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Members of the UNM Faculty Senate

Anne J. Brown, Secretary

November Meeting

The UNM Faculty Senate will meet on Tuesday, December 10, 1991 at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

The agenda will include the following items:

1. Summarized Minutes of November 12, 1991
2. Memorial Minute for Professor Emeritus Joseph Kuntz -- Professor Joseph Zavadil
3. Memorial Minute for Professor Nicholas Kazarinoff -- Professor Alexander Stone
4. Memorial Minute for Professor Frank Bowen -- Professor Artemus Edwards
5. Remarks by Provost Paul Risser
6. Senate President's Report -- Professor Connie Thorson
7. Continued Discussion of Student Tuition and Fee Rates -- Professor Connie Thorson
8. Recommendation Concerning CHE Rule 250 -- Professor Richard Mead
9. Revision of "Policy and Procedures on Conflicts of Interest in Sponsored Research" -- Professor E. A. Walters
10. Proposed Policy on Tuition and Fee Waivers for UNM Employees' Dependents -- Professor David Darling
11. Information Items
    (a) Planning for the Implementation of a Comprehensive Program of Student Outcomes Assessment and Program Reviews at UNM
    (b) Modification regarding Academic Dishonesty for the Student Standards and Grievance Procedure

NOTE: To facilitate discussion of Item #7, please bring to this meeting the AGENDA FOR THE NOVEMBER 12, 1991 MEETING.
The December 10, 1991 meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Connie Thorson at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

Senators present: Lynn Dianne Beene (A&S), Gloria Birkholz (Nursing), Zella Bray (Nursing), Marion Cottrell (Engineering), James Dawson (Gallup Branch), Susan Deese (Zimmerman Library), James DePape (Education), Michele Diel (Valencia Branch), Luisa Duran (Education), Bradley Ellington (Fine Arts), Marilyn Feecher (Zimmerman Library), Robert Gieh (Medicine), Larry Gorbet (A&S), Robert Greenberg (Medicine), Mary Graziano (Fine Arts), Mary Harris (Education), Richard Harris (A&S), Elmo Kazmi (Engineering), Vonda Long (Education), William MacPherson (Law), Patrick McNamara (A&S), David McPherson (A&S), Joseph Martinez (Education), Kathleen Matthews (University College), David Noll (Zimmerman Library), Cornelis Oeneweer (A&S), Susan Pearson-Davis (Fine Arts), Pramod Pathak (A&S), Walter Putnam (A&S), Glynn Raymon (Pharmacy), Jose Rivera (Public Administration), Russell Snyder (Medicine), Connie Thorson (Library), James Thorson (A&S), Pauline Turner (Education), Benjamin Walker (Medicine), James Wallace (Medicine), William Woodside (Medicine), and Estelle Zannes (A&S).

Absent: Edith Oleny (Architecture & Planning), Daniel Derksen (Medicine), Walter Fontaine (Medicine), Kenneth Gardner (Engineering), John Geissmann (A&S), Donald Kendall (Engineering), Jerry King (Medicine), Demetra Logotheti (Dental Progs), Donald Natvig (A&S), Donald Simonson (Anderson Schools), Priscilla Smith (Gallup Branch), James Standefor (Medicine), Ron Storey (Medicine), Donald Vichich (Medicine) and Ebtisam Wilkins (Engineering).

Minutes of November 12. The minutes of November 12, 1991 were approved as distributed.

Memorial Minutes. Memorial minutes for Professor Emeritus Joseph Zavadil and Professors Nicholas Kazarinoff and Frank Bowen were presented by Professors Stephen Zavadil, Alexander Stone, and Artemus Frellos respectively. The Senate adopted the minutes by rising vote and Secretary Anne Brown was asked to send copies to the next of kin.

Remarks by Provost Paul Risser. Provost Paul Risser told the Senate that the Regents had passed the Early Retirement Incentive Program and that he believes it can be implemented immediately.

The Task Force on Honors Education has completed its report which is currently being circulated and Provost Risser said that the Faculty Senate will have input regarding the document. The report makes nine recommendations, one of them being a recommendation to establish an Honors Division. It will now be considered by the University Planning Council as well as other appropriate bodies and the final recommendations will be presented to the Board of Regents for its approval.

