Sung Wu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Page 17*
To: John N. Durrie, Secretary of the University
From: Peter Prouse, Chairman, Faculty Policy Committee

Subject: Proposed Changes in Article II, Section 2, of the Faculty Constitution Intended to Clarify Voting Membership on College and Department Faculties

At their meeting on January 27, the members of the Faculty Policy Committee unanimously approved the language proposed by Professor Ju and me for changes in Article II, Section 2, of the Faculty Constitution. The proposed changes are attached to this memorandum.

We would like this proposal to go before the General Faculty at its meeting on February 16. As you know, the matter will be voted upon at the March meeting, after the required thirty-day period during which it must lie on the table before final action. I will present the proposal on behalf of the Policy Committee.

A number of explanations of the language appear in order:

1) The first sentence establishes the fact that college or departmental faculty membership requires membership on the University Faculty.

2) The second sentence defines the usual or ordinary requirements for voting membership on a college or department faculty.

3) The third sentence establishes the right of the regular voting members of a college or department to extend voting privileges in that college or department to instructors with fewer than three years of service and to persons holding temporary or part-time appointments. The words "a general policy" and the repeated words "to those" make clear that a college or department must extend such voting privileges to all those holding instructorships or temporary and part-time appointments, and not to selected individuals. The language also requires that the regular voting members give majority approval to a formal motion for such action before it shall have effect.

4) The fourth sentence requires that you be given formal notification of such deviation from the usual or ordinary policy.

5) The fifth, and final, sentence clarifies the voting privileges for college and departmental purposes of ex officio members of the faculty. The present language of the Faculty Constitution leaves unclear the question of which ex officio faculty members may vote in
which colleges and departments. Although it may seem silly, realistically, to point out that under the present language any ex officio member of the faculty could exercise a right to vote in any college or department, we decided to clarify this question as long as we were trying to clarify the rest of this particular section of the Faculty Constitution. In other words, we simply decided to be thorough.

**********

Sec. 2 Membership: Faculty membership in a college or department shall be as defined in Article I, Section 1(a) for membership on the University Faculty. For college and departmental voting purposes, such membership shall normally be as defined in Article I, Section 1(b). Those faculty members of a college or department whose eligibility to vote is defined in Article I, Section 1(b) may, upon formal motion and majority approval, establish a general policy extending voting privileges in that college or department to those holding the rank of instructor with fewer than three years of full-time service and to those holding temporary or part-time appointments in that college or department. Formal notification of such action shall be made to the Secretary of the University. Persons described in Article I, Sections 1(a) and 1(b) as ex officio members of the Faculty shall have voting privileges only in the colleges and departments in which they hold academic rank.
Gary Hufbauer for the Economics Department
February 10, 1971

FACULTY SALARY POLICY

NOTE: The proposed policy consists of two resolutions, which should be considered separately.

I. The administration should adopt, in the alternative, one of the following two criteria as a long-term guide for formulating faculty salary budgets presented to the Board of Educational Finance.

(a) The annual percentage gain in average faculty salaries should be at least: (i) the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index during the previous fiscal year (to compensate for expected inflation), plus (ii) a merit increment equivalent to the long-term percentage increase in real productivity per American worker (currently about 3% per year).

or

(b) The annual percentage gain in average faculty salaries should be sufficiently large to improve slowly the standing of the University among a well-defined group of comparable institutions with graduate programs.

II. For the fiscal year, 1972-1973, the Administration should seek a one-time increase in average faculty salaries of approximately 7%, in addition to the gain prescribed by the long-term guide selected under Resolution I. The purpose of this one-time increase is to compensate for inadequate salary gains between fiscal 1966-1967 and fiscal 1971-1972, viewed either from the cost-of-living plus productivity standpoint or from the standpoint of maintaining the University's position among comparable institutions.
February 12, 1971

To All Faculty Members:

Two resolutions on faculty salary policy appear on the agenda for the February 16 Faculty meeting. The attached memorandum explains the views of the Economics Department on this important question. The Department hopes that the resolutions will promote a reasoned discussion. In view of the complexity of the subject, the Department is not necessarily looking for a vote at the February 16 meeting.

