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TO: Members of the Faculty Senate  
FROM: Anne J. Broctony  
SUBJECT: October Meeting

The Faculty Senate will meet on Tuesday, October 10, 1989 at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

The agenda will include the following items:

1. Summarized Minutes of September 12, 1989
2. Memorial Minute for Director Emeritus Ward Fenley--Professor Robert Lawrence
3. Memorial Minute for Professor Emeritus Roy W. Johnson--Professor John Gustafson
4. Senate President's Report--Professor Marion Cottrell
5. Open Discussion (Senators may speak on any subject of interest; however, no motions may be made. This is not an action item.)
6. Administrative Representation on the Faculty Senate--Professor Jim Thorson
7. Report by David McKinney, Vice President for Business and Finance
8. Report from the Senate Budget Committee--Professor Dodd Bogart
9. Report from the University Budget Committee--Professor Gloria Birkholz
10. Recommendations from the Admissions and Registration Committee
11. Committee Replacements--Professor Gloria Birkholz
12. Statement of Charge for the Core Curriculum Task Force--Professor Polly Turner
The October 10, 1989 meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Marion Cottrell at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

Senators present: Garland Bills (A&S), Gloria Birkholz (Nursing), Andrew Burgess (A&S), Andrew Burgess (A&S), Ethel Cherry (Arch & Fin), Robert Copburn (A&S), Carl Cordts (Medicine), Marion Cottrell (Engineering), Paul Davis (A&S), Peter Dorato (Engineering), Lisa Duran (Education), Daniel Fuller (A&S), Marilyn Fletcher (Library), Gregory Franchini (Medicine), Douglas George (Fine Arts), Brian Hansen (Fine Arts), Hugh Habet (Pharmacy), Dennis Lobestein (Education), Kathleen Matthews (University College), Priscilla Smith ( Gallup Branch), Ron Storey (Medicine) James Thorsom (A&S), Pauline Turner (Education), Benjamin Walker (Medicine), Margaret Werner-Washburne (A&S), and Mel Yazawa (A&S).

Absent: John Crawford (Valencia Branch), Paul Edwards (Dental Progs), Walter Forman (Medicine), Shyam Gurthaxani (Engineering), Richard Held (Mgmt), Jose Rivera (Pubilc Admin), Rowena Rivera (A&S), Diana Robin (A&S), Scott Taylor (Law), Donald Vichick (Medicine), James Wallace (Medicine), and William Woodside (Medicine).

Minutes of September 12, 1989. The minutes of September 12, 1989 were approved as distributed.

Memorial Minutes. Memorial minutes for Director Emeritus Ward Penley and Professor Emeritus May Johnson were presented by Professors Robert Lawrence and John Gustafson respectively. The Senate adopted the minutes by rising vote and Secretary Brown was asked to send copies to the next of kin.

Senate President's Report. President Marion Cottrell began his report by explaining that he is not opposed to the BUS Program as suggested by the Daily Lobo, but he was, in fact, one of its original supporters. The program, however, does not have a formal faculty nor any formal method of oversight and therefore, the Operations Committee has formed a BUS Study Committee. Members of the committee appointed by the Operations Committee are Professors Richard Williams (Econ), Mary Harris (Ed Prof), Phillip Gonzales (Sociol), Scott Taylor (Law), and Professor Emeritus David Hamilton (Econ). Vice President Chris Garcia has appointed Dean David Colton (Edm), Professor Julian White (MCL), and an associate vice president for academic affairs to be named later.

Professor Cottrell informed the Senate that the Commission on Higher Education and U.S. West will sponsor an articulation conference in Albuquerque on November 2nd and 3rd at the Four Seasons Hotel. He said that the Operations Committee had suggested that in addition to themselves, Professors Warren Smith and Paul Davis of the Core Curriculum Task Force, and members of the Admissions and Registration Committee, the Curriculum Committee and the Undergraduate Committee be invited. He also asked that any Senator interested in attending the conference contact him for an invitation.
Professor Cottrell explained that an Optional Retirement Plan was under discussion by the Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee and will be presented to the Senate sometime this academic year.

