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TO: Members of the UNM Faculty Senate
FROM: Anne J. Bowers, Secretary
SUBJECT: March Meeting

The Faculty Senate will meet on Tuesday, March 20, 1990, at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva. The agenda will include the following items:

1. Summarized Minutes of February 13, 1990
2. Senate President’s Report -- Professor Marion Cottrell
3. Open Discussion
4. Revised Charge and Membership of the Community Education Committee -- Professor Leonard Sctelman
5. Revised Charge of the BUS Faculty Advisory Committee -- Professor Pauline Turner
6. Report of the University Planning Group -- Professors Brian Hansen and Gaynor Wild
7. Recommendations from the Library Committee -- Professor O. J. Rothrock
8. Long-Term Tuition Policy -- Professor Todd Regier
9. Faculty Development Plan -- Associate Vice President Janet Roebuck
10. Guidelines for Appraisal of Progress of Centers -- Professor Edward Walters
11. Weapons Policy -- Professor Pauline Turner
The March 20, 1990 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), Robert Cognen (A&S), Carl Cordes (Medicine), Marion Cottrell (Engineering), Paul Davis (A&S), Lula Duran (Education), Paul Edwards (Dental Propt), Daniel Feller (A&S), Marilyn Fletcher (Library), Walter Forman (Medicine), Dennis Franchini (Medicine), Douglas George (Fine Arts), Shyam Gurukani (Engineering), Brian Hansen (Fine Arts), Clare Intress (University College), Hugh Kabat (Pharmacy), Jose Rivera (Public Admin), Rowena Rivas (A&S), Kim Smith (Valencia Branch), Ron Storey (Medicine), Scott Taylor (Dentistry), James Thornton (A&S), Pauline Turner (Education), Donald Vichick (Medicine), Benjamin Walker (Medicine), James Wallace (Medicine), William Woodside (Medicine), and Mel Yazawa (A&S).

Absent: Edith Cherry (Architecture & Planning), Peter Dotato (Engineering), Dennis Lohstein (Education), Richard Reid (Management), Diana Robin (A&S), Patricia Smith (Gallup Branch), and Margaret Werner-Washburne (A&S).

Minutes of February 13, 1990. The minutes of February 13, 1990 were approved as distributed.

Senate President's Report. President Marion Cottrell explained that the proposed Faculty Development Plan (item #9 on the agenda) was the effort of Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Jan Roebeck. The Operations Committee feels that this plan will be the University policy statement rather than the University Priority document previously under consideration.

He said that although no one was exactly certain, it was thought that the Legislature had approved a 2 1/2% salary increase. That figure will be for everyone, including staff. However, UNM and New Mexico State University have a 3% peer adjustment which passed at the original legislative session. That 3% does not include staff. The Budget Committee will now work with Administration regarding salaries for 1990-91.

Professor Cottrell next explained the Regents' action of March 12 regarding the President's house. This action included renaming the house University House and approving $400,000 for remodelling. There has been some sentiment of the Regents that the house is "rather shabby." He stated also that a new house cannot be built for $80 per square foot, which is the cost of the renovation.

Cottrell requested additional nominations for at-large senators to be submitted to the Office of the University Secretary.
Open Discussion. Professor Daniel Feller read the following letter addressed to Senate President Cottrell and fellow Senators:

At its December 1989 meeting, the Faculty Senate approved a resolution to add a grade of A+ (4.33) to UNM's grading scale. Those of us who opposed this measure have since been urged to accept it as in the words of the student newspaper, a "done deal."

Speaking for ourselves, we do not accept it, and see no reason why we should. The history department, which President May has publicly recognized as one of the University's strongest, voted unanimously to oppose the A+, and its opinion has not changed. The Senate itself passed the A+ by the narrowest possible margin, after a parliamentary maneuver which overturned its rejection by a more decisive majority only two months before. The reconsidered vote may stand procedurally, but it carries, in our minds, no greater moral weight.

It rather drastically understates the case to say that the implications of this measure have not been thought through. The A+ was adopted in an atmosphere tainted by haste and attempted student intimidation, and upon arguments that were, without exception, either unsupported by facts or just plain wrong. We were told, without any evidence, that fractionated grading had reduced students' GPAs, and that therefore we must make a change which will, indisputably, raise them. We were told that students need the A+ to "balance" the D-. Though entirely specious logically (the A+ changes the scale by raising its upper limit, while the D- merely interpolates between existing grades), this argument does reveal, perhaps inadvertently, the uses to which the A+ may be put. It will make it easier for students to maintain a 2.00 GPA by offsetting grades of D, or worse, in history, English, mathematics, and chemistry with high marks in courses like "Friends and Intimate Relationships" (Family Studies 310), "Theory of Football" (Physical Education 464), "Foundations of Recreation" (Recreation 175), and "Introductory to Academic Strategies" (University College-Academics 120).

This "balancing" effectually devalues the entire grading scale. Further, as Professor Schueler of the Philosophy Department has noted in a letter to the Daily Lobo, the strategy of raising individual course grades while retaining an overall 4.00 limit carries, on its face, evidence of an intention to deceive.
In opposing this grade, we bear no animus against students. One the contrary, our motive is precisely to protect our students by protecting, as far as we can, the academic integrity of the University as a whole. Advocates of the A+ say that UNM students need higher grades to get into graduate and professional schools. (The implicit argument is not that they deserve higher grades, but that faculty should give grades that promote students' interests rather than fairly reflect their performance - an argument we reject entirely.) Whether or not UNM's grades place our students at an unfair disadvantage in competition outside the University (and no evidence has been offered to support that assertion), it is certainly true that unequal grading policies place students in academically rigorous departments at an unfair disadvantage within the University in competing for recognition and financial aid. It is notorious that some departments grant many more A's than others, and that the liberality of their grading practices is sometimes inversely proportional to the strength of their scholarly credentials. The A+, which some departments will distribute profligately and others sparingly, will further exacerbate an already deplorable, if not scandalous, situation.

Clearly, before the A+ can be implemented, we need a thorough and dispassionate evaluation of its ramifications, including its effect on graduate program eligibility requirements, on UNM compliance with NCAA and other regulations concerning athletic eligibility, and on competitive balance within the University. If the Faculty Senate shirks its duty, refuses to address these issues, and insists on mindlessly going ahead, we will continue to oppose this grade through every available means.

After reading the letter, Professor Feller stated that in the event that the Senate takes no further action on the matter, he personally will inform the NCAA and the WAC of the UNM grading practices.

Professor Gloria Birkholz told the Senate that she, as chair of the University Budget Committee, and Professor Dodd Bogart, chair of the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, have supported a cost of living increase for the faculty - a minimum of $4. Regarding the tuition issue, the University Budget Committee has made progress on an annual base increase. This matter will be brought to the Senate at a future date.
Revised Charge and Membership of the Community Education Committee.

Professor Leonard Stitelman for the Community Education Committee explained that because of changes which have occurred over the past several years in the operations of branch colleges and because of the advent of televised classes, a new charge and membership should be approved to reflect the current responsibilities of the Committee.