It should be emphasized that the resolutions and memorandum are phrased in terms of average salary increments. Average does not mean across-the-board; in any given year, many faculty members would receive less than the average increment.

Gary Hufbauer for the Economics Department
FACULTY SALARY POLICY

NOTE: The proposed policy consists of two resolutions, which should be considered separately.

The administration should adopt, in the alternative, one of the following two criteria as a long-term guide for formulating faculty salary budgets presented to the Board of Educational Finance.

(a) The annual percentage gain in average faculty salaries should be at least: (i) the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index during the previous fiscal year (to compensate for expected inflation), plus (ii) a merit increment equivalent to the long-term percentage increase in real productivity per American worker (currently about 3% per year).

or

(b) The annual percentage gain in average faculty salaries should be sufficiently large to improve slowly the standing of the University among a well-defined group of comparable institutions with graduate programs.

For the fiscal year, 1972-1973, the Administration should seek a one-time increase in average faculty salaries of approximately 7%, in addition to the gain prescribed by the long-term guide selected under Resolution I. The purpose of this one-time increase is to compensate for inadequate salary gains between fiscal 1966-1967 and fiscal 1971-1972, viewed either from the cost-of-living plus productivity standpoint or from the standpoint of maintaining the University's position among comparable institutions.
Memorandum on the Proposed Faculty Salary Policy

Background. By the summer of 1970, the Administration had developed an impressive case supporting a gain of approximately 8% in average faculty salaries for 1971-72 over 1970-71. The documentation was presented at the June 1970 meeting of the Board of Educational Finance (BEF). Nevertheless, after that meeting, the BEF staff issued guidelines calling for an increase of only 6% in faculty salaries, and that increase was conditioned on higher student:faculty ratios.

The Board itself met in Silver City on October 2 and 3, 1970. The Board essentially accepted the staff recommendations. After that meeting, the presidents of the institutions of higher learning decided that another effort would be made to convince the BEF that a larger salary adjustment was necessary. Dr. Thomas from New Mexico State University was selected to make the presentation at the BEF meeting in Santa Fe on November 20.

As a result of the November 20 meeting, the Board overruled its staff and approved a one-percent increase in each institution’s budget. Furthermore, the Board softened the staff recommendation that salary increases be conditioned on higher student:faculty ratios.

The dollar amount of the one percent adjustment for UNM would exceed $200,000. The Administration has indicated that, if the adjustment is granted, salaries would enjoy a high priority among the possible uses. Another high priority item is the Library.

We approve the Administration’s efforts on the salary question. If the Administration’s preliminary budget requests, providing for salary increments in the vicinity of 10% per annum, had been met during the past three years, there would be no need now for a "catch-up" effort. We are especially encouraged that in 1970 the higher institutions, acting in concert, persuaded the Board to allocate additional funds, despite opposition from the BEF staff.
But, even if a 6% to 7% increment does emerge from the current legislative session, there are good arguments that average faculty salaries will not have been adequately increased. The purpose of this memorandum is to set forth those arguments, and thereby to support the intent of the proposed faculty salary policy.

Resolutions I and II. Traditionally, the BEF staff has couched its budgeted faculty salary increments in terms of maintaining the position of UNM vis-a-vis a group of comparable institutions. However, the staff has had vague, even shifting, ideas about the institutions included in that group. In about August 1968, the comparable institutions appeared to be the combined land-grant and state universities in each state, a group in which New Mexico ranked near the mid-point (position 22 out of 49). By 1969-70, however, New Mexico’s rank in that cohort declined to position 33. Coincidentally, in 1970, the BEF staff changed the appropriate peer group (in their view) to all National Education Association four-year institutions, a lower quality group. Interestingly enough, all New Mexico institutions combined once again appeared at the mid-point of the new cohort. To complicate matters, the staff has recently mentioned inflation as a consideration, though it showed no real concern for the impact of inflation on past salary increments.2

