The Faculty Senate will meet on Tuesday, November 11, 1986 at 3:30 p.m. 
IN THE KIVA.

The agenda will include the following items:

(pp. 1-5)  
1. Summarized minutes of October 9, 1986
2. Memorial Minute for Professor Emeritus Hugh Miller-Dean Emeritus Donald McRae
3. Senate President's Report--Professor Jack Omdahl
4. Announcements from the Floor

(pp. 6-7)  
5. Resolutions re International Peace Week--Professor Colston Chandler
6. Discussion re Pending Mesa del Sol Sale--President Omdahl

(pp. 7-9)  
7. Discontinuance of Current ACT for Credit Policy--Professor Charlie Steen
8. Items from the Curricula Committee--Professor David Null
   (a) Delete AS Program in Instrumental Engineering
   (b) Delete AS Program in Medical Engineering Technology

(pp. 12-27)  
9. Student Grievance Procedure--Professor Garrett Flickinger
10. Report from the T-VI Liaison Committee--Professor Tom Kyner
11. Progress Report re Decentralization of Graduate Studies--Professor Marian Shelton

(pp. 28)  
12. Committee Appointments--Professor Mary Ellen Hanson
The November 11, 1986 meeting of the UNM Faculty Senate was called to order by President Jack Omdahl at 3:35 p.m., in the Kiva.

The minutes of October 14, 1986 were approved as distributed.

Memorial Minute. Dean Emeritus Donald McRae presented a Memorial Minute for Professor Emeritus Hugh M. Miller. The Senate adopted the Minute by a rising vote and Secretary Brown was asked to send a copy to Mrs. Miller.

Senate President's Report. President Jack Omdahl said that the administrative reviews for Chris Garcia and Carroll Lee are proceeding as was directed by the Senate. In agreement with Dr. Garcia the evaluation as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences will accent past performance in the operation and organization of the office of the Dean and it is intended that the acquired information be used to facilitate his pending role as Vice President for Academic Affairs as well as to enhance the organizational aspects of the position of the Dean of Arts and Sciences. The appointment of an interim dean for Arts and Sciences is in pending and will be announced by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Senator Jane Slaughter and President Omdahl met with several student Senators and discussed lobbying efforts with regard to the next legislative session. Students from UNM, State, Tech, and Eastern will be spearheading efforts with regard to the proposed tuition increases. The UNM lobbying committee is in the process of developing specific strategies for presenting UNM's message in a unified manner to the Legislature.

President Omdahl concluded his remarks by saying that UNM's priority for capital outlay projects to be presented to the Legislature will be improvements for classrooms and lecture halls.

Announcements from the Floor. Senator Lawrence Straus said that he understood that the Regents are now requiring all University personnel to use one travel agency when making travel plans, and he questioned this action. It was pointed out that the mandate came from university administration, not the Regents and President Omdahl said that he would clarify the matter at the next Senate meeting.

Resolution re Peace Week. Professor Colston Chandler told the Senate that the week of November 10-16, 1986 has been endorsed by the American Federation of Scientists (USA) and the Union of Concerned Scientists as the First International Peace Week of Scientists. The purpose is to foster discussion about what is to be done about the threat of nuclear war and about questions of arms control. Topics specifically to be addressed are the arms race, arms control, verification issues, a comprehensive test ban, the impact of scientific developments on international security, the economic impact of the arms race, SDI research, the use of space for military purposes, and alternative forms of defense. He said that because these issues are of paramount
importance to the continuity of life on this earth, he believes it is imperative that the University of New Mexico foster such discussions. Upon his recommendation, the Senate approved the following statement:

The Faculty Senate of the University of New Mexico

(1) encourages participation by members of the university community in the First International Peace Week of Scientists, November 10-16, 1986, and

(2) supports a plan of daily programs on these topics during that week, concluding with a public teleconference linking a panel of local scientists with the International Scientists Peace Conference in Hamburg, Germany.

Resolution re Mesa del Sol. Upon recommendation by Professor Jane Slaughter for the Operations Committee, the Senate approved the following resolution:

The Faculty Senate wishes to support the prudent decision of the Board of Regents and the President to prevent the sale of the Mesa del Sol land at this time, and commends them for defending the interest of the University and preserving the public trust.

Items from the Curricula Committee. Professor David Null, Chair of the Curricula Committee, explained that the Committee recommends deleting two programs from the University’s course offerings. He further stated that the two programs—Associate of Science in Instrumentation Engineering and Associate of Science in Medical Engineering—have not been offered during the last two years because no students were enrolled. The Senate approved the deletion of the two programs as requested.

Student Grievance Procedure. Senator Garrett Flickinger told the Senate that the Student Grievance Procedure as printed in the agenda is brought to the Senate in order that due process procedures for students may be standardized. He said that he would like for the Senate to approve the procedures in principle and allow the committee and University counsel to work out the final wording of the document.

Professor Flickinger raised several areas of concern and the Senate approved the following changes to be sent to the Committee for its consideration.

1. In section 2.3.2, the last sentence was changed to read “The student and/or the faculty member shall be allowed to bring an advisor to the hearing, but legal counsel shall not be permitted.”

2. Change Section 2.3.5 to allow legal counsel at this level of the hearing.

3. The timelines throughout the document may be unreasonable, and the Committee was asked to look into this and make changes as appropriate.