The Senate approved the new charge and membership as follows:

Community Education Committee. The Community Education Committee has responsibility for advising the Academic Vice President concerning the development and maintenance of university-wide community education/outreach programs, including those delivered off-campus by electronic means. Not included are professional continuing education delivered by the Law School and Medical Center. The committee shall also be concerned with the policy, scope, program development, internal impact, and external impact of community education/outreach programs of the University as well as other matters pertaining to the operation of community education/outreach programs.

(Ten faculty members and no more than two from the same school or college, nominated by the Faculty Senate; one representative from each Branch Campus; one student member appointed by GSA; and four community representatives recommended by the Academic Vice President and approved by the Faculty Senate. Ex-officio members shall be the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Dean of Continuing Education, and directors of outreach services or their representatives. The chairperson is elected by the Committee at the first meeting of the fall semester and shall be a faculty member.)
Revision of Responsibilities of BUS Faculty Advisory Committee.

Professor Pauline Turner for the Operations Committee explained that on March 10, 1981 the Senate approved a motion stating:

That the Board of Deans be authorized by Senate action to formulate and approve policy for the Bachelor of University Studies program until such time as the Senate appoints an appropriate faculty body to assume that responsibility.

On October 13, 1981 the Senate approved the composition and responsibilities of the BUS Faculty Advisory Committee. The Operations Committee now requests approval of the revisions of the responsibilities and membership of the BUS Advisory Committee. The committee will consist of ten tenured faculty members representing undergraduate colleges and elected for three-year terms. The Dean of University College serves as a non-voting ex-officio member.

The responsibilities of the committee are as follows:

1. Act as a college faculty in the approval of candidates for the BUS degree.
2. Propose policies governing the BUS Degree to the Faculty Senate. Make periodic reports on the BUS Degree and recommendations for changes in degree requirements to the Faculty Senate.
3. Make final determination of what courses and programs count toward a BUS Degree, including UNM branch and sub-baccalaureate degree credits. Meet with the University College staff concerning individual BUS cases to recommend actions. At least four members of the BUS Faculty Advisory Committee must be present to consider individual cases.
4. Keep written records of actions taken on file in University College.

The committee will be a standing committee of the Faculty Senate.

The Senate voted to approve the revisions.
Faculty Development Plan. Janet Roebuck, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs explained to the Senate that the draft of the Faculty Development Plan involves no fundamental change in current policy; therefore, does not require any formal vote. The Academic Affairs Office does want, however, for the faculty, represented by the Senate, to accept the fundamental principles of the document. She also solicited ideas from the Senators regarding details of the broader aspects of the document. Further, she stated that she would like for the Plan to be a collective effort and not the effort of an individual or a small group.

The Operations Committee was consulted during the preparation of the draft, which was included in the agenda, and it reflects their input. Professor Cottrell stressed that the earlier draft had proposed that deans could supercede department recommendations regarding the hiring of qualified minorities. That idea, he said, flies in the face of all policy regarding who determines the qualifications of candidates for faculty positions. The Plan now before the Senate clearly states that the final decision lies with the department.

Professor Pauline Turner said several questions were raised at the last meeting of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee. One concerned the possibility of charges of reverse discrimination when utilizing "target of opportunity" hiring procedures. Roebuck responded that there is that possibility and that Vice President Paul Risser has requested a legal opinion on the issue.

A second concern was that of funding and status of positions filled under the "target of opportunity" plan after the first year. Would money come from and would the position be lost if the faculty hired under the Plan left UNM? Vice President Roebuck responded that this issue, too, is still unclear.

She explained to the Senate that such issues as the hiring of retirees, the upcoming shortage of Ph.D's, among other complicated considerations, all need to be addressed and the solutions are not simple. She urged input from the faculty, in writing and again the concept of a collective effort.

After further discussion, the Senate voted to support the continued work on the Faculty Development Plan.

Guidelines for Appraisal of Progress of Centers. Professor Ed Walters for the Research Policy Committee, presented proposed Guidelines for the Appraisal of Progress of Centers. He explained that the Research Policy Committee is charged with the responsibility of "formulating policy regarding the establishment, major modification or termination of research centers, bureaus, institutes, or other related organizations, and reviewing and making recommendations to the central administration and the Faculty Senate on proposals regarding these bodies."
In recent years, a policy was developed and approved by the Faculty Senate for the establishment of such centers or institutes. This policy requires, among other things, periodic review of all centers. The Research Policy Committee requests approval of these Guidelines so that an orderly program of review of institutes and centers may be initiated this spring.

He stated that if the Guidelines are approved by the Senate, three centers will be reviewed this spring. The Medical School centers are not to be included in the Guidelines.

The Senate approved the Guidelines as printed in the agenda.

Weapons Policy. Professor Pauline Turner for the Operations Committee, presented a draft of the Weapons Policy. She explained that the proposed policy was drafted in response to a recent episode in which an armed student challenged a grade in a professor’s office. Assistant Vice President David Stuart said it was his understanding that there is a State law prohibiting possession of weapons in any building constructed or owned by the State. He also asked about the armoured car services employees on campus who must carry weapons.

After discussion, the Senate voted to approve the following draft of the Weapons Policy which will now be forwarded to other constituencies for consideration and approval.

Law enforcement officers, in the performance of their authorized duties, may carry weapons on campus: ROTC students conducting required and supervised drills may carry inoperable weapons for the purpose only of those drills.

With the foregoing exceptions, no person may use or possess a weapon on any part of campus. "Weapon" includes, but is not limited to, firearms, ammunition or other dangerous weapons, substances, or materials, bombs, explosives, or incendiary devices. Persons with such weapons, materials or devices must enter campus at the closest point to the Campus Police Office and deposit all weapons or materials at that office for the duration of their stay.
If any person does carry such weapons or materials on campus, they may be impounded by a law enforcement officer for the duration of the person's stay on campus and the person may also be subject to appropriate disciplinary and/or criminal action.

Items 6, 7 and 8 on the agenda were deferred until the next meeting since the presenters were not present.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne J. Brown, Secretary
SUBJECT: Revised Charge and Membership of the Community Education Committee

REQUESTED ACTION:

Approve the Revisions.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Because of changes which have occurred over the past several years in the operations of branch colleges and because of the advent of televised classes, the Community Education Committee feels that the charge and membership as stated in the Faculty Handbook should be revised to reflect the current responsibilities of the Committee.
Community Education Committee. The Community Education Committee has responsibility for advising the Academic Vice President concerning the development and maintenance of university-wide community education/outreach programs, including those delivered off-campus by electronic means. Not included are professional continuing education delivered by the Law School and Medical Center. The committee shall also be concerned with the policy, scope, program development, internal impact, and external impact of community education/outreach programs of the University as well as other matters pertaining to the operation of community education/outreach programs.