Because there are two possible approaches (if not more) to long-term faculty salary policy, Resolution I has been expressed in the alternative. One guide would be to adjust salaries in line with short-term cost of living and long-term productivity increments. This alternative is expressed as Resolution I(a). The other guide would be to adjust salaries so as to improve, slowly over time, the
position of UNM relative to a suitably defined group of universities. This possibility is expressed as Resolution I(b). We think the two alternatives need more intensive study, both by the Administration and by appropriate faculty groups, before a long-term approach is adopted. In any event, the University has deteriorated by both standards since 1966-67 (and, indeed, over a longer period). Hence, Resolution II has been proposed. The next two sections review the performance of average faculty salaries since 1966-67 according to each standard.

Cost-of-Living Plus Productivity

During the years between fiscal 1966-67 and fiscal 1970-71, the money gains in average faculty pay (excluding the Medical School) have been substantially eroded by a quickening pace of inflation. Tables 1 and 2 present the relevant figures. If inflation had continued at the average experienced between 1960 and 1965 (less than 1.5% per year), the money salary gains between 1966-67 and 1970-71 would have been entirely adequate. These money gains amounted to about 20% for the faculty member who remained in the same rank over the four year period (Table 1). For the faculty as a whole, the gains were about 24%. The difference between 20% and 24% is explained by a compositional shift in the faculty from the junior to the senior ranks between 1966-67 and 1970-71.\(^3\)

During this period, however, inflation eroded about 20% of the money gain, leaving a real increase of 5% or less. If inflation had been kept below 2% per year, or 8% over the four-year period, the real gains would have amounted to between 12% and 16%. Both the national and the New Mexican economies experienced real gains of about 12% in personal per capita income between 1966-67 and 1970-71.
in faculty salaries

But, as it happened, the real increase was only 5%, and this was substantially less than average per capita gains in either the nation or New Mexico.

The proposed long-term formula in Resolution I(a) is based on actual past cost-of-living increases. This is an important feature. If the formula referred to anticipated future increases, the BEF staff would very likely consistently underestimate inflation while making no retroactive adjustments for error. Just this tendency has been observed in the matter of enrollment projections.

Under the cost-of-living plus productivity formula, a 7% one-time increase in average faculty salaries in 1972-73 would be the minimum necessary to compensate for inadequate gains between 1966-67 and 1971-72. A figure of 7% assumes no further erosion during 1971-72, an optimistic supposition. Furthermore, while a 7% one-time gain might adequately compensate those faculty who have experienced the normal rate of promotion, it would not prove sufficient for those faculty members who have remained at the same rank for many years. In any event, a 7% one-time gain appears in Resolution II.

Comparable Institutions. The five surveys discussed in Dr. Morris Hendrickson's report show that, in a variety of different university groups, the average percentage gains in faculty salaries at UNM have fallen short of gains elsewhere. The following remarks are condensed from Dr. Hendrickson's report.

Table 3, derived from the AAUP Salary Survey, shows that in all ranks above instructor, UNM salaries have declined relative to other public universities in each year since 1966-67. The relative decline between 1966-67 and 1969-70 has been about 4% for full professors, 7% for associated professors, and 7% for assistant professors. By 1971-72, it seems likely that the average relative
decline for all ranks will be at least 7%. This expectation provides the underpinning for the 7% catch-up figure which appears in Resolution II.

The Montana State Salary Survey compared twelve Rocky Mountain Schools from 1967-68 until 1969-70. This survey indicates the UNM salaries above the rank of instructor have deteriorated consistently since 1967-68, in the sense that the differential between UNM salaries and those of these institutions, many of which do not have a graduate program comparable to ours, has decreased by an average of $206. The figures appear in Table 4.