In conclusion, he said that a draft of the UNM 2000 Report has been distributed and that hearings will be conducted around campus for input from faculty and staff.

Open Discussion. Professor Brian Hansen, who until recently served on the UNM 2000 Committee, read the following statement to the Senate explaining his resignation from the Committee:

As some of you may know, I have spent more than two years as a member of two different versions of the UNM 2000 Committee. As some of you may also know, I have recently resigned from that committee, gravely disappointed by the process and the product of this year's work. In my letter of resignation, I promised my fellow committee members that I would continue to work for a better UNM 2000 Report in other venues. The faculty Senate is such a venue. I wish to take what little time I have today to direct your attention to the gravity of the problems facing UNM and the largely inadequate response of the UNM 2000 Report.

If I had only one criticism of the Report, it would be that the role of planning and rational decision-making, a major thrust of the first draft, has been blurred and confused.

Since I am fervently convinced that UNM must be prepared to make very difficult decisions at the highest level, I deplore the lack of concern for university-wide planning and decision-making in the current UNM 2000 Report.

Some people -- those in a position to know -- put a price on our current difficulties -- 30 million dollars. Per year. That is roughly the difference between what we are -- and what we say we are. Note that I am not talking of our aspirations; I speak only of the enormous gulf which lies between appearance and reality. I do not want to suggest that our problems are all caused by money. But that is a good place to start.

But how does a university close the gap between what it is pledged to do and the resources it has available?

One possibility is to convince the people of the State of New Mexico to give us more money. That is simple -- so simple that even some of my colleagues have thought of it.

Fact: the proportion of the State budget which goes to higher education in New Mexico has changed only slightly in recent years and there is little evidence that it will change much in the future -- either up or down. New Mexico has committed itself to too many institutions of higher education and is not likely to reduce the number soon.
Furthermore, the economy of the State is unlikely to change in positive directions in the foreseeable future. Finally, there are going to be many greater demands upon the State budget than higher education in the years ahead -- for example, prisons, law enforcement, and educational reform at the secondary level.

But if that is the case, then UNM as a research university, should ask for a greater proportion of the higher education "pie." True, we should ask. But do not expect much more than verbal support. If anything, a growing emphasis on community colleges may actually lead to a reduction of the percent of the overall appropriation available to the research universities.

How else can the 30 million dollar gap be closed? We could raise tuition -- enormously. But it is fair to say that such tuition increases would be totally unacceptable for philosophical reasons -- even if they were possible for political ones. Tuition increases beyond inflation are probably inevitable -- but they will have little effect on the larger problem.

We can go to funding sources outside of the university. This is the favored response of the UNM administration. Since there are many of these sources, it is difficult to generalize about them -- except to say that outside sources normally have their own agendas. As a result, to the degree that we solicit external sources of funding, we increasingly become someone else's definition of a university. Some think this trend is desirable, inevitable, or both. I am sceptical.

(This may be the time to remind my friends in the arts and humanities that an unrestrained scramble for external funds, like a form of academic Darwinism, will inevitably lead to a university-wide bias toward those disciplines in which the funding is available. I hope that I don't have to remind you that those areas are not the arts and humanities.)

Of course there is another way of dealing with the discrepancy between what we can afford and what we say we are: that is to make tough decisions about what we are. This simple idea is a heresy in some circles. Some of my most respected colleagues chant that we ought to be "all that we can be." It does no good to remind them that no university can do everything that a university might want to do. The greatest schools in history have always had to make decisions. Like them, we will have to make difficult decisions -- or they will be made for us. I would venture to say that part of the reason for the mess in which we now find ourselves is that we have not made those decisions consciously in the past. The social history of Scholes Hall has prevented even ostensibly strong leaders from making hard but necessary decisions for the university; our history is one of public promises broken privately and private promises which later had to be repudiated publicly.)
It seems to me that Scholes Hall has none of the real power which the faculty thinks it has. Indeed, a major problem of leadership at UNM is that there is no center -- and that, like Europe in the Dark Ages, what little power there is has moved to regional centers and warring cultures.