The report on the Western Hemispheric Initiative is in draft form and will also be considered by the Senate. A report on student advisement is being circulated to appropriate parties.
Senator Pauline Turner requested clarification regarding funding of the Early Retirement Incentive Program. Provost Risser explained that no special funds have been designated and the early retirements are to be funded by departments and colleges.

Provost Risser said that all of the comments submitted regarding reallocation have been compiled and will be distributed to the Planning Council. The Senate Operations Committee will receive a copy in order that the Faculty Senate also have access to the comments. He explained that some of the decisions called for in the document will be made early; however, basically, the process will proceed slowly.

Senate President's Report. Senate President Connie Thorson said that in March the statewide Academic Decathlon will be held at UNM. Faculty and graduate students are needed to help with the Decathlon and she urged any interested persons to contact either their dean or her.

The review of the Medical School is in progress and a report will be presented to President Peck early in 1992.

The first meeting of the Faculty Reallocation Committee will be held on Friday, December 13, 1991 and any suggestions regarding topics for consideration can be submitted to Provost Risser or her.

Continued Discussion of Student Tuition and Fee Rates. President Thorson reminded the Senate that at the November Senate meeting, the recommendations from the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, as printed in the November agenda, were tabled until the December Senate meeting. A motion to remove the recommendations from the table carried. President Thorson then read a memo from Professor Donald Simonson, Senate representative from the Anderson Schools of Management. Professor Simonson said in his memo that the ASN faculty had concerns about the Budget Committee recommendations. It was felt that the recommendations pitted faculty against students and also they had concerns regarding the role of the faculty in the funding process.

President Thorson reminded the Senators that there were four recommendations from the Budget Committee to be considered.

Senator Robert Gloe reiterated his view against the recommendations in view of the importance of higher education and of keeping access open to as many New Mexicans as possible. He urged defeat of the recommendations of the Budget Committee.

Mimi Swanson, President of the Staff Council, said the Staff Council was opposed to the proposed recommendations.

President Thorson reminded the Senators that any action taken by the Senate will only be a recommendation. The Senate does not have the power to set tuition and fee rates. The recommendations finally made will be forwarded to the University Planning Council, the President's Council and possibly to the Board of Regents for a final decision.

The question was called and failed to pass by the required 2/3 majority. The vote was 23 opposed and 12 in favor. Debate continued, focusing on availability of financial aid and how a positive vote on the four recommendations would be viewed by the Legislature.
John Whiteside, Director of Student Financial Aid, said that information regarding access to financial aid, as well as the question of the effects of past tuition increases on enrollment is not yet available.

Senator Cottrell expressed his belief that it is important for the Senate to take some action— that to do nothing sends the wrong message.

The Senate voted against the recommendations of the Faculty Senate Budget Committee by a vote of 26 to 9. Senator Mary Harris then moved a substitute motion and the question was called. The Senate then voted in favor of the substitute motion printed below.

The UNM Faculty Senate Budget Committee has completed their study of the student share of the cost of education and has reported their findings to the Senate (and subsequently to the faculty). Their findings and conclusions include but are not limited to the following:

1. Relative to every objective indicator considered, tuition and fee rates at UNM are too low.
2. The University needs a policy on steady gains and maintenance in tuition and fees relative to the appropriate indices.
3. The appropriate mechanism for ensuring adequate access to the University for low-income students should be addressed, but adequate access should not be the reason for keeping tuition and fees unreasonably low.
4. Historically, procedures for setting tuition and fees at UNM have not served the state or the institution well, and, in fact, have divided the University community.
5. It appears from the data and the analysis that a 30% student share of the cost of education is an acceptable and reasonable long term goal if coupled with adequate student financial aid.

Therefore, the following policy is proposed:

1. Over the next four years tuition and fees should rise in an amount that will increase the student share of educational costs (definition from FSBC: Tuition and fees divided by total F & G expenditure per student FTE) by no less than 1% per year, as long as the resulting tuition and fee increase does not exceed the Regents' Policy of a 10% maximum increase per year. This increase will continue each year of the four years until a 26% student share has been achieved. This share increase will be in addition to the base increase.

