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

The UNM Faculty Senate will meet on Tuesday, November 13, 1990, at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

The agenda will include the following items:

- Summarized Minutes of October 9, 1990
- Senate President's Report — Professor Gloria Birkholz
- Report re General Library — Dean Robert Migneault
- Report from the Athletic Council — Professor Jerry Born
- Discussion of Motion concerning Extending Enrollment Cutoff Date (tabled at October 9 meeting) — Professor Marion Cottrell
- Proposed Revision of Repeat Grade Policy — Professor Susan Deese
- Change in Membership of Curricula Committee — Professor Leonard Stitelman
- UNM-Los Alamos Representation on the Faculty Senate — Professor Connie Thomson
- Report re Family Benefits — Professor Gaynor Wild
- Report re UNM Child Care — Bruce Harrison, Chair, GSA Council
- Open Discussion — Proposal concerning a Faculty Services Office — Professor Pauline Turner
- New Business
November 13, 1990

The November 13, 1990 meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Gloria Birkholz at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

Senators present: Gloria Birkholz (Nursing), Sheri Burr (Law), Edith Cherry (Arch & Plan), Robert Cogburn (A&S), Marion Cottrell (Engineering), James Deeson (Gallup), Michele Diel (Valencia), Peter Dorato (Engineering), Luisa Duran (Education), Paul Edwards (Dental Progs), Marilyn Fletcher (Library), Gregory Franchini (Medicine), Kenneth Gardner (Medicine), Douglas George (Fine Arts), Erinda Gonzales-Berry (A&S), Mary Grizzard (Fine Arts), Louise Harris (Education), Richard Harris (A&S), Gordon Hodge (A&S), Tjome Karid (Engineering), Jerry King (Medicine), Kathleen Matthews (University College), Helen Muller (Management), David Null (Library), Peter Pabisch (A&S), Priscilla Smith (Gallup), Jimmy Starlefer (Medicine), Ann Lehr (A&S), Erlinda Gonzales-Berry (A&S), Mary Harris (Education), Richard Harris (A&S), Gordon Hodge (A&S), Priscilla Smith (Gallup), Jimmy Starlefer (Medicine), Kathleen Matthews (University College), Helen Muller (Management), David Null (Library), Peter Pabisch (A&S), Glynn Raymond (Pharmacy), Jose Rivera (Public Admin), Priscilla Smith (Gallup), Jeeny Standfefer (Medicine), Charlie Steen (A&S), Alexander Stone (A&S), Carrie Thronson (Library), James Thomson (A&S), Pauline Turner (Education), James Wallace (Medicine), Estes Wilkins (Engineering), William Woods (Medicine) and Estelle Zarmes (A&S).

Absent: Jerry Born (Pharmacy), Douglas Brookins (A&S), Carl Cords (Medicine), Daniel Decker (Medicine), Walter Forman (Medicine), Donald Lee (A&S), Joseph Martinez (Education), David MePherson (A&S), Elizabeth Nielsen (Education), Susan Pearson Davis (Fine Arts), Russell Snyder (Medicine), Ron Storey (Medicine), Donald Vichick (Medicine), Benjamin Walker (Medicine), and Margaret Werner-Nashburn (A&S).

Minutes of October 9, 1990. The minutes of October 9, 1990 were approved as distributed.

Senate President’s Report. Senate President Gloria Birkholz told the Senate that the UNM 2000 Plan has been adopted by the Board of Regents and she called the Senate’s attention to several important points regarding the Plan: 1) annual evaluations of faculty not be written, 2) a report from the Core Curriculum Committee is expected in December, 3) teaching is considered to be the top priority of the University, and 4) the University intends to stress the strength of the undergraduate programs, to establish an Honors College and to strengthen our graduate programs. She told the Senate that anyone who would like a copy of the Report can contact Anne Brown’s office.

Additionally, she said, the reallocation process is continuing. The proposed University Planning Council will be discussed later in this meeting. This proposal is the President’s Council’s response to the Senate proposal for a University Planning Group.
There will be a faculty lobbyist at the Legislature this year and President Birkholz said that names of possible lobbyists can be submitted to her.