4. The word “request” in the third sentence of paragraph 2.3.6 was changed to read “require” and the Committee was asked to smooth the awkward wording of the section.

5. University Counsel Nick Estes said that he would like to have more time to consider section 4.2.3, and the Senate agreed that this section could be eliminated at this time to be reinserted into the document later.

6. It was the consensus of the Senate that the words “reverse or modify” should be deleted from the first sentence in section 5.4.2, and University Counsel was asked to study this section further.
Professor Flickinger asked the Senate to allow the School of Law to substitute its Honor Code for Section 3 of the document; however, it was the feeling of the Senate that no school or college should be excluded from the procedures as presented. This matter should be discussed with the University Counsel and should be brought back to the Senate at a later date.

No formal action was taken on the document as a whole. It was understood that after changes have been made it will be brought back to the Senate for consideration.

Discontinuance of Current ACT for Credit Policy. Professor Charles Steen, Chair of the Admissions and Registration Committee, said that at its meeting of October 8, the Committee voted unanimously to discontinue the current American College Test (ACT) for credit policy. The Committee recommends this action because granting of credit by means of ACT has often resulted in confusion since students did not necessarily want nor need the credit and the system automatically awarded credit. In several instances, the ACT credit resulted in students exhausting their eligibility in University College before they were ready to transfer to degree status, thereby creating another administrative complication. The Committee suggests that a credit by examination policy should be limited to those tests designed for that purpose and the ACT is no longer relevant for the University as a whole.

The Senate approved the discontinuance of the Current ACT for Credit Policy.

Report from the T-VI Liaison Task Force. Professor Tom Kynor said that the Task Force is considering the matter of dual enrollment between UNM and T-VI; however, the matter of UNM faculty teaching at other institutions is not an appropriate item to be addressed by the Task Force which was formed for a specific purpose, i.e., the transfer of programs to T-VI.

Several Senators expressed concern about the impact on UNM as a result of full-time faculty teaching at both UNM and other institutions, and Senator Ted Turner moved that an appropriate committee of the Senate be appointed to investigate the matter and give a progress report at the next Senate meeting. The motion carried. It was suggested that the committee coordinate with the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee and differentiate between teaching at local institutions and teaching while on sabbatical.

Decentralization of Graduate Studies. Due to the lateness of the hour, this item was postponed until the December Senate meeting.

Committee Assignments. Upon recommendation by Professor Mary Ellen Hanson for the Operations Committee, the Senate approved the following committee assignments: Gordon Johnson (Biology) as replacement for Martin Bradshaw (Electrical and Computer Engineering) on the Library Committee; and Peter Divasto (Family, Community and Emergency Medicine) as replacement for Fred Ragdale (Law) on the University Press Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne J. Brown, Secretary
The week of November 10-16, 1986 has been endorsed by the American Federation of Scientists (USA) and the Union of Concerned Scientists as the First International Peace Week of Scientists. The purpose is to foster discussions about what is to be done about the threat of nuclear war and about questions of arms control. Specifically to be addressed are the arms race, arms control, verification issues, a comprehensive test ban, the impact of scientific developments on international security, the economic impact of the arms race, SDI research, the use of space for military purposes, and alternative forms of defense.

Because these issues are of paramount importance to the continuity of life on this earth, it is appropriate, even imperative, that the University of New Mexico foster such discussions. I ask that the Faculty Senate approve the following:

The Faculty Senate of the University of New Mexico

(1) encourages participation by members of the university community in the First International Peace Week of Scientists, November 10-16, 1986, and

(2) supports a plan of daily programs on these topics during that week, concluding with a public teleconference linking a panel of local scientists with the International Scientists Peace Conference in Hamburg, Germany.
At its meeting October 8th, the Faculty Committee on Admissions and Registration voted unanimously to discontinue the current American College Test (ACT) for credit policy.

I have attached a copy of the request and am asking that this be brought before the Faculty Senate at an upcoming meeting for approval. I am prepared to make the presentation and to be available for questions from the Senators.
October 8, 1986

TO: Members of the Faculty Admissions and Registration Committee

FR: Robert M. Weaver, Dean of Admissions and Records

SUBJECT: Discontinuance of Current ACT for Credit Policy

In 1979 the University initiated the policy of awarding general credit and advanced standing for high scores on the American College Test (see page 20 of current UNM Catalog.) The Testing Division under the leadership of Dr. Rod Young offered this proposition after much study. The Office of Admissions and Records at the time, after Committee and Faculty Senate approvals, implemented the policy.

The Testing Division and the Office of Admissions and Records now recommends dropping this test for credit program.

The ACT-Credit policy was based on the high correlations between the ACT tests and the CLEP General Examinations which allowed for the substitution of ACT for CLEP. This was done for two reasons: (1) ACT would be considerably less expensive than CLEP and (2) ACT-Credit would serve as a recruiting tool for high scoring students.

The recommendation to phase out the ACT-Credit policy is based on the experience we have gained in working with the policy and some recent changes in the testing situation at UNM.