(Ten faculty members and no more than two from the same school or college, nominated by the Faculty Senate; one representative from each branch campus; one student member appointed by GSA; and four community representatives recommended by the Academic Vice President and approved by the Faculty Senate. Ex-officio members shall be the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Dean of Continuing Education, and directors of outreach services or their representatives. The chairperson is elected by the Committee at the first meeting of the fall semester and shall be a faculty member.)

Passed unanimously at Committee meeting, October 27, 1989.
UNM FACULTY SENATE

SUBJECT: Revision of Responsibilities of BUS Faculty Advisory Committee

REQUESTED ACTION:
Approve the revision.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

On March 10, 1981 the Faculty Senate approved the following motion:

That the Board of Deans be authorized by Senate action to formulate and approve policy for the Bachelor of University Studies program until such time as the Senate appoints an appropriate faculty body to assume that responsibility.

On October 13, 1981, the Senate approved the composition and responsibilities of the BUS Faculty Advisory Committee.

The Operations Committee recommends that the Senate approve the revisions of the responsibilities as outlined on the following page.
Membership
The Bachelor of University Studies Faculty Advisory Committee consists of ten tenured faculty members representing undergraduate colleges elected for three-year terms. The Dean of University College serves as a non-voting ex officio member.

- R.O.A. School of Management: 1
- School of Architecture and Planning: 1
- College of Arts and Sciences: 3
- College of Education: 1
- College of Engineering: 1
- College of Fine Arts: 1
- College of Nursing: 1
- College of Pharmacy: 1
- Dean of University College, ex officio, non-voting: 1

Selection Procedures
Members are appointed by the Faculty Senate. The Committee elects its own chair from the voting members.

Term of Membership
Members serve 3-year staggered terms; faculty membership is renewable. The ex officio member serves by virtue of position. The chair serves for one year but may be re-elected.

Responsibilities
The responsibilities of the BUS Faculty Advisory Committee are as follows:

1. Act as a college faculty in the approval of candidates for the BUS Degree.
2. Propose policies governing the BUS Degree to the Faculty Senate. Make periodic reports on the BUS Degree and recommendations for changes in degree requirements to the Faculty Senate.
3. Make final determination of what courses and programs count toward a BUS Degree, including UNM branch and sub-baccalaureate degree credits. Meet with the University College staff concerning individual BUS cases to recommend actions. At least four members of the BUS Faculty Advisory Committee must be present to consider individual cases.
4. Keep written records of actions taken on file in University College.

*a Initial staggering shall be on a 4,4,3 basis. It is hoped that initial replacements will be faculty renewing their membership to maintain continuity and experience on the Committee.
SUBJECT: Recommendations from the Library Committee.

REQUESTED ACTION:
Adopt the Recommendations.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
See following pages.
The purpose of this report is to recommend to the Faculty Senate the minimum materials budget increase estimated by the Library Faculty at the request of the Faculty Senate Library Committee. The estimated increase is 20% annually for approximately the next five years in order to secure and modestly improve the Library's standing in the Association of Research Libraries. As such, the report may be taken as a follow-up to the resolution of April 11, 1989 in which the Faculty Senate urged the administration to fund the Library so as to maintain its membership and improve its ranking in the Association of Research Libraries. It may also be taken as a recommended remedy to the weakness of materials funding cited in the North Central Association accreditation report of May 1989. Finally, it may be taken as a response to the goals of enhanced research capacity and of eventual membership in the Association of American Universities set out in the "UNM 2000" draft (p. 48).

(1) Background

In 1979-80 the Library's rank in the ARL was 85th of some 104 member institutions. Even at that time the NCA accreditation report found the tenousness of financial support for the Library the University's most serious shortcoming. Overall support for the Library improved in 1983-88, but the materials budget buying power decreased dramatically. By 1987-88 the Library's ARL rank had declined to 104th of 108 member institutions. Additional cause for alarm was the reduction of the materials budget for 1989-90 to half the annual inflation rate of about 10% (7% monograph inflation; 12% serials). The minimum intent of the Senate's April resolution, then, was to prevent ARL probation or even loss of membership. In this respect, the resolution may be said to have been effective (see ARL rank below). It also demonstrated the Faculty Senate's awareness of the Library's funding needs to the 1989 NCA accreditation team, whose report "regrettably" notes the recent reduction (p. 19). The resolution's effectiveness remains to be seen, however, with respect to actual materials budget increases and to state and administrative recognition of the Library's unique importance to New Mexico as the state's only library to qualify as a research library according to the nationally recognized standards of the ARL.
Law and Medical Libraries and ARL Rank

Since April 1989 the administration has determined that according to ARL guidelines (mainly, accessibility to the Albuquerque campus) the Law and Medical Libraries may be included in ARL reporting. It is anticipated that the inclusion of these libraries (an increase from 1.3 to 1.6 million reportable materials) will elevate the Library's rank to around 70th. Investigation finds that most ARL members who have law and/or medical libraries do include them in their reporting, for example, Arizona and Arizona State (23rd and 22nd ARL rank) and the University of Colorado (law only, 84th). The Faculty Senate Library Committee is nevertheless concerned that inclusion of the Law and Medical Libraries, while raising the Library's rank, will prove to be an illusory distraction from the real need to increase substantially the materials budget. Even at the 1983-88 levels of funding, as noted above (see also the NCA report, p. 19), the Library was falling in rank. It is a certainty that at the current level of funding we will see a steady, if not precipitous decline from the projected ranking. We urge, therefore, that the Faculty Senate revise its resolution to read: a minimum of "maintaining the Library's rank in the ARL," i.e., at around 70th, rather than a minimum of "maintaining the Library's ARL membership".

Consistency of Materials Funding

The importance of consistency in materials funding is obvious. Reductions, including increases that do not keep up with inflation and other collection development costs, demoralize not only the Library Faculty but also the teaching and research missions of the University in general. Severe reductions, as in 1989-90, will result in gaps so wide in the collection of current monographs and serials that, even with costly retrospective acquisitions, they may never be filled. The need for "sustained and on-going" materials funding is noted in the NCA report of 1989 (p. 19).

ARL Collection Criteria and the "Information Explosion"

There are now two major areas of library collection development. One may be termed traditional, the other, electronic. The Library's development in recent years of electronic on-line access to off-campus databases and of contract arrangements with compact disc services has been substantial. The need to continue the development of this area, which includes the Library's obligation to contribute to the international libraries electronic network, is pointed out in the 1989
Yet, while the ARL is attempting to evaluate off-campus data base and compact disc services, it does not currently accord them significant weight in the ranking formula. ARL guidelines continue to emphasize traditional, hands-on collection development -- monographs, government publications, ongoing serials subscriptions, and microform -- in support of the full range of the University's doctoral programs. For the foreseeable future, it will be the acquisition of monographs and serials that will, in effect, determine our ARL rank.