There is a military withdrawal policy which states that students who have completed twelve weeks of the semester and have a "C" average will get full credit for the class. She announced that President Peck has two more meetings scheduled with faculty: on November 20 and December 10 at 3:30 in the Centennial Gallery at the New Mexico Union.

Annual reviews will be conducted for: William Hadley (Pharmacy), Ronald Blood (OTHC), James Thompson (Engineering), and Richard Oudy (Policy and Planning Studies).

The members of the search committee for the position of Provost are Fred Harris (Political Science), chairperson; Greg Candela (Valencia Branch), Colston Chandler (Physics & Astronomy), Flora Clancy (Art & Art History), Linda Hall (History), Raquel Martinez (Arts & Sciences), Alfonso Ortiz (Anthropology), Jose Rivera (Southeast Hispanic Research Center), Maria Dolores Gonzales Velasquez (Graduate Student) and Kenneth Walters (Anderson Schools of Management).

The search committees for Associate Provost for Research and Vice President for University Relations will be named soon.

Birkholz explained that at the last meeting of the Faculty Senate, the issue of diversity on committees was discussed. Vice President Paul Risser has revised the policy presented at that time to indicate that 1) more diversity in the faculty as a whole must come first and 2) deans should not compromise a faculty member's welfare in order to assure diversity on committees. The committees most needing the assurance of diversity are those involved in hiring decisions, academic programs, and budget decisions. Deans will work with the appointing administrators to expand committees.

Report re General Library. Dean Robert Migneault said he is asking faculty to begin thinking about the Library and its problems. Construction on the Center for Southwest Research will begin in the next year and will cause great inconvenience for those needing access to the Library.

The cost of serials has seen increasing astronomically for more than a decade by an average of 30-40% per year. Zimmerman Library can only purchase 26 of serials published internationally and 20% of those published in the United States. Migneault said that we will soon have to decide how best to serve the University community. The cost increase will force the Library to increasingly depend on electronic access. He said that by the year 2000, more students will be familiar with electronic networking and the university must be able to respond to their needs.

Additionally, Migneault said that the Library needs additional staffing. Two thousand people come in every day and the human resources are not adequate to meet their needs. Space is also a problem.
The formula revision is very important to the Library and he urged Senators to contact their representatives to support the revision which will increase library funding. The biggest challenge will be, he said, to switch from printed materials to electronic networks. He urged the Senators to read the report which he distributed at the meeting and also urged the Senate Library Committee to begin working more closely with the Library.

Report from the Athletic Council. Since Senator Jerry Born was not present, this report was postponed.

Discussion of Motion Concerning Extending Enrollment Cutoff Date. At the meeting of October 9, the following motion was tabled:

The Faculty Senate requests that its Admissions and Registration Committee study the feasibility of extending the enrollment cutoff date to Friday of the 5th week of each semester or Thursday of the 3rd week for eight-week summer sessions, or Wednesday of the 2nd week for four-week sessions and to report back to the Senate during the spring semester 1991.

Professor Marion Cottrell urged that an ad hoc committee to examine the relationship between academics and athletics be established. After Professor Cottrell expressed his belief that the Athletic Department is not following established UNM policies, a motion was made to table the motion indefinitely. The motion to table failed.

After further discussion, the Senate defeated the motion to refer the matter to the Admissions & Registration Committee.

Proposed Revision of Repeat Grade Policy. Professor Susan Deese, chairperson of the Admissions & Registration Committee, presented the following proposed revision to the Repeat Grade Policy:

Any course acceptable toward an undergraduate degree can be repeated one time for improvement of grade if a "D" or "F" was received. A grade of "C" or better will have the effect of removing the "D" or "F" from the grade point average (GPA).

Hours earned will only be counted one time.

Only 12 hours of courses may be repeated for improvement of grade.

No grade may be changed after a degree has been granted.

This process will not be automatic. After a student has completed a course with a "C" or higher, he must notify the Records Office that this repeat is to be used for grade improvement.
Additional Explanation: Only one "C" or higher grade accepted and only one "D" or "F" removal per course, i.e. a student who has taken a course three times with an "F" each time, repeats with a "C" or higher will only have one "F" removed. The other two will continue to be averaged into the GPA.