2. Access to UNM for low-income residents of New Mexico must be assured by a parallel rise in financial aid dollars available. Low-income, qualified students will not be denied access to UNM for financial reasons.
3. Prior to the end of the fourth year, the UNM Faculty Senate and other bodies within UNM will examine the impact of these tuition and fee increases. If total funding from tuition and fees, legislative appropriations, and other sources has improved UNM's relative peer standing, its ability to hire and retain strong faculty, its library collections and services, and its financial ability to improve graduate assistant stipends and student stipends consistent with base indices, then the UNM Faculty Senate may recommend extending its tuition and fees share policy for another four years to achieve a 30% student share.

Recommendation Concerning CHE Rule 250. Upon recommendation of Professor Richard Mead for the Admissions and Registration Committee, the Senate voted to adopt CHE Rule 250. The purpose of the Rule is to encourage statewide articulation without mandating specifics.

Revision of "Policy and Procedures on Conflicts of Interest in Sponsored Research." As requested by the Faculty Senate at its September meeting, the Research Policy Committee was asked to refine certain elements in the Policy which was presented at that time for approval.

Professor E.A. Walters, for the Research Policy Committee, reported to the Senate that those refinements have now been made and requests that the Policy be approved. Professor Marek Osinski pointed out that the word "government" on page 4, item 2.c. should be stricken in lines 5 and 7.

The Senate voted to adopt the Policy as presented.

At this point, a quorum was called and lacking a quorum, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne J. Brown, Secretary
SUBJECT: Recommendation Concerning CHE Rule 250

REQUIRED ACTION: Adopt CHE Rule 250

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

(See attached)
November 15, 1991

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

TO: Connie Thorson, President, Faculty Senate

FROM: R. W. Mead, Chair, Admissions and Registration Committee

SUBJECT: Response to the Memo of September 27, 1991 Regarding the Document from the CHE

The Admissions & Registration Committee, in their November 1, 1991 meeting, considered CHE Rule 250 as requested.

First, it should be pointed out that CHE Rule 250 was drafted by a statewide task force in response to the Governor's veto message of House Bill 580. The purpose of this rule is to encourage statewide articulation without mandating specifics.

The Admissions & Registration Committee unanimously recommends that the Faculty Senate adopt CHE Rule 250. In doing this, we will join the other NM institutions in this common policy.

Discussion of CHE Rule 250 focused on three areas.

1) Articulation efforts. The Committee noted that CHE Rule 250 is consistent with articulation efforts already completed or underway which include: development and use of a general course equivalency matrix, college and discipline articulation agreements already in operation and current discipline committees developing new agreements.

2) One area under items III. A-1, "treating the transfer students as native students . . . .". The implication of this statement is that college academic requirements would apply equally to native UNM students and transfers from other New Mexico post-secondary institutions. More specifically, if a college accepts a UNM course with a "D" grade toward a degree, it would also accept a "D" grade in transfer from another NM institution. The A&R Committee accepted this concept with respect to transfer students from other NM postsecondary institutions. The Committee noted that each college may wish to review its current policies on acceptance of "D" grades to meet degree requirements. Moreover, approval of CHE Rule 250 would not change current policy on transfer of D grades from out-of-state institutions. Any such policy change would be far-reaching and should be considered separately from the pressing need to act expeditiously on CHE Rule 250.

3) The Committee also expresses its concern and discourages pursuance of a mandated statewide common general education core.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Public Postsecondary Education Institution Officials: Chief Executive Officers
Academic Council on Higher Education
Instructional Council on Higher Education
Articulation Advisory Council and Coordinators
Interested Parties

RE: CHE Rule 250 TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION

The Commission on Higher Education approved CHE Rule 250 TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION (Attachment A) at its meeting August 16, 1991. This new Commission policy, which responds to the Governor’s veto message of HB 580 at the end of the 1991 New Mexico Legislative Session (see Attachment B), provides guidelines for transfer of credits between state education institutions. Section III.B. indicates that institutional policies incorporating these guidelines should be submitted to the Commission on Higher Education by January 1, 1992.