The University of Massachusetts survey has been conducted for only two years. The schools surveyed are essentially the major state university in each state plus a few other major state-supported schools. The specifics are given in the footnotes to Table 5. The faculty covered are exactly those in the AAUP survey except that lecturers are omitted in getting the salary average for all ranks combined. The overall average salaries by ranks in this sample are different from those reported in the AAUP survey because they are unweighted; i.e., each school is treated as though it had the same number of faculty. Although this method produces lower sample averages than the AAUP method, UNM is well below the mid-rank of these institutions for both years. Table 5 shows that in average salaries UNM dropped from 34th to 39th place for professors, from 36th to 41st for associated professors, and from 42nd to 48th for assistant professors.

From the data of the Massachusetts survey it is possible to calculate the percentages of faculty, by ranks and in all ranks combined, who teach in universities with higher average salaries than those of UNM. These percentages show a marked deterioration in the UNM position from last year to this. During the
current year, 78% of the faculty in the Massachusetts survey teach at schools having higher average salaries than those at UNM!

This survey merits special attention because it covers a nationwide sampling of institutions which have responsibilities in their states matching those of UNM in New Mexico. It is an appropriate peer group.

Table 6 reports findings from a survey conducted for many years by the faculty on nine-month contracts at the University of Idaho. The survey deals with the 22 state universities and land-grant colleges identified at the foot of the table. Until recently, UNM has ranked at or near the top of this group in average faculty salaries. A high rank in this survey is appropriate for UNM. Few of the other institutions have programs as varied or as large.

Table 6 shows that in the three years between 1966-67 and 1969-70 UNM has lost relative position in each faculty rank and in the four ranks combined. Whereas, in 1966-67 UNM stood well above the median in each rank, and first in salaries for associate professors, it now stands well down toward the median for the two higher faculty ranks (9th and 7th) and well below for the two lower (15th and 20th). The relatively better standing for all ranks combined is a consequence of the fact that UNM has comparatively few instructors. Faculty salary increases at UNM over the three-year span have not kept pace with the average increases in this group of schools in any faculty rank or in all ranks combined.

The Arizona survey, like the Idaho survey, covers faculty on nine-month contracts. UNM's program has a far greater breadth than all but three of the schools listed in Group B of Table 7, yet the salary differential between UNM and this group has declined significantly in the last two years. The Arizona survey shows that the
differential in salaries above the rank of instructor has declined by an average of $319 in only two years! The Arizona survey also reported that the student faculty ratio at UNM was higher than any other school in Group A and the second highest in Group B, despite the fact that UNM has a graduate program more extensive than all but three of those schools.

The NEF staff has recently chosen to compare New Mexico faculty salaries both absolutely and over time, with the average figures published by the National Education Association. The staff takes some satisfaction in the fact that the New Mexico and national medians for four-year institutions in 1969-70 were very close, about $11,700 in both cases. But many of the institutions in this survey have no graduate programs, nor do they compare in quality with UNM. Moreover, the staff shows little concern for the relative decline of all New Mexico institutions, a decline which amounted to 5% between 1967-68 and 1969-70, as against even the NEA average.

In other words, all surveys show a marked deterioration of salaries at UNM compared with schools having similar programs, a deterioration that is increasing in severity each year. There appears to be no logical peer group whose average salaries have not increased more than UNM's in the late 1960's. The annual percentage gain of faculty salaries at UNM have not kept pace with those of similar institutions and, as a result, the University's standing among these schools has and is continuing to decline. The thrust of Resolution I(b), of course, is that UNM should be improving relative to comparable institutions, not declining.

The Academic Labor Market. It is widely known that the academic labor market has turned "soft" in the past two years. The number of fresh Ph.D.'s rather
exceeds, in a great many disciplines, the number of academic, government, and business openings at the accustomed salary and responsibility levels. Some legislatures in other states have taken advantage of this situation, coupled with their other grievances against the academic community, by severely limiting salary increases. It is possible that the same approach might be urged in New Mexico.

Two things can be said about this short-sighted and vindictive approach.