Professor Peter Pabisch moved to include the grade of "C-" as a friendly amendment to the proposed policy since a "C-" does not count toward a major in the College of Arts and Sciences. Approved.

It was stressed that the policy does not include graduate students. After considerable discussion of the proposed policy, the Senate voted not to approve the revised policy.

Change in Membership of Curricula Committee. President Gloria Birkholz, for the Curricula Committee, presented a request to approve the addition of one representative from each of the branch campuses on the Curricula Committee. The Senate voted approval.

UNM-Los Alamos Representation on the Faculty Senate. Professor Gloria Birkholz explained that the addition of a senator to represent the Los Alamos branch would change the number of Senators and would have to be referred to the Committee on Governance for a constitutional change. The Senate approved a motion to forward the request for the addition of a faculty representative from UNM-Los Alamos to the Committee on Governance.

Report re Family Benefits. Professor Gaynor Wild explained that the Report, included in the agenda, was the work of a joint sub-committee of the Faculty Senate Long Range Planning Committee and the Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee. The issue is that of family leave for faculty and staff. He requested discussion of the fundamental issue, of options, and eventually, further instructions regarding what kind of a policy to develop.

Professor Jane Hood of the Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee, explained that one thing the Committee would like to see in place immediately is the legitimate use of sick leave to care for sick children.

Professor Peter Pabisch urged the Senate to initiate a policy providing maternity leave of at least one month for both staff and faculty women.

Professor Mary Harris stressed that the Staff Council should be included in the decision. Also, she said she felt that parental leave should be available for both men and women.

President Birkholz summed up the issues as follows: 1) use of sick leave for family leave, 2) definition of pregnancy leave, 3) adequate family leave policy for faculty and staff and funding for such leave, and 4) parental leave.

In a straw vote, the Senate indicated it feels the issue is a high priority budget issue. Professor Wild suggested another joint committee be formed now to discuss family leave, cafeteria plan, and other benefits issues.
Report re UMN Child Care. Bruce Harrison of GSA presented a brief report regarding child care. He said that the UMN Child Care Center is doing well but is understaffed and that its director is much overworked. The GSA would like to start an endowment for children of students, however, there are administrative problems with the idea at this time. He suggested that the facility be included in any benefits package proposed by the Senate.

University Planning Council. President Birkholz reported that last May, the Senate approved a plan for a University Planning Group and that this idea was not received well by the administration. The President’s Council then wrote a new plan which was distributed to Senators at the beginning of the meeting.

She then presented major differences in the two proposals: 1) the University Planning Council is much broader in scope regarding setting policy guidelines regarding budget issues, reallocation, tuition, etc., and 2) the membership of the group: the University Planning Group (the Senate plan) would have eleven total members including four faculty members and one regent, whereas the proposed University Planning Council would have 24 members including no regents, only two faculty members, the Vice President for Student Affairs and all deans.

President Birkholz asked that Senators submit any suggestions or comments to her.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne J. Brown
Secretary
SUBJECT: Proposed Revisions of Repeat Grade Policy

REQUESTED ACTION: Approve the Revisions

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Repeat Grade Policy

Hugh Kabat, Chair of the Pharmacy Academic Standards Committee, asked the A&R Committee to reconsider the present Senate Policy regarding the calculation of GPA. At the present time, when a student repeats a course the two grades are averaged. He recommended that the second grade only be averaged into the GPA. Dr. Kabat felt that our present policy penalizes minority and disadvantaged students and does not account for mastery of the material. Chairperson Laura Cameron called for a subcommittee to look further into this matter. Members were: Jerry Shea, Jerry Dominguez, Harold Knudsen, Hugh Kabat ex-officio, Moe Miller ex-officio, Bill Haid, Michele Diel, Ed Reyes, Dick Mead, Jeff Foster.

The subcommittee met and made the recommendation that the policy be changed. Wording of the new policy was unanimously passed by A&R at its March 29, 1990 meeting.
Proposed Repeat Grade Policy

Any course acceptable toward an undergraduate degree is eligible to be repeated one time for improvement of grade if a "D" or "F" was received. A grade of "C" or better will have the effect of removing the D or F from the grade point average (GPA).

Hours earned will only be counted one time.

Only 12 hours of courses may be repeated for improvement of grade.

