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12. The tone of the 29 August 1991 document entitled "Preliminary Recommendation: Reallocation Plans" using words including "inertia" and "lethargy" suggests that the administration feels that faculty will not discontinue programs or institute changes unless forced by an administrative process. This does not reflect the actual historical actions of the faculties of various units which have voluntarily divested or curtailed programs or degrees.

13. Is the proposed reallocation process only a first step in changing the allocation (budgeting) process in a more comprehensive and studied manner? If so, what is the "plan for planning and budgeting" in the longer term? Since UNM 2000 does not set interim, annual targets for expected levels of achievement of objectives, perhaps the reallocation process should start with an explicit target such as x percent of the I and G budget to be reallocated. In this manner, the faculty and others would know what the administration's level of expectations is for this reallocation process.

14. What is the role and job description of the proposed full-time director of planning? If the locus of planning responsibility is eventually to be the existing administrative structure of the institution, is this director or his/her staff to provide support to the deans, chairs, etc.? If planning is to be emphasized as a key administrative function, shouldn't a planning office and staff be available to support the administration's planning process? Shouldn't additional resources be allocated to improving administrator's skills in planning?
The October 8, 1991 meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Connie Thorson at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

Senators present: Lynne Diemme Beene (A&S), Gloria Birkholz (Nursing), Zella Bray (Nursing), Marion Cottrell (Engineering), Michele Diel (Valencia Branch), Luisa Duarte (Education), Marilyn Fletcher (Zimmerman Library), Kenneth Gardner (Medicine), Larry Gorbet (A&S), Mary Grizzard (Fine Arts), Mary Harris (Education), Richard Harris (A&S), Demetra Logothetis (Dental Prog), Vonda Long (Education), William MacPherson (Law), Patrick Mahanara (A&S), David McPherson (A&S), Joseph Martinez (Education), Donald Natvig (A&S), Cornelia Oneuwier (A&S), Susan Pearson Davis (Fine Arts), Walter Putman (A&S), Russell Snyder (Medicine), Connie Thorson (Library), James Thorson (A&S), Pauline Turner (Education), Donald Vichiick (Medicine), Benjamin Walker (Medicine), James Wallace (Medicine), Ebtisam Wilkins (Engineering) and William Woodsiede (Medicine).

Absent: Edith Cherry (Arch & Plng), James Dawson (Gallup Branch), Susan Deese (Zimmerman Library), James DePaepe (Education), Daniel Derksen (Medicine), Bradley Ellingsbo (Fine Arts), Walter Foman (Medicine), John Geismann (A&S), Robert Glew (Medicine), Robert Greenberg (Medicine), Shiloh Harris (Engineering), Donald Kendall (Engineering), Jerry King (Medicine), Kathleen Mathews (University College), David Null (Library), Glynn Raymond (Pharmacy), Jose Rivera (Public Admin), Priscilla Smith (Gallup Branch), James Standerfer (Medicine), Ron Storey (Medicine) and Estelle Zannes (A&S).

Minutes of September 10, 1991. Senator William MacPherson moved that the September 10, 1991 minutes be amended to include the statement made by Provost Risser that he and President Peck expect to attend Faculty Senate meetings during 1991-92.

Senator Mary Harris moved that the words "by five points" be deleted from Provost Risser's statement concerning ACT scores.

Both amendments were duly seconded and carried and the minutes were then approved as amended.

Address by President Richard E. Peck. President Peck began his address by telling the Senate that he would attend Senate meetings whenever possible.

He then presented information concerning graduation rates. He said that last year U.S. News & World Report had reported that UNM graduates 13% of its students. This year, it reported a 21% graduation rate. Both are incorrect. There is no explanation, he said, of where the figures came from.

The graduation rates improve as the preparation level of the incoming freshman class improves. He said the 13% figure was for scholarship athletes who came to UNM in 1983.

It is of little importance to list ways in which the figure is incorrect; it is very important to report that no one records graduation rates accurately because...
of the complexity. For example, only first-time freshmen can be reported and transfer students cannot be counted.