First, it would deprive the University of an unprecedented opportunity to recruit top quality faculty members. In the academic year 1966-67, the nonmedical faculty in regular ranks numbered about 350 persons. Of these, only about 190 were still with the University in 1970-71, indicating that some 45% of the faculty departed over a few year period. Turnover in the next few years may not be so great. But even at a slower rate of turnover, ample opportunities will exist for upgrading the overall faculty—provided that salaries keep pace with conditions elsewhere.

A second objection to a go-slow salary policy, insofar as such a policy might be inspired by events elsewhere, is that the universities which have been conspicuously penalized by their legislatures are also universities which, for the most part, have enjoyed rather higher salaries than UNM. Table 8 lists the universities mentioned in an authoritative source as having recently incurred legislative wrath. In 7 out of 9 instances, the average 1969-70 faculty compensation exceeded the UNM figure.
Postscript on the Proposed 1971-72 and 1972-73 Increments. If all goes well in Santa Fe, the 1971-72 average faculty salary increment will be about 6%-7%. By the standards of Resolution I(a), the increment would have to be about 8%-9%. Between 1969-70 and 1970-71, consumer prices rose 5.6%, and adding about 3% for productivity, the overall increment is 8%-9% (cf. Table 1). By the standards of Resolution I(b) the increment would probably have to be about 8% in 1971-72. This figure results from contrasting the average annual 6% increment between 1966-67 and 1969-70 (Table 2) with the average annual 2% relative deterioration measured by the AAUP survey (Table 3). Evidently, during the 1966/67 to 1970/71 period, an 8% annual increment would have approximately maintained UNM's position.

According to the present BEF budget, the 1972-73 average faculty salary increment would be 6%. This amount would very likely prove inadequate by the standards of either Resolution I(a) or I(b). Furthermore, it would do nothing to meet the request set forth in Resolution II.
1. Dr. Morris Hendrickson, "Report on Relative Deterioration of Average Faculty Salaries at the University of New Mexico," 1970.

2. The following paragraph appeared in a 1970 BEF staff memorandum (September 23, 1970):

   It is anybody's guess as to what the rate of inflation will be between now and 1973. Board of Educational Finance staff guesses that it may be about 4% per year. It is on this basis that the staff proposes that unless productivity, as measured by the student faculty ratio, is increased in calculating the appropriation recommendations, the increases in average salaries be calculated at 4% each year.

3. See Footnote (f) to Table 2.

4. Dr. Morris Hendrickson, op. cit.

5. The comparison appeared in an undated staff memorandum.

6. This figure includes assistant, associate and full professors as of June 1966, and excludes instructors, lecturers, adjunct, and visiting professors, and all administrative personnel. The excluded non-medical faculty numbered some 250.
### Table 1. Price and Productivity Data

#### Percentage Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Consumer Price Index Increase</th>
<th>Nat'1 Real Per Capita Personal Income Increase</th>
<th>NH Real Per Capita Personal Income Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966/67-1967/68</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967/68-1968/69</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968/69-1969/70</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969/70-1970/71</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Increased</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970/71-1971/72 (projected)</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

(a) Fiscal years, July-June. The UNN real income picture would not be improved if the data were extended back to 1965/66.

(b) Increases in the fiscal year average index.

(c) Second quarter to second quarter; e.g., the first row values show the change between the second quarter 1966 to the second quarter 1967.

(d) The total increases are calculated as the sum of the year-to-year increases, and therefore neglect compounding effects.

(e) Estimated on the basis of the November 1969 to November 1970 experience.