No grade may be changed after a degree has been awarded.

This process will not be automatic. After a student has completed a course with a C or higher, he must notify the Records Office that this repeat is to be used for grade improvement.

Additional Explanation:

Only 1 "C" or higher grade accepted and only 1 "D" or "F" removal per course, i.e. a student who has taken a course 3 times with an "F" each time, repeats with a "C" or higher will only have 1 "F" removed. The other 2 will continue to be averaged into the GPA.
SUBJECT: Change in Membership of the Curricula Committee

REQUESTED ACTION: Approve the change in membership

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The present membership of the curricula committee includes one representative from a branch campus. It has been suggested that, since each branch campus serves a unique community, it would be advantageous to have a representative from each branch on the committee as a voting member.

The committee recommends that the Senate approve the expansion of committee membership to include a representative from each branch campus.
Proposed Change in Curricula Committee Membership

(Sixteen faculty members, including the chairperson, nominated by the Faculty Senate: two from Arts and Sciences, and one each from Architecture and Planning, Dental Programs, Education, Engineering, Fine Arts, General Library, Law, Management, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Public Administration, University College, and a the branch colleges; two students appointed by ASUNM and GSA, respectively. Ex-officio members shall include the Registrar, the Collection Development Librarian, the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs for Evening and Weekend Degree Programs, and one representative each from the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees. The chairperson is elected by the Committee.)
The UNM Faculty Constitution specifies "There shall be one senator for each thirty full-time faculty members or major fraction thereof from each school, college or branch with a full-time academic faculty...." and "No school, college or branch with a full-time academic faculty shall have less than one senator."

The attached memo from Angela Coop is self-explanatory, and the Senate is asked to discuss the possibility of a Senate representative from Los Alamos. If the Faculty Constitution must be changed, the proposal will be forwarded to the Committee on Governance.
Per your suggestion I am writing to request that a consideration be given by the UNM-Faculty Senate to extend its membership to a UNM-Los Alamos faculty member.

I understand from Anne Brown that UNM-Gallup has two senators and UNM-Valencia one, and that they are permitted because of their full-time status. As you know our core faculty, especially the six half-time faculty members, play a key role in our institution. Furthermore, our faculty has a Faculty Assembly with a fully developed constitution in place. In addition, we actually do have a full-time faculty member: Linda Schappert, the Director of our Library, is a full-time, permanent employee with faculty status.

I believe that as an integral college of the university our representation on the Faculty Senate is certainly justified and appropriate.

Can you assist me with this matter?
SUBJECT: Report re Family Benefits

REQUESTED ACTION: Discuss the need for a family leave policy

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: (See attachments)
To: Members of the UNM Faculty Senate

From: Gaynor Wild, Chairman, Faculty Senate Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC)

re: The need for a family leave policy.

Enclosed is a copy of a subcommittee report on establishing a Family Leave policy at UNM. This is the final report of an ad hoc, joint subcommittee of both the LRPC and the Faculty and Staff Welfare and Benefits Committee.

Our recommendation to the UNM Faculty Senate is that a Family Leave policy should be developed. The enclosure cites the major pros and cons in the development of such a policy, and cites some examples. Appendix 3 is a particular example, from the University of Indiana, which is seen by members of the subcommittee as being one of the most desirable models.

The LRPC, rather than submitting a specific proposal for the Faculty Senate to debate at this time, instead submits these materials and the following suggestion. We recommend that the entire Faculty Senate consider the major issues surrounding a Family Leave policy and choose a set of guidelines from the options and examples set out in this document. Once the FS has made these major, "coarse tuning" decisions, then a specific, committee, either standing or ad hoc, can be designated to draft the final policy.
To: Members of the Faculty Senate Long-range Planning Committee  
From: Alice Cushing, Chair, Subcommittee on Family Leave  
Subject: Progress Report and Recommendations

Basic Philosophy: Every employee of the University of New Mexico, faculty and staff, should be able to take leave from his/her work when necessary to meet family needs.

Advantages of a Comprehensive Family Leave Plan: Recruitment and retention of employees, fostered by availability of such a plan, will reduce costs of hiring and training, reduce turnover and increase productivity.