Beginning this year, students who come to UNM as transfer students will be tracked. The number of transfer students has increased from 1,900 last academic year to 2,300 this year. This information attests to the fact that UNM is an upper division institution and an institution which focuses on the last two years and graduate school.

The most difficult group to deal with statistically are the students who try to get ahead by attending TVI right after high school graduation and then enroll in UNM. They come as transfers and are therefore not counted.

President Peck said that national figures indicate that UNM is doing rather well. Socioeconomic factors have a strong influence on graduation and many students must work part-time. Preparation level upon entrance cannot be the only factor considered in graduation rates. The average family income of UNM freshmen is five to six thousand dollars lower than that of the surrounding states. Seventy percent (70%) of students work and the average class load is 12 hours. With 12 hours per semester, it takes 5 1/2 years to graduate — if one doesn't change majors and takes only classes applicable to one's major.

There is not a public, urban institution in the country where more than 10% of students graduate in 4 years. The national average now is over 5 years for urban or rural universities; therefore, UNM's rate is comparable. Since so many people return to UNM after being out many years, eventually close to 70% of the students who begin their postsecondary education at UNM graduate.

Dr. Peck has not been able to speak to the editor of U.S. News & World Report as yet; however, many letters have been sent in an attempt to correct this misinformation. Four institutions have refused to furnish U.S. News & World Report with any numbers because the numbers do not represent the true picture.

There has been, he said, a steady increase in the graduation rate. Of the students who entered in 1984, 17% of the class as a whole graduated and 24% of the students with a traditional high school curriculum graduated. By 1986, those figures had increased to 21% and 32% respectively.

It will take three to four years to have completely accurate figures which will include transfer students in the count.

In number of students, our rate has increased by 20% in the last five years and last year the class was 2% larger than the preceding class. The students are coming to UNM better prepared and are more persistent in the attempt to graduate. President Peck ended his presentation by saying that he appreciated very much the opportunity to attend the meetings of the Faculty Senate.

Senate President's Report. President Connie Thorson reported that a proposal had been received by a number of people from Paul Risser regarding the improvement of undergraduate academic advising. She said that the report was available through department chairpersons and that she will put a copy on reserve at Zimmerman Library. Any comments on the proposal should be sent to Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Janet Roebuck.

Also, a town hall discussion will be held on October 16 in the Kiva from 3:00 until 5:00 p.m. regarding the Academic Affairs section of the Reallocation Plan.
There was an announcement by Senator Pauline Turner who said she was greatly concerned about faculty members who do not have parking permits. She said she has been unsuccessful in her efforts to address the problem. Also she told the Senate that there had been an unpleasant meeting the previous week during which Donald Grady, Director of Police & Parking, walked out. Inappropriate comments were made, she said, by Mr. Grady about faculty members in general and women faculty in particular.

Mr. James Melendes, staff member from the Cancer Center, then explained that he planned to present a proposal to the Staff Council condemning the parking situation and requesting a representative parking committee. He distributed a petition requesting the formation of such a committee and asked that Senators sign if they wish.

President Thorson then told the Senate that it is her understanding that a committee is being formed to attempt to address parking issues. That committee is being established by Vice President Zuniga Forbes. Also, the Staff Council and ASUNM want revisions in the committee. She does not know, she said, what those changes are. The Senate Operations Committee has asked Professor Turner to be the Senate representative on the committee. The other faculty member on the committee will be Professor William Gross, chairman of the Campus Planning Committee.

A motion was approved by the Senate that the administrators involved be requested to appear before the Senate with a report regarding the parking situation.

There was also a brief discussion regarding the issue of sexual harassment.

Special Student Fees. Upon recommendation of Professor Dodd Bogart, chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, the Senate approved a motion regarding special student fees. Professor Bogart explained that these guidelines are necessary to prevent inappropriate assessment of "special fees" to raise revenue rather than the intended use of the monies to cover incurred costs.