First the granting of credit by means of ACT has often resulted in confusion because students did not necessarily want nor need the credit and the system automatically awarded the credit. In several instances, the ACT credit even resulted in students exhausting their eligibility in University College before they were ready to transfer to degree status, thereby creating another administrative complication. In regard to its recruiting advantage, the percentage of students in the top ACT-Composite interval (26-36) rose from 11 percent in 1979 to 13 percent in 1980 and has remained at about 12 percent since. There may be a slight effect from the ACT-Credit policy but what was probably going on was a gradual rise in scores resulting largely from changes in admission policies, creation of a skills program (encouraging students to prepare themselves better), and creation of the General College (removing lesser prepared students from the averages). The recruitment advantage—if any—has been slight. Any capable student could always take the CLEP.
Recent changes in the testing situation also support a reversal of the ACT-Credit policy. The acceptance of SAT (last year) on a par with ACT except for credit creates an awkward inequity. Establishing credit through SAT could also be done through equivalencies but the chance for error would increase substantially. The more prudent approach seems to be to reverse the policy and use only those tests for granting credit that are designed for granting credit, which would minimize error rather than increase the error by adding another test for granting credit.

It is particularly appropriate that this change be made now. One of the reasons for adding ACT was to reduce the cost to the students. CLEP is still more expensive but because of the availability of computerized local scoring CLEP tests can be offered for about $18 to $20 rather than the customary $32. This new local scoring system became available July 1, 1986.

In general, it is my recommendation that the ACT-Credit policy be phased out. The research suggested that such a policy was worthwhile but what we have learned about the policy's effects in conjunction with the addition of the SAT and the lower prices on the CLEP suggests that a credit by examination policy should be limited to those tests designed for that purpose.
**FORM C
MAJOR AND MINOR CURRICULAR CHANGES**

Date: May 21, 1986

**Associate of Science in Instrumentation Engr.**

**College of Engineering** (ASIE)

**RECEIVED**
MAY 27, 1986

**DEAN'S OFFICE**

**GENERAL LIBRARY**

I. Major Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Revision of</th>
<th>Deletion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>existing degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>existing major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>existing minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>existing concentration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Give exact title and requirements as they should appear in the catalog in the space provided or on attached sheets.

II. Minor Change

Minor name change of existing degree, major, minor, or concentration.

Minor program revision (3-5 hours)

Reasons for Request (attach extra sheets if necessary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Request</th>
<th>No Longer Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Effective Date of Proposed Change: 1, 1986

Semester Year

Budgetary and Faculty Load Implications: (attach statements) None

Might this change impinge in any significant way on student or departmental programs? Yes  No X

If yes, have you resolved these issues with department involved? (attach statement)

Signature: Department Chair

Approvals:

- Dean of Library Services
- College Curricula Committee (if necessary)
- College or School Faculty
- College or School Dean
- FS Undergraduate Ac. Affairs
- FS Graduate Committee
- Office of Graduate Studies
- FS Curricula Committee
- Provost
- Faculty Senate
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3. College or School Faculty
4. College or School Dean
5. FS Undergraduate Academic Affairs Comm. and/or FS Graduate Comm.
6. Office of Graduate Studies (For grad. level changes)
7. FS Curricula Committee
8. Provost
9. Faculty Senate
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<td>Revision of existing minor</td>
<td>Deletion</td>
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<td>Concentration</td>
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<td>Revision of existing concentration</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Give exact title and requirements as they should appear in the catalog in the space provided or on attached sheets.
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Minor name change of existing degree, major, minor, or concentration.
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No longer offered
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1.1. General

The UNM Student Standards and Grievance Procedure is intended to provide procedures for the resolution of disputes between students and faculty or staff of the University, as well as procedures for handling student disciplinary matters. The following categories of disputes or disciplinary matters are provided for in the sections indicated. Any questions about these procedures should be directed to the Office of the Dean of Students.

1.2. Academic Disputes

Disputes arising within the academic process shall follow the procedures set forth in Article 2, unless they involve allegations of academic dishonesty (handled under Article 3) or allegations of discrimination (handled by the UNM Affirmative Action Office as discussed below).

1.3. Disciplinary Matters

Disciplinary proceedings brought against students, other than allegations of academic dishonesty, shall be handled under the procedures set forth in Articles 4 and 5.

1.4. Branch Colleges

Student grievances or disciplinary matters arising on the branch colleges shall be handled under these procedures as modified in Article 6.

1.5. Matters Not Included Under These Procedures

a. Grievances based on alleged discrimination based on sex, marital or parental status, race, religion, age, national origin, physical handicap, sexual orientation, military involvement, or alleged sexual harassment, are handled by the UNM Affirmative Action Office under procedures set forth in the UNM Affirmative Action Manual. The Affirmative Action Manual requires that all complaints be submitted in written form to the Affirmative Action Office within ninety (90) days of the grievant's becoming aware of the alleged discriminatory action.

b. Disputes involving access to or information in a student's educational records shall follow procedures set forth in the UNM Student Records Policy Guidelines, published in the Pathfinder.
c. Grievances of student employees of the University shall follow procedures set forth in the UNM Student Employee Grievance Procedure, published in the Pathfinder.

d. Disputes involving matters occurring in the Residence Halls shall follow the procedures set forth in the Residence Hall Handbook.

e. Any student grievances concerning decisions made by University personnel, outside the academic process, for which specific procedures are not established shall be resolved between the student and the office or department involved. If no resolution is reached the parties may appeal to the appropriate dean or director and then to the appropriate Vice President. Appeals should be filed in writing within one week of the decision below.