Recent and current articulation activities are listed in Attachment C. The new policy has been developed in the context of these efforts and accomplishments. The Commission acknowledges and recognizes the individual work and cooperation of institutional officials in the development of the new policy and views it as another significant step in improving articulation in New Mexico.

MEETING NOTICES:

The annual meeting of NEW MEXICO ARTICULATION COORDINATORS will be hosted by New Mexico State University from 1:00-4:00 p.m. on September 23, 1991 (location and map to follow). The agenda will include discussion of CHE Rule 250, the 1990-1991 Course Transfer Activity Study, matrices updates, and the feasibility and advisability of developing a commonly accepted general education curriculum.

The eight-member TASK FORCE ON GENERAL EDUCATION ARTICULATION will meet from 9:00-11:00 a.m. on September 24, 1991, in Room 8, Educational Services Center, NMSU, to outline its work during the 1991-1992 academic year.
TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION

Statutory and Other References:

- 21-1-26.5, NMSA, 1990 Supplement;
- Planning for the Class of 2005: A Vision for the Future, Policy No. 28: Statewide Course Articulation;

I. SCOPE AND PURPOSE

Statutory responsibility for the development and implementation of a statewide articulation plan is assigned to the Commission on Higher Education in conjunction with the governing boards of all postsecondary education institutions in the state. The Governor's veto message of HB 580 at the end of the 1991 New Mexico Legislative session requests the Commission on Higher Education to work toward the development of a system-wide articulation policy by adopting prior to September 1, 1991, guidelines for transfer of credits between state education institutions. The Governor and the Commission on Higher Education recognize that the governing boards are autonomous and retain authority to develop and implement policies toward the achievement of these guidelines.

The issues involved in defining a general education curriculum are being debated throughout the higher education communities of the United States. There is no general agreement as to the particular courses, or the content of such courses, that should be included in the education of all degree-seeking students. Any attempt to impose a particular curriculum uniformly upon all institutions must take into account the recognized value of diversity and uniqueness among the variety of established educational institutions. Accordingly, the definition of commonly recognized general education requirements is better understood as an ongoing process rather than a goal to be achieved at a fixed point in time. The role of the Commission on Higher Education in that process is to facilitate the debate in the direction of a coordinated system of higher education that provides the best possible education at the most efficient cost.
It is the purpose of this Commission on Higher Education policy to help further state articulation goals in areas such as:

A. facilitating the transfer of students among postsecondary education institutions with a minimum loss of credit;

B. reducing the cost of education to the student and to the state;

C. increasing representation of ethnic minority and low-income students in upper-division baccalaureate institutions;

D. expanding opportunities for students to complete baccalaureate degrees;

E. re-enforcing the commitment and strengthen the collaboration among public postsecondary institutions that are essential to successful articulation and transfer of academic credit among institutions;

F. obtaining the optimum result in the state's development of its human and natural resources and its economy.

II. DEFINITIONS

A transfer student is one who seeks to move from one New Mexico institution to another expecting credit recognition for course work successfully completed and expecting to be treated equitably with all other students.

A native student is one who enters a New Mexico institution as a first-time freshman as opposed to a student admitted in transfer from another institution.

Articulation refers to systematic efforts, processes, or services intended to ensure educational continuity and to facilitate orderly, unobstructed progress between institutions on a statewide, regional, or institution-to-institution basis. Among the major statewide efforts to improve articulation are the development of articulation agreements and matrices that show equivalencies between lower division courses offered by New Mexico institutions. Examples of articulation processes are recruitment, admission and matriculation, orientation, counseling/advising, and transfer/articulation ombudsmanship. Systematic services include transfer credit evaluation and reporting mechanisms, financial aid, student flow and performance data, feedback information, and collaborative programs.

CHE Rule 250

Effective Date 8/16/91
III. GUIDELINES FOR THE TRANSFER OF CREDITS

A. The Commission on Higher Education adopts the following guidelines for the transfer of credits between state educational institutions.