The approved recommendation states that:

The Faculty Senate urges the University Administration to

1. Enforce the University's policy on Special Course Fees
2. Undertake a compliance survey with respect to this Policy
3. Remove all "grandfathered" and new special course fees which are not in compliance as soon as possible
4. Find and allocate the revenues to remove fees not in compliance within the next three years

Committee Appointments. Upon recommendation of Senator Mary Harris for the Operations Committee, the Senate approved the following committee appointments and replacements: Ron Schrader (Math & Statistics) for Jeannette Cochran (Nursing) on the Admissions & Registration Committee; John Taber (Philosophy) to the Bachelor of University Studies Faculty Advisory Committee; Sandra Scheinberg (Nursing) for Elsie Morosin (Nursing) on the Budget Committee; Gary Anderson (Ed) for Clara Adams (Math & Statistics) for Harriet Smith (Ob/Gyn) on the Community Education Committee; Clara Adams (Physiotherapy) to the Curricula Committee; Richard Hood (Comm) for Mary Jo Cochran (Theatre & Dance) on the Faculty & Staff Benefits Committee;
Revised UNM Code of Conduct. Senate President Connie Thorson said that if the Code of Conduct as printed in the agenda is approved, it would govern all students, faculty and staff. She said also that there is a Code of Conduct in the Faculty Handbook.

Senator William MacPherson addressed the Senate and argued against approval of the proposed Code. He said that he had spoken with someone in the office of the University Counsel and had provided input which was not included in the proposed Code. He said it is poorly written and clearly conflicts with tenure rights as well as the Union contract. Additionally, it conflicts with a provision to allow the Law School, Medical School and branch campuses to have their own Codes of Conduct.

The Senate approved a motion to return the proposed Code of Conduct to the drafters of the Code for further study.

Mr. Robert Bienstock, University Counsel’s Office, explained that Senator MacPherson’s suggestions had not been incorporated because input was still being solicited from various constituencies. Also, he said there is still a question as to whether the Code should apply only to students or to staff and faculty as well.

Senator Marion Cottrell suggested that the Senate send a clear message to the Administration saying that any Code of Conduct for faculty can only be approved by the Regents with the consent of faculty. He urged faculty and staff to say “no” to this proposed Code. He particularly opposed a code written by an attorney working for the Administration and suggested that the Operations Committee discuss the issue further with President Peck.

Senator Turner asked which branch of the Administration had instructed that the Code be formulated. Vice President Zuniga Forbes said the initiative had come from her office in response to the Weapons Policy and the issues of substance abuse and computer ethics. She said that she realizes that the Code may not apply to all constituencies equally but that it is an important document to consider.

Continued Discussion of Reallocation. Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Janet Roebuck, said that Provost Risser sent his apologies for being unable to attend the Senate meeting. She then discussed the Reallocation Plan.

She said that, in the context of reallocation, these are hard times for universities nationwide. We are faced with change through growth without adequate resources. Nationwide, the situation is not being handled well — in New Mexico, the situation is not so dire.

Since it is a new process, we really don’t know how to go about reallocation. Fear and paranoia abound when we are faced with the unknown. When we are afraid, it is hard to listen accurately. When we don’t listen, it is difficult to work things out.

The reallocation process, she stressed, is not designed to weaken faculty governance as has been suggested. It also is not a plot to fire large numbers of tenured faculty members. It is hoped that, through planning, desperate
measures will not have to be taken. We all will have to live with ambiguity during the process and must deal with the realities of the situation.

Senate President Connie Thorson said that it is now necessary for the Senate to focus on what the process should be and to make some specific recommendations. If the suggestions made today are accepted, they should be taken back to college faculty for further discussion and input. She explained that there is a process outlined in the Faculty Handbook by which faculty members can call a faculty meeting. Senators must, she said, take a leading role in this process.

Nine recommendations were presented to the Senate by the Senate Operations Committee. These recommendations have been reviewed by Provost Paul Risser.

Senator Cottrell expressed concern that Athletics continues to be outside of faculty scrutiny.

There was some discussion regarding funding of the UNM Hospital and its relationship to the Medical School and of the time frames involved in the reallocation process.

President Thorson stressed that this is an on-going process, and not a one-time exercise.