Disadvantages of a Comprehensive Family Leave Plan: There will be attendant costs which are difficult to predict (see Background). Some employees will "take advantage" of the system. Certain jobs are filled by employees so specialized that there is no suitable substitute.

Background: Basic information which would be useful to project costs to the institution of a comprehensive family leave policy might include 1) maternity leave experience with the present number of employees of childbearing age and 2) a formula for budgeting sick leave based on number and type of employees. Undoubtedly there are others.

The first data are not available because maternity leave is charged to sick leave and there is no separate accounting for it. The process for handling sick leave projections in the budgeting process is unclear. Moreover the family leave plan we are proposing would potentially encompass every employee of the
university.

Precedents for family leave policies among state institutions and universities are briefly tabulated in Appendix 1 along with one example of a private company. It may be possible to get cost figures from these entities but we have not attempted to do so.

We have information on benefit packages including types of leave provided by other universities (kindly tabulated by Jane Hood) in Appendix 2. The AAUP office has recent data on family leave policies affecting faculty and will send them to us.

Political Climate: The House failed to override a presidential veto of a proposed family leave plan that would have guaranteed up to three months unpaid family leave to employees of companies with 50 or more employees. The veto was based on assertion by the "business lobby" that this would be too costly for small businesses. We don't know the extent of this sentiment locally but it could provide an excuse for denying implementation of a more generous leave policy at the university or in other state agencies.

Proposals for providing family leave for employees:

IMMEDIATE: Through the sick leave mechanism: allow the employee to use his/her sick leave to meet needs of any family (or significant other) member. Pool sick leave within departments or divisions for use by the participating members.

Allow employees to share jobs and to work flexible hours at a single job. This will present problems for areas that require being "manned" at particular times as well as for jobs so specialized that only a special employee can perform them (neurosurgery, special areas of literature or history or other graduate field).
INTERMEDIATE: Provide on-campus day-care for sick children, and elderly spouses and parents.

LONG-RANGE GOAL: Options which could be selected at time of employment or on a twice-yearly enrollment schedule.

Option A: all leave remain as it is.

Option B: accrue "sick" leave (call it something else) at the present rate and use it as necessary for family needs. When sick leave, paid at the usual rate, has been used, grant leave without pay (LWOP) for an additional period of time to be determined. This option takes advantage of a sick leave accrual system already in operation and allows additional leave without additional outlay by the institution. Both this option and Option C will require further definition of handling of tenure track time, retirement, accrual of leave and other benefits for the employee on family leave.

Option C: accrue sick leave (call it something else) at the present rate and use it as necessary for family needs except pay differently i.e. full pay for x portion, half pay for x portion and no pay for x portion but continue to pay fringes.

Option D: employee pays into a fund to insure x amount of family leave after x period of probation, with paid benefits to continue during leave. This might save the institution money in actual outlay but would increase bookkeeping costs.