ARTICLE 2. ACADEMIC DISPUTES

2.1. Scope

This section sets forth the procedures which should be followed by a student who believes that he or she has been unfairly or improperly treated by a faculty member or by administrative staff in connection with the academic process. For example, it applies to disputes over grades, decisions about program or degree requirements or eligibility, or claims that course requirements are unfair.

2.2. Informal Resolution

2.2.1. The student should first try to resolve the grievance informally by discussing the grievance with the faculty or staff member as soon as reasonably possible after the matter arises. If the student and faculty or staff member cannot reach agreement, the student should discuss the grievance with the chairperson of the department or division or with the staff member's supervisor. If the grievance is still not resolved, the student should discuss the grievance with the Dean of the appropriate college.

2.2.2. In these informal discussions, the chairperson, supervisor, or Dean is encouraged actively to mediate the dispute. In particular he or she should talk to both the student and the faculty or staff member, separately or together, and should examine any relevant evidence, including
2.2.3. These informal discussions shall be completed within two weeks of the occurrence upon which the grievance is based.

2.3. Formal Appeals of Academic Matters

If the informal discussions do not resolve the grievance, the student may bring a formal appeal using the procedures set forth in the following sections. This appeal process shall begin within one week following the informal discussions.

2.3.1. The student shall make a written complaint to the Dean of the college. The complaint should describe the grievance, including a statement of what happened, and the student's reasons for challenging the action or decision. The complaint should also describe the student's attempts to resolve the grievance informally. The student may attach copies of any relevant documents. The student shall send copies of the complaint to the faculty or staff member and his or her chairperson or supervisor. The faculty or staff member shall have one week to respond in writing to the Dean.

2.3.2. In deciding the appeal, the Dean shall receive and review any written evidence or statements submitted by the parties, and shall provide both parties the opportunity to review and respond to all evidence. The Dean shall interview each party and may interview other persons with relevant information. In his or her discretion, the Dean may decide to hold an informal hearing involving both parties and any witnesses. Where the dispute primarily concerns factual questions, rather than matters of academic judgment, the Dean should normally hold such a hearing. If a hearing is to be held, the Dean will give the parties five days notice. The student shall be allowed to bring an advisor to the hearing, but legal counsel and cross-examination of parties or witnesses normally shall not be permitted.

2.3.3. The Dean in his or her discretion may convene an advisory committee to hold a hearing or otherwise help him or her evaluate the dispute. For this purpose the Dean may utilize a standing committee appointed within the Dean's college.
2.3.4. The Dean shall issue a written decision explaining his or her findings, conclusions, and reasons for the decision. The decision shall be sent to each party, and to the chairperson or supervisor of the faculty or staff member. The decision shall be made within two weeks after the complaint is filed, unless an informal hearing is held, in which case the decision shall be made within three weeks.

2.3.5. Either party may appeal the Dean's decision within one week to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Vice President shall resolve the grievance utilizing any procedures available to the Dean set out above.

2.3.6. The chairperson, Dean, or Vice President may not overrule a faculty member's academic judgment. However, the student may request that the decision in the case be made part of his or her academic record. The Vice President in his or her discretion may refer the matter to the Faculty Ethics and Advisory Committee for consideration of disciplinary action against the faculty member involved, if such action appears warranted.

ARTICLE 3. ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

3.1. Scope

This section sets forth procedures which shall be followed in cases of suspected academic dishonesty. The rules defining academic dishonesty are set forth in the University of New Mexico Catalog, the Faculty Handbook, and in the Pathfinder. Academic dishonesty includes but is not limited to cheating, plagiarism, or other instances of taking credit for work performed by others, and also instances of hindering the academic work of other students.

3.2. Academic Dishonesty within Courses: Faculty-Imposed Sanctions

3.2.1. When a violation of the academic dishonesty rules appears to have occurred within the academic process, the faculty member shall discuss the apparent violation with the student as soon as possible and give the student an opportunity to explain. After this discussion, the faculty member may impose an appropriate sanction within the scope of the academic activity, such as grade reduction and/or involuntary withdrawal from the
course. The faculty member shall notify the student of the academic sanction.

3.2.2. The faculty member may report the matter in writing to the Dean of Students and the chairperson of the department. The report shall describe the facts, including the discussion with the student and any resulting sanction. A copy of such report shall be sent to the student.

3.2.3. The student may challenge a faculty-imposed sanction through the formal academic appeals process, set forth in Article 2. At the student's request, the Dean shall hold an informal hearing as provided in Section 2.3.2. At such hearing, the student will be given a fair opportunity to explain the matter and, if the student desires, present witnesses with pertinent information or other evidence. The student may appeal the Dean's decision to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, as provided in Section 2.3.4. The student may have the final decision made part of his or her academic record.

3.3. Academic Dishonesty in Other Settings

When academic dishonesty occurs in connection with any test or examination not connected with a course, but administered by an officer of the University or in connection with any non-disclosure or misrepresentation in filling out applications or other University records, the person under whose auspices the violation occurs shall transmit in writing to the Dean of Students a statement describing the occurrence. A copy shall be sent to the student. The Dean of Students shall determine the sanction following the procedures for Disciplinary Procedures set forth in Article 4. The student may appeal following the procedures set forth in Article 5.