The Senate then voted to approve recommendations 1 through 8 and to address recommendation number 9 at a later date since there was no consensus on the wording. Recommendation 9 states that "reallocation must be expanded to include athletics, central administration and the medical school."

The approved recommendations are as follows:

FACULTY SENATE REALLOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS

The need for refocusing the resources of the Instructional and General budgets is acknowledged across campus. There is a need, however, to relax some of the deadlines on the schedule so that faculty can be involved in the process and decision making. In this context, the Senate Operations Committee suggests the following be adopted by the Senate. These recommendations should then go back to all college faculties for discussion and adoption.

1. There should be a Faculty Reallocation Committee composed of the following: chairs (or other appointed representative of the committees) of Undergraduate, Graduate, Curriculum, AAR, Research Policy, Long Range Planning, Budget, Teaching Enhancement, Computer Use; 1 at large senator; 1 operations committee member. This committee would represent the faculty on reallocation procedures and policies. For example, decisions concerning the merging or reduction of Centers and Institutes would be made in consultation with the FAC.

2. Based on the Faculty Handbook, all recommended course and degree requirements and changes need to be considered by the appropriate college and Faculty Senate committees — e.g., new departments, mergers, new colleges, new programs. Appropriate faculty committees (perhaps the Graduate Committee or the Undergraduate Committee) will establish criteria and priorities for terminating or seriously cutting any programs and will review such recommendations.

3. Based on the review of all undergraduate programs, the Undergraduate Committee will establish criteria for evaluation and prioritization of the programs — including numbers of faculty and students, quality, and cost. Additionally, the committee will direct the examination of the following: a) all
non-baccalaureate programs (main campus and Medical School) by the appropriate faculty committees so that criteria and priorities for terminating, cutting, modifying, enhancing, or retaining these programs can be established; b) classes with small enrollments (10 or fewer for undergraduates and 5 or fewer for graduates) and duplicate classes will be examined by departments, colleges, and appropriate faculty committees so that reasonable and fair recommendations about discontinuing, offering less often, altering, retaining, or cross referencing courses can be made. In all cases the faculty affected need to be consulted. Proposals should be reviewed by college curriculum committees and by the FRC.

4. Based on the review of all graduate programs, the Graduate Committee will establish criteria for evaluation and prioritization of the programs — including faculty and student numbers, quality, and cost.

5. All academic program changes, new courses, degrees, colleges, divisions, institutes, centers, and reallocation plans recommended by Deans must, of course, undergo appropriate scrutiny including a vote of the appropriate college faculties and committees and Faculty Senate committees. College proposals must have had a vote of the faculty of the relevant college.

6. The FS Budget and Long Range Planning Committees will be involved in budget hearings and recommendations of budget priorities together with the University Planning Council. Included would be establishing priorities for the expenditure of the funds to be reallocated as well as analysis of the areas which are to have their funding reduced.

7. Priority and redistribution of vacant faculty positions which revert to Provost should be made in consultation with the FRC.

8. During the reallocation process, there should be the same "hiring pause" for newly created positions at Deans' level and above (associate or assistant vice presidents, vice presidents, directors) as there is for faculty.

Recommendation #8 was amended to include associate and assistant deans.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Anne J. Brown, Secretary
SUBJECT: Change in Composition of Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee

REQUIRED ACTION: Approve the Change as Requested

BACKGROUND:

(see attached)
To: Connie Thorson, President, Faculty Senate  
From: David Darling, Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee  
Subject: Change in composition of Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee

At our May meeting last year, the last meeting of the committee, we looked at the language in the Faculty Handbook to see if we wanted to recommend any changes. Our discussion then focused on the composition of the committee. Since the language in the current Handbook was approved, the University Staff Council has been created. Discussion then took place that addressed the merits of keeping the composition of the committee as it is, changing it to reflect the new interest in benefits by the Staff Council (they created their own Benefits Committee), or to recommend that two committees be established - one for faculty and one for staff. After discussion the following motion was made, seconded and passed with one dissenting vote:

1. The following language be stricken from the Faculty handbook:

"Eight faculty members, including the chairperson, nominated by the Faculty Senate, three staff persons, one of whom shall be from the clerical staff, one of whom shall be from the production, service, and maintenance staff, and one of whom shall be from the technical, professional and managerial staff, nominated by the Faculty Senate;"

2. The following language be substituted for the language deleted:

"Six faculty members nominated by the Faculty Senate, four staff members nominated by the Staff Council, two staff members nominated by the Union;"

3. The following language be retained with the emphasized and underlined portion added:

"and the following ex-officio members: the Vice President for Business and Finance, the Associate Controller for Payroll, and the Associate Director of Personnel Services. The chairperson shall be elected by the voting members of the committee. It is understood that faculty and staff from specialized fields may be invited to provide information and advice as required."

4. The following language should be added:

Other units within the University will not create separate benefits committees.

We request that this item be placed on the Faculty Senate's agenda. I will recommend that we look further at the language in the Handbook to see if the committee wishes to recommend any changes in the committee's charges.

Thank you.

cc: Anne Brown  
Gloria Birkholz
At today's meeting, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee moved and passed the motion to recommend that:

"The Faculty Senate urge the University Administration to

(1) Enforce the University’s policy on Special Course Fees
(2) Undertake a Compliance Survey with respect to this Policy
(3) Remove all 'grandfathered' and new special course fees which are not in compliance as soon as possible
(4) Find and allocate the revenues to remove fees not in compliance within the next three years."
SUBJECT: Revised UNM Code of Conduct

REQUIRED ACTION: Discuss the Document

BACKGROUND:

In 1965 the Regents of the University adopted the statement of "Rights and Responsibilities at the University of New Mexico." This statement, Faculty Handbook (pp. A-4 - A-6) included a Code of Conduct (Section 6) which was to be "an interim measure pending further study and the adoption of a permanent policy."

The revised Code of Conduct on the following pages has been reviewed by the President's Council and University Counsel and is presented for Senate consideration.
It is important for all members of the University community to be aware of conduct that will lead to University disciplinary action. In order to clarify the types of conduct which shall be considered to affect adversely the University’s educational function, to disrupt community living on campus, or to interfere with the rights of others to pursue their education, to conduct their University duties and responsibilities or to participate in University activities, the Board of Regents hereby adopts the following Code of Conduct:

1. Any member of the University community -- student, faculty, staff, visitor, or guest -- who commits or attempts to commit any of the following acts of misconduct shall be subject to appropriate disciplinary procedures and sanctions.

1.1 Causing physical harm to any person on University premises or at University-sponsored activities, or intentionally or recklessly causing reasonable apprehension of such harm.

1.2 Committing rape or any other type of sexual assault on University premises or at University-sponsored events.

1.3 Interfering with normal university functions or University-sponsored activities, including, but not limited to, studying, teaching, research, University administration, University-sponsored activities, fire, police or emergency services.

1.4 Intentionally furnishing false information to the University.

1.5 Forgery, unauthorized alteration, or unauthorized use of any University document or instrument of identification.

1.6 Intentionally and substantially interfering with the freedom of expression, movement, or activity of others on University premises or at University-sponsored activities.

1.7 Intentionally initiating or causing to be initiated any false report, warning or threat of fire, explosion or other emergency on University premises or at University-sponsored activities.

1.8 Theft of property or of services on University premises or at University-sponsored activities; knowing possession of stolen property on University premises or at University-sponsored activities.
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1.9 Destroying or damaging the property of the University or of others on University premises or at University-sponsored activities.

1.10 Intentionally or recklessly misusing or damaging fire safety equipment on University premises or at University-sponsored activities.

1.11 Failure to comply with the directions of University officials, including campus police officers, acting in performance of their duties.

1.12 Illegal use, possession, or distribution of any controlled substance, illegal drug or alcohol on University premises or at University-sponsored activities. "Use" of a substance, drug, or alcohol includes being under its influence.

1.13 Use or possession of fireworks on University premises or at University-sponsored events, unless expressly authorized by the President or his designee.