The rude truth is that institutional decisions will get made -- if only by default. Now is that time for the entire university community to make it crystal clear that decision-making will be made openly, rationally, and through accepted channels. This is also the time for the faculty -- who have the clearest professional commitment to universities as institutions and who have collectively the most experience with universities -- to guarantee that faculty governance plays a key role in planning and decision-making.

That is not clear from the current UNM 2000 draft. The commitment to institutional planning and decision-making must be firmly in place by the time this process is complete.

Although I admire and respect them as individuals, I urge you to show the UNM 2000 Committee no quarter. Collectively they have not worked hard enough; they have not been tough enough on themselves; and this work is simply not acceptable. I urge my fellow faculty to treat our colleagues with the same concern and seriousness which we would show to graduate students.

Mark up the draft. Council with the authors. And send them back to work.

The work of the UNM 2000 Committee is far from finished. The ante is incredibly high. Remarkable possibilities are attainable. We must not settle for anything less than this group's best.

And this is not it.

Thank you.

Administrative Representation on the Faculty Senate. Professor James Thorson for the Senate Operations Committee explained that on February 14, 1989 the Senate Operations Committee discussed a proposal to increase the size of the Senate by increasing representation from the schools and colleges, and this recommendation was forwarded to the Committee on Governance. To date the committee has not discussed the recommendation. The Operations Committee feels that in order to facilitate and improve communication with the administration, the Senate membership should be further increased by adding administrative representatives.

He moved that the Senate approve the following amendment to the Faculty Constitution, Section 6 (b) (iv), be forwarded to the Committee on Governance:

1. Administrative Representation on the Faculty Senate.

Professor James Thorson for the Senate Operations Committee explained that on February 14, 1989 the Senate Operations Committee discussed a proposal to increase the size of the Senate by increasing representation from the schools and colleges, and this recommendation was forwarded to the Committee on Governance. To date the committee has not discussed the recommendation. The Operations Committee feels that in order to facilitate and improve communication with the administration, the Senate membership should be further increased by adding administrative representatives.

He moved that the Senate approve the following amendment to the Faculty Constitution, Section 6 (b) (iv), be forwarded to the Committee on Governance:
The President of the University, if he or she holds a faculty title, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and two academic deans, selected by the Council of Deans, shall be voting members of the Faculty Senate. All other vice presidents, associate vice presidents, deans of schools and colleges, and directors of branch colleges, shall be ex-officio, nonvoting members of the Faculty Senate.

After a brief discussion, the motion failed.

Report by David McKinney, Vice President for Business and Finance. Vice President McKinney prefaced his report by thanking the faculty for their support during his recent illness.

The Senators were provided with a summary of the Funding Requirements which were approved by the Board of Regents earlier in the day and Mr. McKinney summarized key points of the document.

- A salary increase of 7% for faculty and staff
- A separate fringe benefits budget increase of 10%
- An inflationary adjustment of 6% for other nonpersonnel budgeted expenses
- Phasing-in of the C&F funding formula revisions being considered by the CHE for the six four-year universities.
- Identification of funding requirements to support UNM's special emphasis on improving the participation of underrepresented populations at the university
- Request for funding support for UNM's desire to develop a state-wide communications network for on-line access to articulation matrices
- Support of the basic instructional effort of the Medical School
- Improvement of instructional program of the Medical School by addition of faculty in areas of Pediatric Pulmonology, Physical Therapy, Geriatrics, Trauma Surgery, and Obstetrics and Gynecology
- Maintenance of current levels of services provided in certain areas such as KINNE-TV, Poison and Drug Information Center, etc.
- Expansion of services in some areas such as Substance Abuse Program, EMS Academy, Newborn Intensive Care Unit, etc.
- Request for one-time appropriation to create a private funds matching endowment in support of the Southwest Research Center.

Mr. McKinney explained that total recurring funding requirements are $155,712,828; non-recurring requirements equal $2,000,000; and "first-time" appropriations equal $968,930.

Report from the Senate Budget Committee. Professor Dodd Bogart, chairperson of the Senate Budget Committee, explained that the name of the committee had been changed from Budget Review Committee and the mandate to the committee had changed accordingly. It now participates in the budget process rather than reviewing the budget after it is published. He said the committee invites the entire faculty to become informed about the budget and the committee will keep the Senate informed.