3.4. Additional Sanctions

3.4.1. Upon receiving a report of academic dishonesty from a faculty member pursuant to Section 3.2.2., the Dean of Students may discuss the matter with the student and faculty member, may decide to impose an additional sanction beyond that imposed by the faculty member, or may decide that the matter should be referred to the Student Standards and Grievance Committee for a determination of whether additional sanctions are warranted. Any decision made...
A decision of the Committee concerning alleged academic dishonesty may be appealed to the Vice President for Academic Affairs under the procedures set forth in Article 5.

ARTICLE 4. DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES

4.1. Prohibited Conduct

This section sets forth procedures to be followed in cases of disciplinary measures imposed for student misconduct other than academic dishonesty. Prohibited acts include those set forth in the Code of Conduct (Section 6 of the Regents' Statement of Policy, Rights and Responsibilities at the University of New Mexico). The Code of Conduct is printed both in the Pathfinder and in the Faculty Handbook.

4.2. Referral of Misconduct to Dean of Students' Office

4.2.1. Any member of the University community may refer an allegation of misconduct on the University campus to the Dean of Students' Office. The Dean of Students has primary authority to deal with disciplinary matters.

4.2.2. The Dean of Students or his or her designee will consult with the student involved, review relevant evidence and consult with other parties with relevant information. The Dean or designee shall tell the student the results of any such consultations and shall allow the student to respond. Then the Dean or designee shall take one of the following actions:

a. Dismiss the matter after having dealt with it informally.

b. Impose one of the following disciplinary measures as defined in the Code of Conduct: censure, warning or disciplinary probation.

c. Propose a tentative sanction of suspension or expulsion, effective in two weeks unless the student requests a hearing before the Student Standards and Grievance Committee, in which case the Committee shall determine what sanction if any to impose.
4.2.3. In determining what disciplinary action should be taken, the Dean or Committee may consider whether any official off-campus action has been taken or is likely to be taken against the person charged, and whether such off-campus action is sufficient sanction. The Dean or Committee may delay the decision until final off-campus action has been taken.

4.2.4. The student may appeal any disciplinary measure imposed by the Dean of Students to the Student Standards and Grievance Committee.

4.3. Emergency Suspension

4.3.1. The Dean of Students may immediately suspend a student if the Dean concludes that the student’s continued presence on the campus may endanger persons or property or may threaten disruption of the academic process or other campus functions.

4.3.2. When a student has been immediately suspended by the Dean of Students under this section, the student may request that the Dean hold an informal hearing to consider whether the emergency suspension should be continued. The hearing shall be held as soon as possible (no later than one week) after the student's request. The Dean of Students shall give the student an opportunity to explain his or her position and shall receive evidence or hear from witnesses with pertinent information, if requested by the student.

4.3.3. After the hearing, if the Dean finds that the student’s continued presence may endanger persons or property or threaten disruption of the academic process or other campus functions, the Dean shall continue the suspension. Otherwise, the emergency suspension shall be revoked.

4.3.4. An emergency hearing under this subsection is not intended to be a substitute for or to preclude the normal disciplinary sanctions and appeals process set out in this Article and in Article 5.
ARTICLE 5. STUDENT STANDARDS AND GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

5.1. Jurisdiction

The Student Standards and Grievance Committee has jurisdiction over the following matters:

5.1.1. Disciplinary proceedings—when a student appeals a decision of the Dean of Students under Article 4 or other disciplinary measures imposed on a student outside the academic process or when a student requests a hearing on a proposed sanction of suspension or expulsion under Section 4.2.2.c.

5.1.2. Academic dishonesty—when a student appeals a sanction imposed by the Dean of Students under Sections 3.3 or 3.4, or when the Dean of Students refers the matter to the Committee under Section 3.4.1.

5.1.3. Appeals from the Student Court or other campus boards or committees, where appeal to the Student Standards and Grievance Committee is provided for in their rules or bylaws.

5.2. Composition

5.2.1. The Student Standards and Grievance Committee shall be composed of a graduate and an undergraduate panel of five individuals each. Each panel shall be composed of two faculty and two faculty alternates, and two students and two student alternates (graduate or undergraduate, depending on the panel), who will choose a fifth member from an area of the University community considered appropriate by the other four members. Each panel shall serve for one academic year. The faculty members shall be named by the Faculty Senate. The student members shall be named by the GSA or ASUMN, depending on the panel.

5.2.2. A panel quorum shall consist of five members or alternates. A majority vote of the quorum is required for the panel to make a decision. A permanent chairperson for each panel shall be chosen by the panel members at the beginning of the academic year.

5.2.3. The Dean of Students shall designate an Administrator of the Committee to advise and assist the Committee and maintain all necessary records.
5.2.4. Members have the right to disqualify themselves from a case. If challenged by interested parties, they may be disqualified for cause by the permanent chairperson. A permanent chairperson may be disqualified for cause by the Vice President for Student Affairs.