**Sources:**

Table 2. Salary Data

Percentage Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year^a</th>
<th>Salary Increase for All UNM Faculty^b</th>
<th>Salary Increase for Prof.</th>
<th>Salary Increase for Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Salary Increase for Prof. Prof.</th>
<th>UNM Faculty Real Personal Income Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966/67-1967/68</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967/68-1968/69</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968/69-1969/70</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969/70-1970/71</td>
<td>6.7f</td>
<td>6.6^d</td>
<td>7.0^d</td>
<td>6.5^d</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Increase</td>
<td>24.2f</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970/71-1971/72 (projected)</td>
<td>7.0?</td>
<td>2.0?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(a) Fiscal years, July-June. The UNM real income picture would not be improved if the data were extended back to 1965/66.
(b) Excluding medical faculty.
(c) Salary increase for all UNM faculty minus the increase in the Consumer Price Index.
(d) This figure is the increase for the 427 faculty at UNM in both 1969/70 and 1970/71.
(e) The total increases are calculated as the sum of the year-to-year increases, and therefore neglect compounding effects.
(f) The average increase for all faculty exceeds the average for each rank. This is because the composition of the faculty shifted as follows: assistant professors: 1965/66, 40%; 1969/70, 34%; associate professors: 1965/66, 30%; 1969/70, 27%; professors: 1966/67, 30%; 1969/70, 39%.

Sources:
State of New Mexico, Board of Educational Finance, Analysis of Legislative Budget Requests for 1970/71, Table 18a.
State of New Mexico, Budget Estimate of the State Educational Instructions, University of New Mexico, 1970/71.
AAUP, Report on Academic Salary Data and Compensation Indices for the Academic Year 1970-71, University of New Mexico submission (prepared by Dr. H. S. Hendrickson).
The University of New Mexico Bulletin, catalogue issue, 1966/67 and 1970/71, Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1966-7</th>
<th>1967-8</th>
<th>1968-9</th>
<th>1969-70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNM</strong></td>
<td>16,410</td>
<td>15,361</td>
<td>16,074</td>
<td>16,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Public Univ.</td>
<td>15,028</td>
<td>16,121</td>
<td>17,140</td>
<td>18,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMN as % of All Public</td>
<td>95.89</td>
<td>95.29</td>
<td>93.78</td>
<td>91.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMN</td>
<td>11,555</td>
<td>12,337</td>
<td>12,496</td>
<td>12,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Public Univ.</td>
<td>11,243</td>
<td>12,022</td>
<td>12,864</td>
<td>13,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMN as % of All Public</td>
<td>102.78</td>
<td>105.62</td>
<td>97.14</td>
<td>95.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSISTANT PROFESSORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMN</td>
<td>9,350</td>
<td>9,783</td>
<td>10,168</td>
<td>10,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Public Univ.</td>
<td>9,267</td>
<td>9,937</td>
<td>10,502</td>
<td>11,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMN as % of All Public</td>
<td>100.90</td>
<td>98.45</td>
<td>96.27</td>
<td>95.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTRUCTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMN</td>
<td>6,887</td>
<td>7,233</td>
<td>7,552</td>
<td>8,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Public Univ.</td>
<td>7,106</td>
<td>7,546</td>
<td>8,052</td>
<td>8,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMN as % of All Public</td>
<td>96.92</td>
<td>95.03</td>
<td>93.79</td>
<td>94.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Money Needed to Hold 1966-7 Position</strong></td>
<td>125,076</td>
<td>142,639</td>
<td>133,451</td>
<td>7,412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Universities included (a) institutions which have a minimum of two professional schools, which offer the doctorate, and which conferred in the most recent three years an annual average of 15 or more earned doctorates covering a minimum of three non-related disciplines, and (b) the major public university within each state even though it does not meet the above criteria.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1967-8</th>
<th>1968-9</th>
<th>1969-70</th>
<th>2-Year % Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROFESSORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average</td>
<td>15,361</td>
<td>16,074</td>
<td>16,629</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Average</td>
<td>14,466</td>
<td>15,420</td>
<td>16,089</td>
<td>11.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Deviation</td>
<td>4895</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average</td>
<td>12,337</td>
<td>12,496</td>
<td>12,941</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Average</td>
<td>11,278</td>
<td>12,119</td>
<td>12,673</td>
<td>12.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Deviation</td>
<td>+1,059</td>
<td>+377</td>
<td>+268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSISTANT PROFESSORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average</td>
<td>9,783</td>
<td>10,160</td>
<td>10,470</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Average</td>
<td>9,490</td>
<td>10,160</td>
<td>10,701</td>
<td>12.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Deviation</td>
<td>+293</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTRUCTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average</td>
<td>7,233</td>
<td>7,552</td>
<td>8,105</td>
<td>12.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Average</td>
<td>7,382</td>
<td>7,841</td>
<td>8,308</td>
<td>12.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Deviation</td>
<td>-149</td>
<td>-289</td>
<td>-205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL RANKS COMBINED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average</td>
<td>11,742</td>
<td>12,412</td>
<td>13,003</td>
<td>10.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Average</td>
<td>11,161</td>
<td>12,031</td>
<td>12,628</td>
<td>13.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Deviation</td>
<td>+581</td>
<td>+581</td>
<td>+375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This survey covers the following schools:
- University of Arizona
- University of Colorado
- Colorado State University
- University of Idaho
- University of Montana
- Montana State University
- University of Nevada
- University of New Mexico
- University of Utah
- Utah State University
- University of Wyoming
- New Mexico State University
## Comparison of UNM Average Salaries with Those at Other State-Supported Universities