The committee has been divided into sub-committees dealing with salaries, tuition, research, resource levels, and buildings and grounds.
He requested that if any Senator has suggestions or questions, to please present them as soon as possible.

Report from the University Budget Committee. Professor Gloria Birkholz, chairperson of the University Budget Committee, explained the history of the committee. The charge to the committee, she said, was to assure that the budget process is open to the community.

The committee is composed of two faculty members, two staff members, two undergraduate students, one graduate student, one dean and one non-academic person. Jim Wiegmann, Budget Director, and Vice President David McKinney are ex-officio members of the Committee. The committee plans to present information to the faculty regarding timing of the budget process and to solicit input from the faculty.

Recommendations from the Admissions and Registration Committee. Registrar William Hald presented items from the Admissions and Registration Committee.

ITEM I: On March 21, 1989, Michael Sanchez, ASUNM Attorney General, asked the Faculty Senate to endorse a proposal from the ASUNM which called for the institution of an A+ in the fractionated grading system. The proposal was forwarded to the Admissions and Registration Committee with a request that the Committee make a recommendation to the Senate.

The A+ was purposely omitted from the original development of the fractionated grading system on the principle that "A" is the top grade in the 4.00 grade scale used at UNM. An ASUNM initiative has caused the A+ to be reconsidered. The student position is that an "A+" is necessary in the 4.00 grading system to counter the effect of the "A-". The committee passed the recommendation on a narrow vote.

He recommends to the Senate the addition of the "A+" grade to the fractionated grading system at UNM. An "A+" would be worth 4.33 grade points and would calculate in the grade point average but 4.00 would be the highest cumulative grade point average permitted.

After lengthy discussion, including input from ASUNM representative, Adam Hathaway, the recommendation was defeated.

ITEM II: The "W" grade has been used in the grade system at UNM before. It is being recommended to more accurately record the approved administrative or retroactive withdrawal that occurs after a semester is over. No change or use of "W" is recommended in the current drop and withdrawal procedures.

The Admissions and Registration Committee recommends the reinstatement of the "W" grade to be used for administrative withdrawals. The "W" grade means simply "withdrawal". It has no academic penalty or effect on the grade point average. It would be used in the case of approved administrative withdrawals.

This recommendation was approved by the Faculty Senate.
Committee Replacements. Upon recommendation of Professor Gloria Birkholz, the following committee replacements and assignments were approved: William MacPheron (Law) (semester I only) and Fred Hart (Law) (semester II only) on the Budget Committee; Viola Leyba (Community Representative) on the Community Education Committee; Lynndianne Beene (English) and James Linnell (Theatre Arts) on the Computer Use Committee; Wolfgang Freiser (Architecture & Planning) to fill vacancy and Phillip Gonzales (Sociology) for Dodd Bogart (Sociology) on the Curricula Committee; Patrick Gallagher (English) on the Library Committee; Diane Lane (Journalism) for Scott Sanders (English) on the Student Publications Board; Barry Calmes (English) for Lynndianne Beene (English) on the Undergraduate Committee.

Statement of Charge for the Core Curriculum Task Force. Upon the recommendation of Professor Polly Turner for the Operations Committee, the Senate approved the following Charge to the Core Curriculum Task Force:

Recognizing that there is a common core of knowledge and basic analytical and communication skills that should be acquired by all students who earn a baccalaureate degree, the UNR Faculty Senate charges a multidisciplinary committee named Core Curriculum Task Force to undertake the following:

1. identify the intellectual content of the core curriculum,
2. identify the most suitable instructional format for the core curriculum, and
3. study and recommend an appropriate structure and plan for implementation and monitoring of the core curriculum.