(5) Recommended Materials Budget Increase

The request to the Library Faculty was to recommend a minimum materials budget increase that would secure and modestly improve our ARL rank. The estimated increase to achieve these goals, with necessary emphasis on traditional collection development, is 20% each year for at least the next five years. Of the 20%, it is anticipated that inflation will take about 10%. Of the remaining 10%, processing will require about 1% (processing of acquisitions is wisely part of the materials budget). The remainder translates in the first year into about $240,000. At the current averages of $38 per monograph, $200 per serials subscription (bearing in mind that serials acquisitions account for well over half the materials budget expenditures), the recommended budget increase is thereby a percentage for modest improvement, indeed.
SUBJECT: Faculty Development Plan

REQUESTED ACTION:
Endorse the Plan.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The Senate Operations Committee has been working with Vice Presidents Paul Elsner and Janet Roebuck on the question of faculty development. The following Faculty Development Plan has been reviewed by the Committee and it is recommended that the Senate consider endorsing the Plan.
The University of New Mexico faces many issues in considering the future of its faculty. Fundamental social issues include, for example, demographic change; the evolution of an increasingly multicultural society within the nation in which women and other traditionally underrepresented groups will play increasingly important roles; growing international interdependence; the need to value and develop new knowledge and skills. The University must balance the imperatives of change with those of sustaining its central missions -- providing high quality academic programs for students; supporting and encouraging research; educating future intellectual, social and economic leaders. All of these issues have a major impact on what must always be the central concern of any University, sustaining and developing a high quality faculty.

In the context of a growing social awareness of demographic change and an expanding concern for equity, the University has undertaken a great deal of self-scrutiny and has developed blueprints for its future in the UNM 2000 Report and the New Mexico Plan. These documents provide the setting, broad structures and much of the rationale for this paper. The object here is, focusing on the faculty, to combine vision with reality and to set the guidelines by which ideals may be made to work in practice.

The Major Issues

1) The Maintenance of a High Quality Professoriate

The maintenance and continued development of a high quality, vigorous faculty requires full inclusion of members of traditionally underrepresented groups. The enormous physical, economic, social and intellectual challenges that we face require that all the best talent be applied to problem solving. Further, as scholars and professionals, the faculty work in a world which is becoming increasingly internationalized and diversified; our students must be prepared to live and work in a future world in which old social stereotypes no longer apply. The creation of a multicultural professoriate is thus an issue of both function and quality.
The Maintenance and Enhancement of Program Quality

Academic ideals and the practical expectations of the students and the people of the State require that UNM continue to place the highest priority on program quality. The operational assessment of quality is, appropriately, placed in the hands of the individual academic units as overseen by institutional officers and evaluated by national accrediting bodies. This, like any system, has its flaws, but no better one has yet been presented. Hence it is anticipated that while the search for improvement will continue, the fundamental responsibility for all judgments affecting program quality will remain with the academic units.

The Preservation of Established Fields and the Incorporation of New Knowledge

The same social and intellectual changes which are modifying the personnel of the professoriate are also introducing exciting and promising new knowledge, and new approaches to knowledge and learning, which must be incorporated into both the teaching and research agendas of the University. This process will require the exercise of academic rigour as well as unprecedented imagination and creativity. It can only be accomplished in an atmosphere in which prejudgment and bigotry are absent, or at least consciously rejected, and in which the best traditions of the free spirit of intellectual discourse and inquiry are self-consciously maintained and fostered.

In an operational context, all of these issues, and others, interlock into a dynamic whole in which strengths combine for the benefit of all.
STAGES IN BUILDING THE FACULTY

Retaining and strengthening a quality faculty is the single most important concern of any academic unit. In the absence of a high quality faculty, quality is not attainable in other areas such as research and instruction. It is a fundamental assumption here that all units recognize the importance of faculty quality and will, in their own interest, continue to strive to enhance it.

The realities of academic life imposed by the major forces of demographic and social change require that we review and revise traditional attitudes and paradigms about the faculty. Whether we plan effectively or do nothing, the faculty of the future will look different and be different from the faculty of the past. If we do nothing, it is likely to be of smaller size and lower quality than in the past; if we plan effectively its composition will change but we can maintain and improve quality. Even for the most intellectually dynamic, the process of change and of modifying established expectations and paradigms can be a problematical one. It will require extraordinary sensitivity on the part of all parties involved, as well as openness, dialogue, free inquiry, learning, and mutual respect.

THE EARLY CAREER GROUP

A) GRADUATE STUDENTS

In the long term planning for the development of the professoriate, close attention must be paid to the nature of the pool from which they are drawn, the graduate students. The number of doctorate degrees awarded in all fields increased sharply in the 1960's, but it has remained fairly constant at about 31,000 a year since 1978. Within that apparent constancy, however, traditional patterns have changed. The number of white males has declined considerably. This decline has been offset by a substantial increase in the number of foreign nationals. The increase in the number of non-Asian minorities and women which occurred between the late 1950's and early 1970's appears to have leveled off and these groups remain severely underrepresented in doctoral education. In addition, as salaries have undergone a period of relative decline, a faculty career has become less attractive, and as a result more of the best students have opted for professional schools and fewer of those who do earn doctorate degrees are entering the professoriate. Data on the career choices of young men and women indicate that college teaching has lost much of its appeal.

There are many issues here. For example:

For the sake of the long term maintenance of quality in the professoriate, we need to work to ensure that an adequate number of potential faculty members from all social groups, including white American men, are trained and motivated to join it.
If present trends continue, the pool of potential faculty members seems likely to shrink. Assuming that demand for them remains stable or increases, the best and brightest of them will be in considerable demand.

If the pattern sketched by the demographics of doctorates already awarded holds steady into the faculty ranks, additions to the faculty will be more likely than in the past to come from minorities, women and foreign nationals.

These are national issues but, as the faculty market is a national one, they directly affect the long term future of the University of New Mexico. Equally, they have specific local implications. For example, given the demographics of our State, we must do a larger than average "share" of producing Native American, Hispanic, and African American Ph.D's, both male and female, for the national market in all disciplines. UNM's production of minority minority Ph.D's, both men and women, is more than a local matter. It is our obligation to the future of intellectual life and of higher education in the United States.

**Action Items**

All this being so, there are many practical steps we must take. These include, but are not limited to:

- Minorities and women are the largest underrepresented groups in graduate programs generally -- work to expand the number of minorities and women entering graduate school. All academic units should develop programs which support and encourage their best undergraduate students and make a deliberate effort to recruit them into graduate school, at UNM and elsewhere. Funding is a key issue, but others, such as campus climate, community support etc., are also central.

Motivate our best students, of all social groups, to enter careers in the professoriate. This will involve, e.g. developing fellowship programs, internships, which provide adequate funding, as well as better training and mentoring.

Remove disciplinary restrictions on fellowships etc. which are targeted for underrepresented groups. Both society and the future professoriate need women and minority Ph.D.'s in all fields. (Recent studies indicate, for example, that the faculty shortages of the late 1990's could be especially acute in the humanities and social sciences.) Minority and women students also deserve the same freedom in choosing a field, and being supported in that choice, that has traditionally been accorded to white males.