1. Public postsecondary institutions shall treat native and transfer students equally in all academic matters. This means, for example,
   - facilitating for transfer students from community colleges the ability to complete a baccalaureate degree in the same amount of time as native students;
   - treating transfer students as native students in the application of credit toward certificate or degree requirements;
   - treating the catalog of matriculation in the same manner for both groups.
   - treating transfer and native students equitably in the award process of financial aid/scholarships; and

2. Public postsecondary institutions shall address the advisability and feasibility of developing a commonly accepted general education curriculum.

3. The associate in arts and the associate in science degrees shall be reflected upon the student's transcript of record maintained by the receiving institution.

4. The receiving institution shall recognize general education credit for all transfer courses in which a reasonable course equivalency exists.

5. Public postsecondary institutions shall advise students using articulation (transfer) guides and shall cooperate with other public postsecondary institutions to keep these guides updated;

6. Public postsecondary institutions shall use articulation (transfer) matrices.

7. Public postsecondary institutions shall continue to use and to expand

CHE Rule 250
Effective Date 8/16/91
individually negotiated articulation agreements with other public postsecondary institutions.

8. Public postsecondary institutions shall provide the Commission on Higher Education with a copy of all executed articulation agreements.

9. Public postsecondary institutions shall adopt a grievance procedure to address intra-institutional and inter-institutional disputes arising from articulation issues, and such procedures shall provide for arbitration of such disputes, by agreement of the parties, by the Commission on Higher Education or its designee.

B. The governing board of each public postsecondary institution in New Mexico should adopt policies on articulation and the transfer of credit which meet or exceed the guidelines outlined above. These policies should be submitted to the Commission on Higher Education for its review by January 1, 1992.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION

Chief academic officers and articulation officers of associate and baccalaureate degree-granting institutions should provide leadership in recommending and implementing state policies on transfer and articulation and in resolving issues of mutual concern. To this end, the New Mexico Commission on Higher Education shall regularly convene the chief academic officers and the articulation officers of baccalaureate and associate degree-granting institutions to assess the status of state policies on transfer and articulation and to resolve any issues that arise.

V. ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS

As part of the statewide articulation plan required by statute, institutions will continue to report annually after the spring semester census date the number of students who request evaluations of transfer credit; how many student credit hours are evaluated; credits denied transfer from other institutions and reasons for their denial; and credits denied transfer by other institutions and reasons for their denial.

In addition, the Commission on Higher Education will monitor the academic progress of cohorts of two-year postsecondary education institution students who transfer to baccalaureate degree-granting institutions in cooperation with the four-year institutions. This information should serve as the basis for the regular review and improvement of the undergraduate curricula, support services, and articulation and

CHE Rule 250 Effective Date 8/16/91
transfer agreements of associate and baccalaureate degree-granting institutions.

The New Mexico Commission on Higher Education will review institutional articulation agreements, will examine institutional and state-wide trends in student transfer and degree completion and shall use these analyses to make necessary modifications in policies on articulation and transfer.

CHE Rule 250

Effective Date 8/16/91
HB 580 ARTICULATION AND TRANSFER PLAN
AND GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

HB 580 ARTICULATION & TRANSFER PLAN - Wallach: HB 580 provides for articulation and transfer plan implementation by requiring all New Mexico public postsecondary institutions to adopt and implement articulation and transfer practices consistent with guidelines in the bill. The guidelines provide that:

1. Students awarded an associate of arts or an associate of science degree from a New Mexico public postsecondary educational institution shall be admitted at the junior level in baccalaureate degree-granting institutions and shall be considered to have fulfilled all of the lower-division general educational core requirements of the receiving institution. The lower-division general education requirements of the baccalaureate degree shall be the responsibility of the institution awarding the associate degree.

2. If a student has not completed an associate degree program prior to his transfer to another institution, the general education requirements shall become the responsibility of the receiving institution. The receiving institution shall recognize general education credit for all transfer courses in which a reasonable equivalency of discipline or course content exists.

3. All public postsecondary educational institutions in the state shall treat transfer students as native students in the application of credit toward certificate or degree requirements.

HOUSE EXECUTIVE MESSAGE NO. 20: 

"...Although I am in complete agreement with the goals of this bill, I would prefer that the regents of each university be given an opportunity to consider this most important issue prior to mandating a specific program.