1.14 Use, possession or storage of any weapon on University premises or at University-sponsored activities, unless expressly authorized by the President or his designee. "Weapon" includes, but is not limited to, firearms, ammunition or other dangerous weapons, substances, or materials, bombs, explosives, or incendiary devices.

1.15 Unauthorized presence in or use of University premises, facilities or property, in violation of posted signs or when closed, after normal operating hours.

1.16 Willfully refusing or failing to leave the property of or any building or other facility owned, operated, or controlled by the University when requested to do so by a lawful custodian of the building, facility or property if the person is committing, threatens to commit or incites others to commit any act which would disrupt, impair, interfere with or obstruct the lawful mission, processes, procedures or functions of the University.

1.17 Misusing University computing resources by intentionally seeking, providing, modifying information in -- or obtaining copies of -- files, programs, or passwords, belong to other computer users without their permission.

1.18 Violating the terms of any disciplinary sanction imposed in accordance with this Code.

1.19 Violation of published or posted University regulations or policies. Such regulations or policies may include, but are not limited to, the residence hall contract, regulations relating to discrimination or discriminatory harassment, sexual
harassment, entry and use of University facilities, sale or consumption of alcoholic beverages, use of vehicles, amplifying equipment, campus demonstrations, misuse of identification cards, computer use and student organizations.

1.20 Any other acts or omissions which affect adversely the University's educational function, disrupt community living on campus, interfere with the right of others to the pursuit of their education, or affect adversely the process of the University.

1.21 Aid to others in committing or inciting others to commit any act mentioned above.

2. Sanctions:

2.1 As used in this subsection,

2.1.1 "Censure" means a written reprimand or expression of disapproval.

2.1.2 "Warning" means an oral censure.

2.1.3 "Disciplinary probation" means the establishment of a time period during which further acts of misconduct may or will result in more severe disciplinary sanctions depending on the conditions of the probation.

2.1.4 "Suspension" means losing student status for a period of time specified in the terms of the suspension. A suspension may commence immediately upon a finding of a violation or it may be deferred to a later time.

2.1.5 "Expulsion" means losing student status for an indefinite period of time. Readmission may not be sought before the expiration of two years from the date of expulsion.

2.1.6 "Dismissal" means a termination of employment, either for a stated time period or indefinitely.

2.1.7 "Barred from campus" means being barred from all or designated portions of the University property or activities.

2.2 Any student who violates any of the rules set forth in Section 2.1 above shall be subject to censure, warning,
disciplinary probation, suspension, expulsion, dismissal from University employment, or being barred from campus.

2.3 Any member of the faculty or staff who violates any of the rules set forth in Section 2.1 above shall be subject to appropriate disciplinary action under applicable rules and regulations, as set forth in the Faculty Handbook, the Personnel Policies and Practices Manual, or other appropriate documents.

2.4 If any of the acts of misconduct set forth in Section 2.1 above are committed by a person who is not a student or member of faculty or staff, such person may, after notice and an informal hearing before a University officer appointed to review the matter by the President, be denied admission, readmission, or employment by the University or may be barred from campus.
The University of New Mexico

To: Faculty Senate

From: Operations Committee

Issue: Committee Replacements

DATE: October 7, 1991

The following are submitted for Senate approval:

**ADMISSIONS & REGISTRATION COMMITTEE**

**BACHELOR OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**
John Taber, Philosophy, 1992 for faculty vacancy in A&S, 1992

**BUDGET COMMITTEE**
Sandra Schwanberg, Nursing, 1993 for Elsie Morosin, Nursing, 1993

**COMMUNITY EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

**CURRICULA COMMITTEE**
Clara Miura, Dental Programs, 1993 for faculty vacancy in Dental Prgms, 1993

**FACULTY & STAFF BENEFITS COMMITTEE**

**LIBRARY COMMITTEE**
Andrew Burgess, Philosophy, 1994 for Ruth Luckassen, Special Educ, 1994
Jeff Schauer, Nursing, 1993 for Sandra Schwanberg, Nursing, 1993
Marcella Vink, Gallup Branch, 1992 for branch vacancy, 1992

**RESEARCH ALLOCATIONS COMMITTEE**
Faculty Senate Reallocation Recommendations

The need for refocusing the resources of the Instructional and General budgets is acknowledged across campus. There is a need, however, to relax some of the deadlines on the schedule so that faculty can be involved in the process and decision making. In this context, the Senate Operations Committee suggests the following be adopted by the Senate. These recommendations should then go back to all college faculties for discussion and adoption.