Encourage academic units to "target" potential faculty members while they are still in graduate school, here and elsewhere, and to encourage them to consider future positions here. The modest funds...
needed for such a project (the occasional phone call, a lunch at a conference, even a visit to campus) should be considered normal recruitment costs.

Enhance the support systems which allow students to pursue advanced degrees and whose existence provides a supportive campus climate. These systems include, for example, child care facilities, family housing, and financial aid packages which recognize the costs of dependent care.

B) JUNIOR FACULTY

1) Recruitment and Hiring

Recognizing the importance of recruiting the very best young scholars to the professoriate, great care must be devoted to the recruitment of top candidates from all social groups. Junior faculty members are essential to short and medium term planning, but they are also the key human elements in the long term planning for our future. In formulating hiring plans and priorities for junior faculty, care must thus be taken to balance all these levels of interest. For example, given the degree granting patterns outlined above, it is possible that in the long term future, white males could become underrepresented. Any great disproportion in participation would represent a violation of the very principles of inclusion, equity and equality which short-term "traditionally underrepresented group" hiring are designed to address. Further, it is important to remember that in the past the "feminizing" and/or "ghettoizing" has not been followed by a fall in both social status and economic standing.

With this modest caveat for the long term, it is nonetheless clear that, in the short and medium term, UNM must add a concern for diversity to its concerns for quality when hiring junior faculty. "The underrepresentation...of women and minorities must be addressed as a matter of both practical necessity and social justice. We cannot afford the costs of a continued inability to recruit the talent from such large and rapidly expanding sectors of our society." 28

a) Regular Hiring

The well established hiring mechanism for junior faculty will continue to operate. However, practical realities and University priorities require that it be augmented in the interests of achieving the goals of both quality and equity and diversity. This augmentation is necessary, not because of any assumption of gender or ethnic bias on the part of the present faculty but because of market conditions. Given that a) high quality women and minority candidates are in relatively short supply nationally, b) most other institutions nationwide are trying to hire a more diverse faculty, c) UNM, like any other major institution, competes on the
national market for faculty, qualified minorities and women often "cost more" than other candidates. This higher "cost" (which can have many forms besides salary) is not, in any intrinsic way, different from the higher "cost" of, say, a physicist or engineer (who may require a lab costing tens, even hundreds of thousands of dollars as a start up dowry) relative to a Shakespeare scholar (who may require only a relatively modestly priced computer and collection of sources), or of a faculty member in business or law (whose salary reflects the generally high levels in related fields beyond the campus) compared to a faculty member in sociology (whose salary reflects the relatively low levels in related fields beyond the campus). Even so, the internal inequities created by responses to national market conditions must be handled with sensitivity and care -- it will not help us to demoralize the good faculty we already have for the sake of a single appointment.

**Action Items**

The Vice President for Academic Affairs will obtain special funds from those set aside for the implementation of the New Mexico Plan in order to help academic units who locate top quality candidates for regularly available positions who are minorities and/or women.

The form of this assistance will vary by case but might include, for example: salary supplements; funding for temporary faculty; the additional interview expenses involved in introducing the candidate to individuals or groups outside the unit whose intellectual, cultural and social presence on campus would build the candidate's enthusiasm for joining UNM; modest equipment or research assistant costs to finish a project; assistance with finding jobs for other family members; and setting aside places at the Child Care Center.

In making his/her judgement about whether or not to allocate special funds in any given case, the VP for Academic Affairs will be influenced by such things as, for example, the quality of the candidate; the "fit" of the candidate with the unit's long term curricular and research plans; the unit's enthusiasm for the candidate (manifested by, e.g. efforts to secure the support of other appropriate campus groups in a positive recruitment/interview process, the provision of "matching" funds at the departmental or college level).

b) **Target of Opportunity Hiring**

(See plan outlined below)

2) **Retention**

Building a high quality faculty can only be accomplished if those who are hired stay at UNM and become fully participating members of the campus community. The signpost that a faculty member has attained this mature status is, traditionally, the award of tenure. This is important in and of itself and also because it marks
the end of the "early career" stage of a faculty member and signals
the onsets of the longest, most productive and most influential stage,
the "mature career." UNM's commitment to recruiting and hiring the best will be accompanied, therefore, by a commitment to keeping the best.

By the nature of the academic endeavor and the University's commitment to ever increasing quality of effort on the part of its faculty, the probationary stage of a faculty member's career necessarily involves a great deal of time, effort, and stress. UNM recognizes, however, that the positive maturation of a junior member is best accomplished in a supportive, encouraging, nurturing environment. Because positive and enthusiastic faculty who are dynamic members of the university community are UNM's greatest resources, the balance of rigor and understanding is in the best interests of the University too.

**Action Items**

In the best interests of both the University and the junior faculty member, efforts will be made to improve the quality and effectiveness of the probationary stage of a faculty member's career. These will include, for example:

- The Office of Academic Affairs will work with other appropriate units and groups to develop an effective faculty orientation program. (This will assist all faculty members but will concentrate on those in the junior ranks.) [This is a separate project.]

- Develop more effective procedures for implementing current tenure and promotion policies which make them more helpful to both the University and the junior faculty member.

- Traditional mentoring systems may not necessarily work well for women and minorities. When their own resources seem likely to be inadequate, academic units will work with appropriate campus groups in an effort to secure appropriate contacts for their junior members.

- Junior faculty will be encouraged to participate in all appropriate components of the Faculty Development Program (below).

- Building a teaching repertoire, doing research or creative work and striving to meet the publication or other standards required for tenure place great demands on the time of junior faculty. Academic units are urged to provide, at an appropriate time in the six year probationary period, a semester in which the junior faculty member is assigned the lightest possible teaching load and withdrawn from as many other duties as possible. During this "Professional Development Semester," the junior faculty member will work closely with appropriate senior scholars on campus with the object of meeting or exceeding the publication requirements for tenure.
THE MATURE CAREER GROUP

The long term health and vitality of the University depends in greatest measure on the faculty who make long term careers and profound personal and professional commitments to UNM. They are the critical mass in sustaining quality; they make crucial decisions in hiring, tenure, promotion and governance; and it is they who carry the main burden of the teaching and research programs. In its eagerness to clarify the importance of recruitment and hiring, the University must avoid either the reality or the impression of taking this group for granted or of valuing them less than others. Care, interest and energy will be devoted to the interests of this group notable in efforts to improve benefits, professional development and in helping them gain the satisfaction of being able to do their jobs to the best of their ability.

1) Recruitment and Hiring

a) Regular Hiring (See above)

b) Academic Targets of Opportunity

Purpose

As part of the New Mexico Plan, the University will implement a Target of Opportunity Program. The purpose of this project is to enhance the quality of academic programs, especially with respect to the cultural diversity of the faculty.

Implementation

It is expected that conventional hiring processes will continue to bring forth the highest quality candidates and will seek to enrich the cultural diversity of the faculty. The Academic Targets of Opportunity project is a supplement to the conventional hiring process. Specifically, the usual hiring policies and procedures will be suspended in order to develop strategies for attracting a few carefully selected scholars.