(Data Source: Massachusetts Salary Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1960-9</th>
<th>1960-70</th>
<th>$ Inc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average</td>
<td>16,074</td>
<td>16,629</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Sample Average</td>
<td>16,841</td>
<td>17,852</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average as % of Sample Average</td>
<td>95.45</td>
<td>95.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Deficit</td>
<td>-767</td>
<td>-1,223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Faculty Teaching at Schools with Higher Average Salary than UNM</td>
<td>79.08</td>
<td>83.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Professors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average</td>
<td>12,496</td>
<td>12,941</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Sample Average</td>
<td>12,841</td>
<td>13,557</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average as % of Sample Average</td>
<td>93.71</td>
<td>95.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Deficit</td>
<td>-345</td>
<td>-616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Faculty Teaching at Schools with Higher Average Salary than UNM</td>
<td>80.85</td>
<td>87.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Professors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average</td>
<td>10,165</td>
<td>10,470</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Sample Average</td>
<td>10,493</td>
<td>11,151</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average as % of Sample Average</td>
<td>95.90</td>
<td>95.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Deficit</td>
<td>-325</td>
<td>-681</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Faculty Teaching at Schools with Higher Average Salary than UNM</td>
<td>86.72</td>
<td>94.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average</td>
<td>7,552</td>
<td>8,103</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Sample Average</td>
<td>8,059</td>
<td>8,618</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average as % of Sample Average</td>
<td>93.59</td>
<td>94.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Deficit</td>
<td>-517</td>
<td>-515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Faculty Teaching at Schools with Higher Average Salary than UNM</td>
<td>87.19</td>
<td>79.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Ranks Combined (Excludes Lecturers)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average</td>
<td>12,418</td>
<td>13,018</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Sample Average</td>
<td>12,635</td>
<td>13,453</td>
<td>6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average as % of Sample Average</td>
<td>98.28</td>
<td>98.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Deficit</td>
<td>-217</td>
<td>-435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study covers the following schools:

(a) The major state university in each state except for Indiana, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, and Wyoming. New York is represented by both SUNY at Albany and SUNY at Buffalo. University of California is reported as a system.