5.3. Rules Governing Proceedings Before the Committee

5.3.1. Statement and Answer

a. Proceedings before the Committee shall be commenced by a written statement to the Administrator of the Committee from the party seeking the hearing ("the petitioner"). The statement shall state the facts and the reasons for seeking the hearing. A copy of the statement shall be sent to the other party ("the respondent") by the Administrator.

b. Within one week of receipt of the statement, the respondent shall submit a written answer to the Administrator and the Administrator shall mail a copy to the petitioner. The answer shall respond to the substance of the statement. At the discretion of the Administrator, the time for the answer may be extended to two weeks. If the respondent fails to file an answer, the Committee may proceed without it.

c. Within one week of receipt of the statement and answer, the Administrator shall convene the appropriate panel of the Committee. The panel shall decide whether or not the circumstances warrant a full hearing. A full hearing will always be held at the student's request if the dispute involves a disciplinary proceeding or an academic dishonesty matter. If a hearing is to be held, the Administrator, after consulting with the interested parties, shall set a date and place for the hearing while the University is in session, allowing the parties a reasonable time to prepare their cases, normally not to exceed two weeks.

d. Statements and answers shall be sent by mail and shall be deemed received three days after mailing.

5.3.2. Hearings Before the Committee
a. Unless both parties request a public hearing, the hearing before the Committee shall be private.

b. If any material facts are in dispute, testimony of witnesses and other evidence shall be received.

c. Each party shall have the option of being represented by legal counsel or an adviser at his or her own expense.

d. The parties, their representatives, and Committee members shall have the right, within reasonable limits set by the chairperson, to question all witnesses who testify orally.

e. The Committee may proceed independently to secure evidence for the hearing. Both parties shall have access to any such evidence at least two days before the hearing and shall have opportunity to respond.

f. A taped recording of the proceedings shall be kept by the Administrator until any appeal has been concluded. No typed record shall normally be made.

g. Any person charged with violation of University rules shall have, when needed, the aid of the University administration and the Committee, in obtaining the information necessary to answer the charges made against him or her or requesting the attendance of witnesses at the hearing. When a witness is unable to attend a scheduled hearing, the witness may make a written and signed statement which may introduced at the hearing. The statement shall be disclosed to the other party sufficiently in advance to permit the other party to contact the witness and to prepare for appropriate rebuttal at the hearing.

h. The Committee is not required to follow judicial rules of evidence.

5.3.3. Consideration of the Case by the Committee.

a. After hearing the evidence, the Committee...
may request or accept written arguments from the parties and defer ruling on the case for no more than one week until such written arguments have been reviewed.

b. The Committee shall deliberate in closed session. The Committee’s decision shall be based solely on the hearing, the evidence, and the papers filed by the parties.

c. The Committee shall issue a written opinion containing its findings of fact, conclusions, and recommended actions. The opinion shall be issued within two weeks of receipt of all the evidence and arguments. The opinion shall be sent to each party.

5.4. Appeal to Vice President

5.4.1. Either party may appeal the Committee’s decision to the Vice President for Student Affairs. If the grievance involves academic dishonesty, however, any appeal shall be to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. On appeal the Vice President shall review the Committee’s opinion and the evidence and may request additional oral or written arguments or hold an informal hearing.

5.4.2. The Vice President shall affirm, reverse or modify the Committee’s decision or remand to the Committee to gather further evidence. The Vice President’s written decision, along with a statement of findings and reasons, shall be sent to the parties and to the Committee. The Vice President’s decision shall be based on the record of the Committee proceedings and on the results of any new arguments or hearing.

5.5. Records of the Committee

The Administrator of the Committee shall keep a record of Committee actions to be filed at the end of each academic year in the office of the Dean of Students.

ARTICLE 6. BRANCH CAMPUSES

6.1. Applicability

These Student Grievance Procedures shall, to the extent applicable, apply to the UNM branch campuses at Gallup, Los Alamos, and Valencia County. Because of differences in
administrative structure between the branch and main campuses, however, some modifications to these rules are necessary. The following sections identify those modifications.

6.2. Decision Makers at Branch Campuses

6.2.1. Any role assigned to the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall, on a branch campus, be carried out by the Campus Director.

6.2.2. Any role assigned to the Vice President for Student Affairs shall, on a branch campus, be carried out by the Campus Director.

6.2.3. Any role assigned to the Dean of a College shall, on a branch campus, be carried out by the Associate Director for Instruction.

6.2.4. Any role assigned to the Dean of Students shall, on a branch campus, be carried out by the Coordinator/Director of Student Services.

6.2.5. Any role assigned to the Student Standards and Grievance Committee shall, on a branch campus, be carried out by that branch's Student Affairs Committee.

6.3. Student Affairs Committees

Article 5, governing the Student Standards and Grievance Committee, shall govern the Student Affairs Committees, except that the members of the Committees shall be faculty or students at each branch. The faculty members shall be named by the faculty of the branch. The student members shall be named by the students of the branch.

6.4. Jurisdiction Disputes

Jurisdiction disputes on a branch campus shall be decided by the Campus Director, rather than by the ad hoc committee defined in Section 7.2.

6.5. Appeals to Main Campus

6.5.1. The procedures set out above provide for appeal up to the level of Campus Director. If a party disputes the Campus Director's decision, he or she may appeal to main campus as follows.

6.5.2. Appeals from decisions made under Articles 2 and 3 (Academic Disputes and Academic Dishonesty) shall be made to the Vice President
for Academic Affairs. Appeals from decisions of the Student Affairs Committee under Article 5 shall be made to the Vice President for Academic Affairs if academic dishonesty is involved, and to the Vice President for Student Affairs otherwise. The Vice President's written decision, along with a statement of findings and reasons, shall be sent to the parties and to the Campus Director.