Only a few faculty will be pursued each year under this project. Selections will be accomplished in two rounds of competition, with the first round to select those who can be pursued. The second round will consist of the final selection of these scholars.

Procedure

Step 1.

Departments will seek to identify persons who match the criteria for scholars to be recruited under this project. Documentation of how this person would contribute to the academic quality of the
department and its teaching and research programs. A part of the nominating package will include the strategy to be used in attracting the scholar and will address all needed resources. Candidates can also be proposed by more than one academic unit, especially when it is believed that the scholar would contribute to both units and to interdisciplinary programs.

Step 2.

Departmental recommendations will be forwarded to the relevant dean(s) who will evaluate these nominations. These evaluated nominations will be sent to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs by April 15 of each year. Within the following 30 days, the Vice President, with the assistance of a committee chosen from the current Regent’s Professors and the Directors of the Studies Programs, will select the nominations to be pursued.

Step 3.

Once the nominees have been selected, the Vice President, the nominating department, the dean(s) and any other directly involved units will determine the resources available for the use of the department in its recruitment efforts. The originating department will then have until the following April 15 to attract the scholar. It is expected that this process will involve an on-campus interview with the dean(s) and the vice president.

Criteria

The scholarship of the candidate is of paramount importance. Thus, while this project is in no way limited to senior scholars, candidates must be far enough along in their career so that it is possible to ensure that their academic credentials are excellent.

It is important to recognize that the purpose of this project is also to enrich the cultural diversity of our faculty. Thus, priority will be given to candidates from underrepresented populations.

Although candidates can be proposed from any academic area, preference will be given to those whose scholarly discipline coincides with current strengths or with planned future developments of our academic programs.

Although the faculty members hired into these positions will be expected to play full, normal roles in academic programs and campus life, the positions themselves will continue to be regarded as "special cases." Hence, when one of these positions is vacated, the funding for it will revert to the Dean and/or VP Academic Affairs for re-allocation.
SUPPORT SYSTEMS FOR HIRING

Even with the best of intentions, it is sometimes difficult for academic units to secure minority and women candidates for positions. This is especially true in units which do not already have significant numbers of faculty from these groups. The Office of Academic Affairs will, therefore, provide a variety of supports and encouragements to assist academic units as they build their future faculties.

Action Items

Financial/new position incentives (discussed elsewhere in this document)

Traditional paradigms and patterns of thought combine with the often "unconventional" fields of study of minority and women scholars to lead to their not being "seen" in traditional hiring pools.

All academic units are, therefore, expected to have at least one person from an underrepresented group on each search committee. Units with few such faculty members are, however, asked not to overburden them with these duties (especially junior members) and to draw on other sources as necessary and appropriate to secure adequate diversity on search committees.

VP for Academic Affairs will, in consultation with appropriate campus groups and constituencies, establish a campus wide Faculty Hiring Assistance Committee. This committee will build a "vita bank" of qualified minority and women candidates for the use of academic units in the construction of candidate pools. Academic units may also submit a description of their faculty needs for an individual position, or their long range development plans and needs, and ask for the Committees help (e.g. suggestions on advertising sources, personal contacts, etc.) in finding candidates. Deans of large colleges are encouraged to work with the central committee to establish appropriate sub-committees for their colleges.

At the beginning of each academic year, all academic units will obtain the most recent information about national availability of women and minorities in their areas from the Affirmative Action Office. Each unit, (department, non-departmentalized college, special section, "Appendix A," to its Annual Report. (Units which match national norms are encouraged to exceed them whenever possible, but they are not required to produce this special report.) The Report will state the facts of the case and give a full account of the efforts it has made that year to recruit high quality the efforts it has made that year to recruit high quality underrepresented faculty. All Appendix A reports, in consultation with the appropriate Dean and the vp for Academic Affairs, with the Faculty Hiring Assistance Committee (or subcommittee), will be reviewed by the appropriate Dean and the vp for Academic Affairs, with the Faculty Hiring Assistance Committee (or subcommittee), with suggestions will then be made to assist the academic unit to reach its goals.
In cases in which local resources seem inadequate to address the problem, VP for Academic Affairs will enlist the aid of experienced consultants appropriate to the field.

The VP for Academic Affairs will work with the directors of the Studies Programs, deans, departments and other campus groups to sponsor a speakers series which addresses the issues of cultural pluralism in an academic setting and develops in more detail its exciting challenges and assets for the whole community of scholars. Some minority and women scholars work in conventional fields; others approach knowledge with fresh perspectives and from new directions, often producing some of the most intellectually demanding work of our age, challenging existing paradigms and producing new visions of the world. Yet other scholar/administrators have more experience than we in building a multicultural campus. Their experiences would be valuable to all. Also, many leading scholars are already members of our faculty and could contribute their expertise to this effort.

As UNM builds its faculty of the future there are many elements to consider. Throughout, we must keep in mind that "the faculty," "candidates," "academic units," "targets of opportunity," and the like are not simply entities or numbers but human beings who must be accorded respect and treated with dignity. Adding multicultural perspectives to our faculty is fundamentally an issue of academic quality and must not be allowed to degenerate into simply hiring people for the sake of an "appropriate" body count. In working to overcome exclusion, we must not fall into the trap of marginalizing or trivializing our minority and women scholars or their work. In recognizing difference, we must not oversimplify our categories, and we must be especially sensitive to this issue for minority women.

It must also be clearly understood that nowhere, in any part of this document, is there any expectation that academic units will be "forced" by some external group or person to hire a faculty member they do not want. To do so, or to set up any expectation of doing so, distorts our academic mission and also represents a cruel and irresponsible act committed against the person, and the professional life of the new faculty member. Faculty build their careers in the context of their academic unit(s), and we must do all we can to enhance their opportunities to thrive and succeed in their intellectual homes. If necessary, units must be persuaded, educated, supported, even directed, to find appropriate candidates, but the choice of a new faculty member still lies with them.

2) Retention

As with junior faculty, hiring the best senior faculty is only a preamble to keeping the best so that they can make the full and many faceted contributions to campus life which are expected from senior faculty. On the ideal multicultural campus of our future, women and men of all ethnic and social groups will be dynamic and influential members of the campus community. This involves, for example, playing members of the campus community.
major roles in teaching, curriculum development and research as well as providing mentors and role models for students and junior faculty and participating in university governance and administration in all ways and at all levels. Faculty who are committed to the expansion of their own intellectual and social horizons, who bring a sensitivity to social issues to the rigor of their instruction and research, and who have a deep commitment to this University are the main elements in shaping our future in a positive fashion. These kinds of commitments and efforts are grounded in a sense of community and respect for, and delight in, the exploration of difference and the intellectual and social challenges which it presents.

Action Items

Some of the necessary programs are already in place, including sabbatical policies, teaching awards, research grants, programs such as Faculty Scholars. These need to be more widely publicized, and their recipients more generally recognized and honored.