The Task Force shall provide the Senate with a status report of its study no later than May, 1990, and submit final recommendations and conclusions by May, 1991.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Anne J. Brown, Secretary
UNM FACULTY SENATE

SUBJECT: Administrative Representation on the Faculty Senate

REQUESTED ACTION:

Recommend to the Committee on Governance that the Faculty Constitution Section 6 (b)(iv) be amended to read:

The President of the University, if he or she holds a faculty title, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and two academic deans, selected by the Council of Deans, shall be voting members of the Faculty Senate. All other vice presidents, associate vice presidents, deans of schools and colleges, and directors of branch colleges, shall be ex-officio, nonvoting members of the Faculty Senate.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

On February 14, 1989 the Faculty Senate discussed a proposal to increase the size of the Senate by increasing representation from the schools and colleges, and this recommendation was forwarded to the Committee on Governance. To date the committee has not discussed the recommendation. The Operations Committee feels that in order to facilitate and improve communication with the administration, the Senate membership should be further increased by adding administrative representatives.

If the Senate approves the above recommendation, it will be forwarded to the Committee on Governance.
UNM FACULTY SENATE

SUBJECT: Recommendations from the Admissions & Registration Committee

REQUESTED ACTION: Adopt the Recommendations

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

On March 21, 1989, Michael Sanchez, ASUNM Attorney General, asked the Faculty Senate to endorse a proposal from the ASUNM which called for the institution of an A+ in the fractionated grading system. The proposal was forwarded to the Admissions and Registration Committee with a request that the Committee make a recommendation to the Senate.
The A/R Committee submits the following two recommendations to the Faculty Senate for action.

Item 1
The Admissions and Registration Committee recommends to the Senate the addition of the "A+" grade to the fractionated grading system at UNM. An "A+" would be worth 4.33 grade points and would calculate in the grade point average but 4.00 would be the highest cumulative grade point average permitted.

Background
The "A+" was purposely omitted from the original development of the fractionated grading system on the principle that "A" is the top grade in the 4.00 grade scale used at UNM. An ASUNM initiative has caused the "A+" to be reconsidered. The student position is that an "A+" is necessary in the 4.00 grading system to counter the effect of the "A-". The committee passed the recommendation on a narrow vote.

Item 2
The Admission and Registration Committee recommends the reinstatement of the "W" grade to be used for administrative withdrawals. The "W" grade means simply "withdrawal". It has no academic penalty or effect on the grade point average. It would be used in the case of approved administrative withdrawals.

Background
The "W" grade has been used in the grade system at UNM before. It is being recommended to more accurately record the approved administrative or retroactive withdrawal that occurs after a semester is over. No change or use of "W" is recommended in the current drop and withdrawal procedures.

Examples of administrative withdrawals are retroactive withdrawals approved by the grade petition process. The reason for a student requesting a retroactive withdrawal vary but typically involve the student never attending the class, processing errors, catastrophic illness or other reason beyond the student's control. The grade petition is a faculty approved process for requesting retroactive changes in enrollment. It would be the only way for an administrative "W" to be assigned. The administrative "W" would not be available as an instructor assigned grade.
October 10, 1989

CHARGE TO CORE CURRICULUM TASK FORCE

Recognizing that there is a common core of knowledge and basic analytical and communication skills that should be acquired by all students who earn a baccalaureate degree, the UNM Faculty Senate charges a multidisciplinary committee named Core Curriculum Task Force to undertake the following:

1. identify the intellectual content of the core curriculum,

2. identify the most suitable instructional format for the core curriculum, and

3. study and recommend an appropriate structure and plan for implementation and monitoring of the core curriculum.

The Task Force shall provide the Senate with a status report of its study no later than May, 1990, and submit final recommendations and conclusions by May, 1991.

Department of Philosophy
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University of New Mexico
TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Gloria Birkholz, Vice President

SUBJECT: Committee Replacements

The following are submitted for Senate approval:

**BUDGET**

William MacPherson, Law, 1990 (Sem I only)
Fred Hart, Law, 1990 (Sem II only)

**COMMUNITY EDUCATION**

Viola Leyba, Community Representative

**COMPUTER USE**

Lynndianne Beene, English, 1991
James Linnell, Theatre Arts, 1990

**CURRICULA**

Wolfgang Preiser, Arch & Plng, 1990
Phillip Gonzales, Sociology, 1990

**LIBRARY**

Patrick Gallacher, English, 1992

**STUDENT PUBLICATIONS BOARD**

Dianne Lamb, Journalism, 1991

**UNDERGRADUATE**

Barry Gaines, English, 1991