ARTICLE 7. GENERAL PROVISIONS

7.1. Time Limits and Extensions

7.1.1. Unless stated otherwise or extended in writing, the time limit for a decisionmaker to issue a decision is two weeks if no hearing is held and three weeks if a hearing is held.

7.1.2. Unless stated otherwise in these rules or extended in writing under 7.1.4., the time limit to file an appeal is one week after the decision appealed. If the decision is given in person, the one-week period shall begin at that time. If the decision is mailed, the one-week period shall begin on receipt, which shall be deemed to be three days after mailing.

7.1.3. If a time limit is exceeded by a decisionmaker, the student may appeal to the next step before receiving a decision. If a time limit is exceeded by the student, he or she shall lose the right to proceed unless he or she can demonstrate unusual circumstances justifying the delay and the failure to request an extension in a timely manner.

7.1.4. In any procedure governed by these rules, time limits shall be suspended in the following circumstances:

a. For good cause, the appropriate Dean or Vice President shall extend any time limit set forth in these rules. Good cause shall include the fact that a deadline falls during finals week or during a period such as vacations, holidays, intersessions, or summer sessions if parties or decisionmakers are absent from the University. Any such time extension shall be communicated in writing to all interested parties along with a new written schedule.
b. If the procedure involves the Student Standards and Grievance Committee, and the Administrator determines that the Committee members cannot convene and decide the case during finals week, summer session, intersession, vacation or holidays, the Administrator will so advise the parties and will schedule a hearing as soon thereafter as possible.

c. If a faculty or staff member is absent from the University, the decisionmaker, with the student's permission, may permit the faculty or staff member to participate in a hearing or interview by conference call or by letter.

7.2. Jurisdiction Disputes

If there is any question as to which set of procedures should govern a grievance, the moving party shall select the procedures that seem appropriate. The decisionmaker should resolve any jurisdictional issue first, consulting with other decision makers if appropriate. If the grievance has been brought under the incorrect procedure, it shall be transferred rather than dismissed. If the new (transferee) decisionmaker or the parties challenge the jurisdictional decision, the jurisdiction shall be decided jointly by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Student Affairs, and the University Counsel, or their designees. Their decision shall be final. The jurisdictional issue shall be resolved within one week, during which other time limits shall be suspended. Where appropriate, a dispute may be severed into separate issues to be resolved concurrently under separate procedures.

7.3. Former Students

These procedures apply to disputes between students and other members of the University community. If the student has left the University community (by graduation or otherwise), these procedures shall continue to apply so long as the event giving rise to the dispute occurred while the student was a member of the University community and so long as the University has the power to resolve the matter. The University retains the right to change grades or rescind degrees, when, after the grade or degree has been awarded, it discovers new information indicating that the grade or degree was earned improperly.

7.4. Designees of Deans or Vice Presidents

Whenever these regulations specify submission of a dispute or decision to a Dean or Vice President, that individual may
delegate consideration and decision of the matter to a
designee. Such designee shall normally be a member of the
decisionmaker's staff.

7.5. Review by the President and the Regents

7.5.1. The parties' right to appeal decisions under
these procedures terminates with appeal
to the appropriate Vice President. However,
the President has the discretionary authority to
review all decisions at the Vice Presidential
level or below, and the Regents have the
discretionary authority to review all decisions
of the President. The President or the Regents will
normally review grievance or disciplinary
decisions only in extraordinary cases, for
example, where proper procedures have not been
followed, or where the decision appears to violate
University policy.

7.5.2 Requests for review made to the President or
the Regents normally will be considered only
after the normal avenues of appeal have been
completed. Requests shall be made by written
statement, including the facts, the proceedings
below, and the reasons justifying extraordinary
review. Such requests should be filed in the
President's Office within one week of receipt of
the decision.

7.5.3. If review is granted, appropriate procedures shall
be set by the President or the Regents. The
procedures shall be communicated to the parties
in advance, and shall provide each party the
opportunity to explain his or her position orally
and/or in writing. New evidence (such as
additional documents or testimony of witness) will
not normally be taken by the President or Regents.
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To: Faculty Senate

From: Operations Committee

Re: Committee Appointments

The following names are submitted for Senate approval:

Library

Gordon Johnson, Biology, 1987 for Martin Bradshaw

University Press

Peter DiVasto, Fam, Comm & Emerg Medicine, 1989 for Fred Ragsdale
To: Chairs, College Graduate Committees  
From: Gary J. Norrov, Chair, Senate Graduate Committee  
Subject: Decentralization

May 8, 1986

For the past two months the Senate Graduate Committee has discussed many questions surrounding the decentralization of graduate education at UNM. The result of these discussions has been refinement of the policies required by the charges to the SGC and the college graduate committees in the Faculty Handbook.

First, implicit in the Charge to College Graduate Committees as well as the charge of the Senate Graduate Committee is the requirement that each college, school or division offering graduate programs have such a Committee. The SGC has, therefore, made this a matter of policy. The SGC strongly urges that the membership of the graduate committee in each college be chosen to broadly represent the views of the graduate faculty in the college and to include voting representation of the graduate students in the college and of OFFICIAL representation of the College and Graduate Deans. The process by which committee members will be selected is to be incorporated in the procedures for implementing decentralization required of each college committee by paragraph 3 of the Charge.