The University provides some support for travel to professional meetings, but for most faculty, this alone is not enough to support vigorous and prolonged participation in their disciplines at the national level. It is essential that UNM have more funding for travel if it is to fulfill its mission in the future. For example, it is in reading papers at professional meetings that young faculty obtain both the experience and visibility which promotes publication and successful grant applications; it is in discussing new problems with peers at national and international meetings that mature faculty develop both the ideas and contacts necessary for successful collaborations with both other universities and with industry.

Time is the other major support necessary for faculty to achieve their full potential as scholars, teachers, and national leaders in their fields. The current sabbatical leave policy provides to faculty members with strong and creative research projects the opportunity to take periodic leaves to pursue their research interests. Sabbatical time promotes, for example, better research and publication records, enhanced ability to secure grant support, better preparation of graduate students, reinvigorated teaching, the development of new knowledge and new technologies. Both the University and the community are well served by sabbatical time, and current leave policies must be sustained and strengthened.

In order to improve UNM's status as a research university and our competitive standing with other similar institutions, the value of faculty research time must be considered in more than just the context of sabbatical leaves. Our teaching load is higher than that of most comparable institutions in our region. While this reflects UNM's strong commitment to undergraduate instruction and may increase the number of student credit hours, it, inevitably, reduces the amount and effectiveness of faculty research time and makes it more difficult for us to recruit and retain high quality, research oriented faculty. Serious thought must be given to reducing the current teaching load.
UNM currently provides some support for faculty seeking individual or joint research and/or development grants and faculty are encouraged to apply for external funding for their projects. As the requirements of granting institutions become more complex and as national competition for grant support increases, faculty members need more, and more sophisticated, assistance in writing proposals. Steps are already being taken in this direction, but technical support services and people must be made more readily available to faculty if UNM is to enhance its reputation as a research institution and also to play an appropriate role in the economic development of our community.

Before they can obtain outside support for their efforts, most faculty begin by requiring smaller amounts of inside support, "seed money," which enables them to develop their projects to a level of maturity which may attract outside funding. UNM currently makes available some such support through programs like the Research Allocations Committee's awards program and the Faculty Scholars Program. This funding helps a great many faculty but, again, to maintain, and certainly to enhance, our competitive position, this funding needs to be amplified.

Faculty salaries have not kept pace with those of other professionals in the past few years. Low compensation and salary compaction have serious negative effects on faculty morale and make it difficult to retain many high quality faculty. They also amplify the difficulties of encouraging the best students to consider the professoriate as a career. UNM will make every effort to enhance the compensation levels of its faculty with the goal of bringing them up to at least regional norms in comparable institutions.

Demographic change has produced marked changes in the demands which personal and family responsibilities make upon faculty members. UNM will work towards recognizing these changes in such fields as, for example, child care, elder care, insurance needs, in the benefit packages available to its faculty.

UNM's mission of providing a high quality education for both graduate and undergraduate students requires that we pay attention to the development of faculty as teachers, as well as research scholars. Some support for this already exists in, for example, college resource centers, departmental programs for teaching enhancement, a standardized teaching evaluation instrument, etc. The importance of excellence in teaching is recognized and symbolized by a variety of teaching awards. Even so, especially as learning technologies become more sophisticated and as concern for the nation's educational attainment mounts, more attention and resources must be put into the development of faculty as teachers. Potential strategies include, for example, teaching workshops targeted for special populations (e.g. freshmen and new graduate students), faculty seminars and short courses on teaching, support and time for faculty to attend conferences and special training to acquire enhanced instructional skills.
Career development programs for faculty must also be considered. Workshops would include, for example, working towards tenure for junior faculty, retirement and financial planning for the more mature groups, leadership training and internship opportunities for faculty who wish to develop administrative careers, etc.

Recognize mentoring, role modeling, special assignments, etc. by minority and women faculty as an important and disproportionately large (because there are, currently, relatively few of them and relatively many minority and women students) component of the teaching and intellectual life of minority and women faculty and an accepted, expected, part of their normal duties.

Probably also needs to tie in with other projects, e.g. Core Curriculum development.

THE CONCLUSION-OF-CAREER GROUP

The very senior scholars who have many decades of experience in the academic world have many roles to play. In addition to normal teaching, research and governance duties, they, above all, act as role models and mentors for students and faculty of all levels. They also have a major impact on faculty building, both long and short term, because their decisions to reduce or conclude their work commitments to UNM affect both academic and research programs and also help determine the number of positions available for new hiring.

The future of the most senior ranks of the faculty is one which is the subject of a great deal of national research and debate at the moment, and it touches on many and complex issues. For example:

There is a good deal of evidence that the major issue of the professoriate in the mid 1990's will be a labor shortage, and the problem will not be how to get faculty to accept "the golden handshake" but how to retain them with "the silver handcuffs." There is likely to be a large retirement bulge at the same time that undergraduate numbers grow as a result of the echo of the baby-boom reaching college age. Others disagree with this vision and worry about the removal of the mandatory retirement age creating a doddering and moribund professoriate (ageism needs to be added to racism and sexism on the list of social and intellectual ills). Yet others point out that retirement incentives have very little overall impact on retirement dates.

The approach to these questions which seems both the most sensible and the most humane, from both an individual and an institutional perspective, is to develop a comprehensive retirement plan which would permit both early and late retirement. For example, an innovative plan which would allow a faculty member to "phase down" to half time in his/her late 1950's or early 1960's and work part time for a few for many years without this lower salary affecting time for a few or for many years without this lower salary affecting
the eventual amount of retirement might be very attractive to many people. It could, for example, help us attract the kind of senior stars we have trouble competing for now. (It would require revision of state statutes, but that has been done for less worthy causes!)

All this plugs into work of the Faculty Senate’s Committee on the Professoriate.
The are many basic demographic studies and examinations of various consequences of demographic change. See, for example, Hayes-Bautista, David E. et.al., The Burden of Support: Young Latinos in an Aging Society, Stanford UP, 1988.


It should be noted that the majority of our students are female. For a study of many of the issues in this paper concerning both women and minorities, see Pearson, Carol S. et.al. (eds.) Educating the Majority: Women Challenge Tradition in Higher Education, ACE/Macmillan, 1989. This includes for example, articles by and about minority, disabled and older women, campus climate, hiring, mentoring, curriculum, quality and diversity, leadership, etc.


Actually, it needs to come before even this in a concern for the make-up of college-qualified high school students. See Fields, Cheryl, "The Hispanic Pipeline: Narrow, Leaking, and Needing Repair" and De Necochea, Gloria, "Expanding the Hispanic College Pool: Pre-college Strategies that Work" in Change, May/June 1988.


Faculty Senate Budget Committee, "Faculty Compensation and Salaries at UNM," Report presented to the UNM Faculty Senate, November 14, 1989.