Additional Considerations: Whichever plan is eventually implemented should be accompanied by an accounting system that allows the institution to collect useful data on family-related needs of employees and costs to the institution.
Leave Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Maternal/Parental</th>
<th>LWOP 1</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM Supreme Court Admin. Office</td>
<td>parental leave</td>
<td>Administrative discretion, no more than 12 mos. (Provisions)</td>
<td>compassionate 5 days, case by case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pregnancy or adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(annual + sick + LWOP)</td>
<td>to 180 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Personnel Board</td>
<td><em>same as others</em></td>
<td>30 days probationer, 12 mos. employee (Provisions)</td>
<td>Educational Military (15 w.d.) Funerals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sick leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNM</td>
<td>Maternity 8 weeks</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Regular, Personal 7-30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extended, Personal &gt; 30 days provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Indiana (1988)</td>
<td>6 weeks (full salary)</td>
<td>Family-related-individual and department head</td>
<td>Family-related partial up to 15 weeks at 75% salary (other qualifiers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Academic appointees)</td>
<td><em>and such time as is medically required</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5% as sick leave, 12 weeks with pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% as sick leave, 15 weeks 50% pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 days with pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Survey (47 Unives)</td>
<td>51% as sick leave 2X 12 weeks with pay</td>
<td></td>
<td>day care on campus 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2X 15 weeks 30% pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2X 30 days with pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not stated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM</td>
<td>Max 126 working days with Presidential approval (faculty) sick leave (for staff employee only)</td>
<td></td>
<td>military 15 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. LWOP - Leave without pay
2. Like status, pay, geographic area or waiver
3. Altered benefits coverage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Date of Info.</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCAL Berkeley</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>10 week/uses sick leave for 55% of pay for childbirth only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>4 weeks before/ 6 week after short term disability leave only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>6 month unpaid leave/mothers only. 8 week unpaid leave for childbirth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(can use 156 sick days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana U.</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>6 week unpaid leave for child rearing Can use vacation time and sick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leave for reimbursement (up to 20 days).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Iowa</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>8 week unpaid leave for childbirth (can use 156 sick days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 week unpaid leave for child rearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can use vacation time and sick pay for reimbursement (up to 20 days).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Six weeks paid pregnancy leave. Unpaid childrearing leaves of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unspecified length to fathers &amp; mothers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana U.</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Six weeks paid pregnancy leave. Unpaid childrearing leaves of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unspecified length to fathers &amp; mothers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stop tenure clock for probationary faculty for one year for principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or co-equal care-givers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two extensions only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One course release for caregivers for newborns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family-related partial leave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See attached This is the most advanced so far.)
To: University Faculty Council
From: University Faculty Affairs Committee
Susan Eastman & Richard Peterson, co-chairs
Date: January 11, 1990
Subject: Family Leave Policy
(revised, based on UPC discussion of November 14, 1989, and subsequent recommendations)

The Faculty Affairs Committee moves:

THE ACADEMIC HANDBOOK STATEMENT CONCERNING 'OTHER LEAVES AND ABSENCES' (PAGE 57 OF THE JUNE 1988 EDITION, FOLLOWING THE SECTION ON 'SICK LEAVE' AND PRECEDING THE SECTION ON 'MILITARY TOURS OF DUTY') SHALL BE AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS:

PREGNANCY AND FAMILY-RELATED LEAVES
All full-time academic appointees with family-related needs may choose between two leave options: family-related partial leave and leave without pay. Women who are about to bear children have the additional option of family pregnancy leave.

PREGNANCY AND CHILD-BEARING LEAVES. Medical disabilities of any employee resulting from pregnancy (including pre-delivery, delivery, and post-partum medical needs, and complications of pregnancy and/or childbirth, and termination of pregnancy whether by miscarriage or by abortion) are to be treated as are any other temporary medical disabilities for purposes of granting sick leave, regardless of marital status.

A pregnant academic appointee may take, but is not required to take, a leave, to be known as a pregnancy leave, extending for up to six weeks from up to two weeks prior to expected delivery date through up to four weeks following delivery date and such additional time as is medically required. Such pregnancy leave shall be considered to be necessitated by disabilities resulting from pregnancy.

Appointees on pregnancy leave shall be paid up to six weeks' full salary during the leave and 50% for the balance of the period of leave when medically required. Upon recommendation of the chairperson or immediate supervisor with the concurrence of the appropriate dean or Vice President or Chancellor, the period of leave can be extended beyond the limits of a semester to a total maximum of six weeks at full pay and nine additional weeks at one-half pay when medically required. Beyond such periods or upon recognition that the disability will be more prolonged, the individual shall be placed on leave without pay. Academic appointees taking 13 weeks (or one semester) of pregnancy leave will not have the time credited toward tenure, sabbatical eligibility, or early retirement. The University will make the usual contribution to retirement funds.

Deletions because recast below in Family-Related Leaves Without Pay. A reasonable number of child-caring blocks shall be available under rules normally governing leave without pay to both mothers and fathers, under conditions mutually agreed upon between individuals and his or her department head.

Pregnancy and child-bearing shall be considered a permissible purpose for applying for a leave without pay and shall be available as prescribed by the policy on leave without pay, to all academic appointees.

(Board of Trustees, June 29, 1974)

Text in regular type repeats existing policy in the Academic Handbook, June 1988, pages 55-57. Additions are underlined. Deletions are struck out.
FAMILY-RELATED PARTIAL LEAVES. Full-time academic appointees who are primary or co-primary caretakers are eligible for family-related partial leaves for the following reasons: the birth of a child, the adoption of a child, or the catastrophic illness of a child, parent, spouse, or household member. A partial leave can be granted for up to 12 weeks. Tenure probationary appointees who avail themselves of a family-related partial leave may exclude the time from the probationary period according to University guidelines.