Second, it was agreed by the SGC that a major ongoing problem in the administration of graduate education is the lack of clear policies regarding resolution of conflicts that arise from the assignment of certain oversight functions impacting on quality to both the Graduate Office and the college graduate committees. For this reason, the policy described below for resolving conflicts arising in the administration of University-wide policies bearing on items 2d and 2e in the Charge to College Graduate Committees was adopted. These two areas are: (d) receiving and processing petitions on behalf of individual graduate students dealing with changes in programs, requirements related to that graduate unit, or any other appeal and (e) supervision of quality control processes including admission of students to graduate programs, approval of the membership of examination committees, dissertation committees, and program of studies committees. This appeal process specifically applies to conflicts arising from rejection of a thesis or dissertation by the Graduate Office when it has been approved by the student's Dissertation Committee.  

1. A request by a graduate student to waive or meet a modified version of any University-wide requirement or standard must be approved by both the student’s department and the Graduate Dean. A thesis or dissertation must be approved by the student’s thesis or dia-
ertation committee and accepted by the Graduate Dean.

2. In the event the Graduate Dean refuses the request, or declines to accept a thesis or dissertation, any appeal of his/her decision will be to an appeal body that includes the Graduate Dean and all or part of the graduate committee in the student's college as provided by that college committee's approved decentralization procedures.

3. If the college graduate committee and the Graduate Dean are not able to agree on a resolution of the request or on whether or not the thesis/dissertation should be accepted, the matter may be submitted to the Senate Graduate Committee for final resolution in accord with its internal operating procedures. If the Graduate Dean and the college graduate committee are in agreement on the matter, it is not subject to appeal to the SGC.

Requests to waive or meet modified graduate requirements or standards imposed by an individual college, school or division are subject only to the appeals process appearing in that college's approved decentralization implementation procedures even if the Graduate Dean is involved with the administration of those requirements or standards.

The SGC did not change the procedures by which new courses and programs are to be implemented, as they seem to be fairly well defined. However, the standards by which it is to be determined that a course is suitable for graduate credit and against which proposed new graduate programs and concentrations are to be judged are to be the subjects of future deliberations by the SGC. Approval of new courses and programs at the individual college level will continue to be in accord with the decentralization procedures approved for that college.

The University-wide standards for graduate, teaching, research, and project assistants as well as the procedures for administering these assistantships were reviewed and extensively revised by the SGC about two years ago. These standards and procedures appear in the Graduate Bulletin. Again, standards or procedures specific to an individual college will continue to be determined by the college and incorporated in the college' decentralization implementation procedures.

The final decision as to the suitability of a regular UNH faculty member to teach a course carrying graduate credit will remain with the graduate committee in the college offering the course and will be made in accordance with that college's approved decentralization implementation procedures. A list of regular faculty who are approved by their respective colleges to teach courses carrying graduate credit is to be submitted to the Graduate Office and is to be updated regularly. The credentials of all other faculty
(including visiting faculty and faculty hired with "soft" money) who are proposed as instructors for courses carrying graduate credit must be submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies for approval. A decision by the Graduate Dean that the proposed instructor's credentials are inadequate may be appealed to the graduate committee in the college offering the course and to the Senate Graduate Committee as described above.

With the completion of the Senate Graduate Committee's review of the decentralization issues discussed above, the Committee's earlier request that college graduate committees refrain from undertaking modifications in their procedures for implementing decentralization is lifted. In fact, it would be appropriate for each college graduate committee to review its procedures early in the fall semester and modify them as necessary to incorporate the policies discussed above as well as any other policies the college deems appropriate. The modified procedures should be submitted to the SGC for approval prior to their being implemented.

Copies:
Deans of colleges/schools/divisions having graduate programs
Dean, Office of Graduate Studies
Senate Operations Committee
In Cary J. Morrow's document of May 8, 1986, he discusses the Senate Graduate Committee's refinement of policies on decentralization and asks that the various College Graduate Committees modify their governance plans to accommodate the functions listed below by December 1, 1986.

These functions are required as a graduate student advances toward a doctoral degree. This checklist indicates where that procedure may be handled. Some of the functions are housed at the departmental level, some with college graduate committees, and some at the Office of Graduate Studies. Certain of these functions may be placed at the college's discretion at any one of the above places. Please indicate in your modifications documents WHICH a department, program, or college wishes such functions to take place IF it is an optional feature.

PLEASE NOTE: These university procedures, except for optional features, may only be added to, but not omitted from, college procedures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dept/College/OBS</th>
<th>Criteria/Other/Optional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Inquiries about program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Application and fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Screening for admission</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Letter of admission or refusal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Degree verification</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Graduate Faculty Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Academic advisement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Course grade reports</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Review of grades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Petitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Appointment of Committee on Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Complete all necessary requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Department or exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Appointment of dissertation committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Dissertation progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Final defense of dissertation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Candidacy forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviews dept criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Dissertation defense results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Records Office
** Student/Committee Chair

(1) What are they?
(2) What form? If written, number of hours student writes; is it a take-home or proctored on campus?
(3) Limit on number of student committee professors can chair?
(4) Does each College if it plans to have a dissertation review committee. If so, OBS would be third step and that committee the 2nd step.