** Need demographic data on NM faculty, students, general population cf. natl norms in FN here.

For a review of basic demographics and issues here, see Estrada, Leobardo F., "Anticipating the Demographic Future" in Change, May/June 1988.
For introductions to the importance of "campus climate" (from a student perspective, but generally valid) see Sandler, B., "The Campus Climate: A Chilly one for Women" [???]; Flaxe, Edward B., "The Undergraduate Hispanic Experience" and Skinner, Elizabeth F. and Richardson, Richard C. Jr., "Making it in a Majority University: The Minority Graduate's Perspective" in Change, May/June 1988. 


It is interesting to note that the average salary for minorities and women at all ranks is less than that for white males and that for women. Salary differences at all ranks have widened since 1975. 


For example, a list of regional consultants can be found in Western states Project on women in the Curriculum, Ideas and Resources for Integrating Women's Studies into the Curriculum, v.2, Southwest Institute for Research on Women, University of Arizona, 1986.

See, for example, Gilligan, Carol, In a Different Voice, Harvard UP, 1982; Spanier, Bonnie B., "Transforming the Biology Curriculum: Themes, Strategies, and Resources" and Glazer, Nona Y., "Reconceptualizing Introductory Sociology: Two Course Outlines" in Western States Project on Women in the Curriculum, Ideas and Resources for Integrating Women's Studies into the Curriculum, v.1, Southwest Institute for Research on Women, University of Arizona, 1986.

Examples include Donna Shalala, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI; Tomas Arciniega, Cal State, Bakersfield, CA.

See, for example, Madrid, Arturo, "Missing People and Others: Joining Together to Expand the Circle" in Change, May/June 1988.

See, for example, Suzukii, Bob H., "Asian Americans as the 'Model Minority': Outdoing Whites? or Media Hype?" and Chan, Sucheng, "Beyond Affirmative Action: Empowering Asian American Faculty" in Change, Nov/Dec 1989.
For a discussion of some facets of this issue, see Rebolledo, Tey Diana, "Chicana Studies: The Missing Text" in Western States Project on Women in the Curriculum, Ideas and Resources for Integrating Women's Studies into the Curriculum, v.1, Southwest Institute for Research on Women, University of Arizona, 1986.


See, for example, Arden, Eugene, "Colleges Should Look to Retired Professors to Cope with the Looming Faculty Shortage" in Chronicle of Higher Education, January 3, 1990.
SUBJECT: Guidelines for Appraisal of Progress of Centers

REQUESTED ACTION:

Approve Guidelines.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

See following pages.
To: Marion Cottrell, President  
Faculty Senate

From: E.A. Walters, Co-Chairman  
Interdisciplinary Research Committee  
Research Policy Committee

Re: RPC Guidelines for Appraisal of Progress of Centers.

The Research Policy Committee is charged with the responsibility of formulating policy regarding the establishment, major modification or termination of research centers, bureaus, institutes, or other related organizations, and reviewing and making recommendations to the central administration and the Faculty Senate on proposals regarding these bodies.

In recent years, a policy was developed and approved by the Faculty Senate for the establishment of such centers or institutes. This policy requires, among other things, periodic review of all centers. We now bring for Faculty Senate action the "Guidelines for Appraisal of Progress Centers." The Research Policy Committee requests approval of these Guidelines so that an orderly program of review of institutes and centers may be initiated this spring.

By way of supplementary information, this document was sent to Vice President Risser on 31 January 1990 for distribution to the Deans for review in their Council.
I. A preliminary statement should be submitted by the center directors containing at least the following items:

A) Center achievements;
B) How well goals have been met. Be specific with regards to library, space, etc., projected requirements;
C) If specific goals were not met, reasons for not meeting them should be given;
D) Any new goals should be articulated at this time,
E) Financial structure;
F) Funding sources with a specific statement of new grants obtained through the existence of the center;
G) A statement of cooperation with and/or duplication of activities of other university units;
H) Plans for the next two years, including library and space impacts;
I) Anything else the center director thinks should be included.

II. The composition of the people responsible for the actual evaluations will be determined as follows:

A) A list of potential members shall be made by the subcommittee using the Center Director, Deans and the Vice President for Research as well as any others as resource people.
B) The list will be sent to concerned faculty and administrators for comments.
C) The evaluatory groups should consist of the following: two faculty members recommended by the director, two faculty recommended by this subcommittee, and one outside person who is expert in center activities. These people should be individuals...
who are a center director, an administrator officer from another institution, and an appropriate external authority in the field of the center.

III. The evaluation group shall prepare a report and submit it to this RPC subcommittee. Of the several possible recommendations which could be made, the subcommittee will consider at least the following:

A) Continue the center as is, everything is fine.
B) The center isn't going anywhere, close it up.
C) If there are problems, recommend reorganization and continued probation.
D) Recommend new directions be taken and continued probation.
E) Recommend that the administration take prescribed actions to help the center and continued probation.

IV. The attached format shall be followed for preparation of the final report.

IV. After the subcommittee prepares its recommendations, it shall follow this path of approval and implementation:

A) RPC
B) Senate
C) V.P. for Research and other concerned administrative officers.
Format for Review Reports

1. Procedures
   Explain the procedures used in the review process.

2. Goals and Objectives
   Identify the goals and objectives of the unit.

3. Results
   Summarize the results of the evaluation of the activities and projects of the unit.

4. Financial Summary
   Provide a financial summary showing the expenditures from state and local funds in each of the major budget categories (personnel services, equipment, etc.) and showing all revenues received, including the sources and the amounts for each of the past five years.

5. Recommendation and Justification
   Include a recommendation for continuation or disestablishment and briefly explain the justification for the recommendation.

6. Future Plans
   Describe the future plans for the unit if it is recommended for continuation, including specific follow-up actions that will be taken by the university and/or college to correct any deficiencies identified in the review.

7. Next Review Date
   Specify the next review date. If only minor deficiencies were found, the next review should be conducted in four or five years. If one or more major deficiencies were found, the next review should be conducted within three years.

8. Reporting Lines
   Reporting lines (requested from Vice President for Research and Academic Affairs), i.e. Dean and/or Chair, and the Vice President for Research.
SUBJECT: Weapons Policy

REQUESTED ACTION:

Adoption by Senate.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

A recent episode in which an armed student was challenging a grade in a professor's office provoked an inquiry into UNM's policy with respect to possession of weapons on campus. Finding no such policy, a task force was convened by Associate Vice President Honbuck to develop such a policy. The attached, if passed, will be added to the Faculty Handbook and Pathfinder.
WEAPONS POLICY: DRAFT

Law enforcement officers, in the performance of their authorized duties, may carry weapons on campus; ROTC students conducting required and supervised drills may carry inoperable weapons for the purpose only of those drills.

With the foregoing exceptions, no person may use or possess a weapon on any part of campus. "Weapon" includes, but is not limited to, firearms, ammunition or other dangerous weapons, substances, or materials, bombs, explosives, or incendiary devices. Persons with such weapons, materials or devices must enter campus at the closest point to the Campus Police Office and deposit all weapons or materials at that office for the duration of their stay.

If any person does carry such weapons or materials on campus, they may be impounded by a law enforcement officer for the duration of the person’s stay on campus and the person may also be subject to appropriate disciplinary and/or criminal action.