1. There should be a Faculty Reallocation Committee composed of the following: Chairs (or other appointed representative of the committee) of Undergraduate, Graduate, Curriculum, A&R, Research Policy, Long Range Planning, Budget, Teaching Enhancement, Computer Use; 1 large senator; 1 operations committee member. This committee would represent the faculty on reallocation procedures and policies. For example, decisions concerning the merging or reduction of Centers and Institutes would be made in consultation with the FRC.

2. Based on the Faculty Handbook, all recommended course and degree requirements and changes need to be considered by the appropriate college and Faculty Senate committees -- e.g., new departments, mergers, new colleges, new programs. Appropriate faculty committees (perhaps the Graduate Committee or the Undergraduate Committee) will establish criteria and priorities for terminating or seriously cutting any programs and will review such recommendations.

3. Based on the review of all undergraduate programs, the Undergraduate Committee will establish criteria for evaluation and prioritization of the programs—including numbers of faculty and students, quality, and cost. Additionally, the Committee will direct the examination of the following: a) all non-baccalaureate programs (main campus and Medical School) by the appropriate faculty committees so that criteria and priorities for terminating, cutting, moving, enhancing, or retaining these programs can be established; b) classes with small enrollments (10 or fewer for undergraduates and 5 or fewer for graduates) and duplicate classes will be examined by departments, colleges, and appropriate faculty committees so that reasonable and fair recommendations about discontinuing, offering less often, altering, retaining, or cross referencing courses can be made. In all cases the faculty affected need to be consulted. Proposals should be reviewed by college curriculum committees and by the FRC.
4. Based on the review of all graduate programs, the Graduate Committee will establish criteria for evaluation and prioritization of the programs—including faculty and student numbers, quality, and cost.

5. All academic program changes, new courses, degrees, colleges, divisions, institutes, centers, and reallocation plans recommended by Deans must, of course, undergo appropriate scrutiny including a vote of the appropriate college faculties and committees and Faculty Senate committees. College proposals must have had a vote of the faculty of the relevant college.

6. The FS Budget and Long Range Planning Committees will be involved in budget hearings and recommendations of budget priorities together with the University Planning Council. Included would be establishing priorities for the analysis of the areas which are to have their funding reduced.

7. Priority and redistribution of vacant faculty positions which revert to Provost should be made in consultation with the FRC.

8. During the reallocation process, there should be the same "hiring pause" for newly created positions at Deans', vice presidents', directors', (associate or assistant vice presidents, central administration, and the medical school)

9. Reallocation must be expanded to include athletics.

Faculty Committee Structure

As you are no doubt aware, the reallocation document, on page 1 of the Academic Affairs section, states that "The Faculty Senate will also review its committee structure and procedures with similar goals of increasing efficiency". You are doubtless also aware that the Faculty Senate has the right to decide whether or not to review and revise its own committee structure and need not do so simply because the Administration requests that it be done.

Nevertheless, I think that it is a good idea to review our committee structure and in fact had drafted a memo requesting the Senate to do so before the reallocation document appeared. In particular, the restrictions on membership requirements outlined in the Faculty Handbook (pages 13-25), which allocate certain slots for particular colleges, branches, and programs, sometimes make it impossible to find a person who is willing to serve. It may be the case that changing the wording to "preferably" or "if possible" in some cases would permit necessary flexibility while keeping the representativeness that committees need. It may also be the case that combining or more efficiently coordinating the work of more than one committee would be desirable.

Therefore I propose that the Senate adopt the following resolution:

All Faculty Senate Committees are requested to review their membership requirements, charge, procedures, and relationships with other committees. Recommendations for changes which would improve the functioning of the Senate and its committee structure should be brought to the Faculty Senate as soon as convenient, preferably by early in 1992.