(b) Colorado State, Florida State, Purdue, Iowa State, Michigan State, and Wayne State.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1966-7</th>
<th>1969-70</th>
<th>3-Year $ Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROFESSORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Average</td>
<td>14,394</td>
<td>16,637</td>
<td>15.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Average</td>
<td>13,749</td>
<td>16,566</td>
<td>20.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM as % of Sample</td>
<td>104.69</td>
<td>100.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Average</td>
<td>11,580</td>
<td>12,961</td>
<td>11.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Average</td>
<td>10,673</td>
<td>12,849</td>
<td>20.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM as % of Sample</td>
<td>100.50</td>
<td>100.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSISTANT PROFESSORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Average</td>
<td>9,234</td>
<td>10,460</td>
<td>13.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Average</td>
<td>8,983</td>
<td>10,759</td>
<td>19.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM as % of Sample</td>
<td>100.79</td>
<td>97.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTRUCTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Average</td>
<td>8,982</td>
<td>7,890</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Average</td>
<td>8,203</td>
<td>8,203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM as % of Sample</td>
<td>100.11</td>
<td>95.03</td>
<td>19.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL RANKS COMBINED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Average</td>
<td>10,902</td>
<td>12,859</td>
<td>17.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Average</td>
<td>10,372</td>
<td>12,671</td>
<td>22.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM as % of Sample</td>
<td>100.11</td>
<td>101.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This survey covers the following state universities and land-grant schools:

- Arizona State University
- Colorado State University
- Idaho State University
- Kansas State University
- Montana State University
- Nevada State University
- New Mexico State University
- North Dakota State University
- Oregon State University
- South Dakota State University
- Texas A&M University
- Utah State University
- Washington State University
- Wyoming State University
### Comparison of UNM Salaries with Those at 12 Other State Universities (Group A) and with 14 Other State-Supported Schools (Group B)
(Data Source: Salary Survey by Arizona Board of Regents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A Schools</th>
<th>Group B Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ Inc.</td>
<td>$ Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average</td>
<td>16,075</td>
<td>16,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Group Av</td>
<td>17,016</td>
<td>17,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Deviation</td>
<td>-941</td>
<td>-1,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Professors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average</td>
<td>12,492</td>
<td>12,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Group Av</td>
<td>12,779</td>
<td>13,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Deviation</td>
<td>-267</td>
<td>-457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Professors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>10,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Group Av</td>
<td>10,563</td>
<td>11,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Deviation</td>
<td>-483</td>
<td>-682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average</td>
<td>7,583</td>
<td>7,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Group Av</td>
<td>8,050</td>
<td>8,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Deviation</td>
<td>-467</td>
<td>-662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Ranks Combined</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Average</td>
<td>12,253</td>
<td>12,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Rank</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Group Av</td>
<td>13,109</td>
<td>13,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Deviation</td>
<td>-856</td>
<td>-1,003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group A Schools:**
- University of Arizona
- Arizona State University
- University of Colorado
- University of Iowa
- University of Michigan
- University of Missouri
- University of New Mexico
- Ohio State University
- University of Utah
- University of Texas at Austin
- University of Washington
- University of Wisconsin

**Group B Schools:**
- Southern Arizona University
- Colorado State University
- Indiana State University
- Central Michigan University
- University of Nevada
- University of New Mexico
- New Mexico State University
- Miami University (Ohio)
- Oregon State University
- University of Texas at Arlington
- University of Texas at El Paso
- Utah State University
- Washington State University
- Wisconsin State University
- University of Wyoming
Table 8. "Penalized" Universities Compared with UNM:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Average 1969/70 Total Compensation</th>
<th>Average 1966/70 Salaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State Univ.</td>
<td>$14,787</td>
<td>$13,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of South Dakota</td>
<td>11,903</td>
<td>11,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State Univ.</td>
<td>14,645</td>
<td>12,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Univ.</td>
<td>16,045</td>
<td>13,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Wisconsin</td>
<td>14,894</td>
<td>13,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Colorado</td>
<td>14,449</td>
<td>13,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Calif.</td>
<td>16,666</td>
<td>14,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn. State Univ.</td>
<td>12,284b</td>
<td>11,750b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State Univ.</td>
<td>15,035</td>
<td>13,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM</td>
<td>13,553</td>
<td>13,003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Mentioned as the objects of legislative displeasure in N.M. Chambers, Appropriations of State Tax Funds for Operating Expenses of Higher Education, 1969/70, and 1970/71, Office of Institutional Research, National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

(b) 1968/69 figures.