In the usual case, a full-time academic appointee may take a 15-week (one semester) leave from classroom teaching duties (or equivalent structured service duties) while continuing their research/creative work and other service activities. In exceptional cases, equivalent arrangements can be made. Upon return to regular duties, the appointee will not be expected to take on a heavier teaching load than existed prior to the leave.

Appointees on family-related partial leave shall be paid 20% of 15-week salary and relinquish that period's University contribution to retirement funds (TIAA/CREF). Upon request, the University will arrange the option of a contribution to retirement before taxes if that amount is deducted from salary. The balance of unpaid salary and the University's retirement contribution shall return to the college/school's salary pool. Teaching replacement funds will be met from that pool.

FAMILY-RELATED LEAVES WITHOUT PAY. Full-time academic appointees can request a leave without pay for the following reasons: the birth of a child, the adoption of a child, or the catastrophic illness of a child, parent, spouse, or household member. A reasonable number of childrearing leaves shall be available under rules normally governing leaves without pay to both mothers and fathers, under conditions mutually agreed upon between an individual and his or her department head. Family leaves shall be available to all appointees under rules normally governing leaves without pay.
November 6, 1990

To:  Paul Risser, Interim Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs
     David McKinney, Vice President for Business and Finance
     Orcilia Zuniga Forbes, Vice President for Student Affairs
     Judy K. Jones, Executive Assistant to the President

From: Judy K. Jones, Executive Assistant to the President

SUBJECT: PLANNING COUNCIL PROPOSAL

Attached is the current draft version of the Planning Council proposal which has been developed by the President’s Council at the request of President Peck. President Peck has asked that we review the proposal with appropriate people in each of the areas and with the leadership of the Faculty Senate, ASUNM, GSA and the Staff Council.

We have scheduled a President’s Council meeting on November 29 to discuss comments about the proposal and proposed revisions.

JKJ/mcm

cc: President
Leonard Napolitano, Dean, School of Medicine/Director, Medical Center
The institutional planning process would be the responsibility of the Planning Council, which would consist of the vice presidents, deans, and representatives of the Faculty Senate, Staff Council, ASUNM and GSA. Primary staff to the Council would be a director of planning.

This group would deal with institutional-level planning and resource allocation policy issues, which would be brought to the Council by the director of planning. Typically, the work of the Council with respect to a particular issue would be a two step process: (1) the approval of broad policy guidelines which would guide detailed planning or operational activity at the appropriate unit level; and (2) the approval of institutional-level recommendations or proposals developed in response to the broad policy guidelines. The decisions of the Council would go to the President for approval and to the Board of Regents for action as necessary.

The composition and role of the Planning Council are intended to provide continuity in the planning process, to assure an active role in the process by the administration, to allow substantive and meaningful participation by the various constituencies, and to provide an institutional perspective with the special interests of each of the areas.

The director of planning will have the primary responsibility for assuring that carefully formulated proposals are brought forward for consideration by the Planning Council. The proposals, draft language, research issues, analyze data, evaluate programs, monitor direction and were consistent with the basic principles and goals of the institution, that the Council would primarily deal with specific recommendations, there would be instances deliberation.

Because of the multitude of activities which can be placed under a "planning umbrella," it is important to identify the issues with which the Council will be involved and to define in the first few years; the preliminary definition below of the nature and extent of the organizational task.

1. UNM 2000 Planning and Updating: While the UNM 2000 long-range planning document is not expected to change dramatically over the next several years, there will undoubtedly be a need for the Council to re-examine some of the issues, to consider additional issues, and possibly to update the document itself.

2. Annual Planning Per UNM 2000: Each of the units within the University would be expected to do annual action planning, translating the general goals and objectives from the UNM 2000 plan into specific strategies for implementation and relating their action plans to their budgets. The Council would provide policy guidelines for the annual planning, including the use of the annual plans as part of the budget process.

3. Legislative Requests: The Council would establish general guidelines and priorities for units to follow in developing legislative requests and would then recommend a legislative package for consideration by the President and the Board of Regents.

4. Budget Allocation: The Council would recommend the budget allocation policy, over the long-term and annually depending on legislative appropriations and the amount of revenue from other sources. Long-term policies relating to faculty salaries might be addressed as part of this planning issue. The Council would act on specific internal allocations for new funds made available through appropriation, reallocation of current base budget and other sources of new funds.

5. Capital Budgeting: The Council would establish priorities, policies and a process for consideration of capital budget requests, and would approve annual and long-term capital budget proposals based on specific project requests. This area would involve consideration of the campus master plan, current and future revenue sources for capital projects, as well as the goals of UNM 2000.

6. Long-range Tuition Planning: While it is closely related to budget allocation, long-range tuition planning is an issue which merits separate consideration by the Planning Council. The Planning Council might be expected to recommend to the Board of Regents a specific long-range tuition policy which would guide the setting of tuition within a defined range from year-to-year.

7. CHE Planning Issues: The Planning Council would recommend the institution's response to major planning issues raised by the Commission on Higher Education. The intent would be to assure that statewide planning for higher education reflected UNM's institutional goals.

8. Reallocation Planning: The Planning Council would establish institutional guidelines for reallocation planning. Actual reallocation analysis and detailed recommendations would take place within vice presidential areas and at the institutional level by reallocation planning groups. Following this process, the Planning Council would set
9. Campus Master Planning: In the past, campus master planning has been facility- and space-driven. Through the Planning Council, campus master planning would not be a separate effort but would occur within the context of the UNM 2000 long-range institutional goals. The Planning Council would assure that the physical plan and the institutional goals were compatible.

Many of the issues listed above overlap and are interrelated. In addition, these are complex issues which continue to merit attention over time. For these reasons and because the Planning Council must function at an institutional policy level in order to be effective, the role of the director and the participation of staff support from various units are critical to the success of the planning effort.

This planning process does not infringe upon the right of the faculty, nor is it contrary to the responsibilities contained in the Faculty Handbook.

The chart on the following page depicts the various elements of the proposed institutional planning structure. The Planning Support Group is discussed in more detail in the section which follows the chart.
Implementation and Operational Issues

1. Named members vs. designees: The strength of the Planning Council will derive, in large measure, from the participation of the named members, rather than designees. For the most part, those who deal with institutional level planning issues in the Planning Council will also be the individuals who are actually responsible for implementation within their areas. At UNM, implementation has been a major concern during the development of the planning document; the proposed composition of the Planning Council will help to assure that planning decisions are translated into action.

2. Planning Support Group: Except for the director of planning and secretarial support, there would be no direct full-time staff for the Planning Council. Instead, a Planning Support Group, comprised of directors of various offices with responsibility for some aspect of planning, would be the working group for the Planning Council. This group would accumulate data, develop options and recommendations, and bring operational level insight to consideration of institutional planning issues. Collectively, the Planning Support Group would serve as staff to the Planning Council, but individually, the members would continue to have line responsibility for such things as the preparation and submission of budget documents, the updating of master plans, the preparation of data for the CHE. Each Planning Support Group member would be accountable to the cognizant functional division, academic affairs, student affairs, etc.

3. Other Current Planning and Planning-Related Groups: Most of the current planning and planning-related groups could continue to function much as they do today. The link between each of the groups and the Planning Council would be through representation on the Planning Council or the Planning Support Group.
   a. Campus Planning Committee: The link between this committee and the Planning Council would be the Director of Facility Planning who staffs the Campus Planning Committee and would be a member of the Planning Support Group.
   b. Faculty Senate Long Range Planning Committee: The chair of this committee would be a member of the Planning Council.
   c. Economic Impact Task Force: This group could continue to deal with issues related to tuition and cost of education. The results of their deliberations could provide valuable input to the Planning Council and the Planning Support Group. Because of the circumstances surrounding the formation of this group, it may be advisable to have the chair of this group report to a Regents' committee annually.

University Budget Committee: The proposal for the Planning Council could be viewed as a further refinement of the University Budget Committee concept. The same groups will be represented on the Planning Council, the mission will be broader than budget issues, and participation in the decision-making process will be enhanced because of the membership of the Council.