"I am requesting the Commission on Higher Education to adopt prior to September 1, 1991, minimum standards for transfer of credits between state educational institutions. If by January 1, 1992, the regents of all four-year postsecondary institutions of higher education have not adopted policies for the transfer of credits which meet or exceed the Commission approved standards, I will resubmit this issue to the 1992 session of the legislature for further consideration."
The transfer of credits between two-year and four-year institutions has been a significant issue in New Mexico since the early 1980s when the New Mexico Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers prepared a matrix that shows equivalencies between lower division academic courses offered by New Mexico institutions. Since then, matrices for other disciplines have been developed and maintained through the Instructional and Academic Councils.

Other articulation milestones that have been achieved with institutional leadership and collaboration include:

- Development of Guidelines for Improving Articulation between Two-Year and Four-Year Institutions (1984);
- Academic Preparation for College project to define what students need to know and be able to do to be successful in college (1986);
- Adoption of high school core curriculum requirements for regular admission by colleges and universities to increase student competencies (phased-in and fully implemented by Fall 1991);
- Resolution adopted by institutional representatives to accept and recognize the PARTNERSHIP of two-year and four-year institutions in delivering lower-division course work (1987 UNM Articulation Conference);
- U S West/CHE-sponsored statewide and regional conferences to identify and to remove barriers to articulation between two-year and four-year institutions and between the public schools and higher education (1988-1991);
- Adoption by colleges and universities of institutional policies to promote the continuous, efficient, forward progress of students through the educational system of New Mexico by endorsing practices which facilitate the intrastate transfer of credit and support the development and implementation of a statewide articulation plan; adoption of policies ensuring that students with associate of arts and associate of science degrees completed at two-year institutions transfer as juniors to four-year institutions (1989);
- Annual institutional reporting of course transfer activity including reasons courses are denied in transfer (1990);
- New Mexico Articulation Advisory Council and Articulation Coordinators Network established to promote transfer of students and to resolve grievances (1990);
Task force activated to study feasibility of developing statewide acceptance of a lower division general education curriculum (1991);

Seven faculty task forces representing both associate and baccalaureate degree-granting institutions activated to develop and maintain course and program articulation agreements and for promoting compatibility between associate and baccalaureate curricula in the following areas: English, mathematics, business, computer science, education, technologies, and engineering (1991).
SUBJECT: Revision of "Policy and Procedures on Conflicts of Interest in Sponsored Research"

REQUIRED ACTION: Approve the Revision

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

(See attached)
8 November 1991

MEMORANDUM

TO: Connie Thorson, President
    Faculty Senate

FROM: E. A. Walters, Chairman
    RPC

RE: Revision of "Policy and Procedures on Conflicts of Interest in Sponsored Research"

As requested by the Faculty Senate, RPC has made further refinement in the proposed "Policy and Procedures on Conflicts of Interest in Sponsored Research." Enclosed are two versions of the proposed replacement for material currently in the Faculty Handbook. The first of these contains the wording currently found in the Handbook. The words to be removed have lines through the material to be retained is unmarked, and new material is underlined...except the "Procedures" section, beginning on p. 9, all of which is new. The second version is a clean copy of the revision as it would appear in the Handbook.

The concerns raised by the Senate earlier have been addressed:

1). Ambiguous language has been clarified.
2). Reference to the relevant statutes of the State of New Mexico has been included.
3). The question as to proposing two review committees, one for the Main Campus and another for the Medical School, was reconsidered and the original proposal was retained for the following reasons:
   a). There simply are two research administration structures. The proposal recognizes that fact. It is not appropriate to use this policy as a vehicle to drive change of that organization.
   b). A liaison is to be a member of both review panels.
to assure uniform standards.

c) Although the workload is not clear, the Provost currently deals with approximately six cases annually of actual conflict-of-interest situations. We believe this suggests a significant enough workload to merit the two panels which must deal with potential conflict situations…hopefully a larger number than the actual problems.

RPC recommends adoption of this policy and procedures.

I will plan to attend the Senate meeting at which this is considered and I shall ask the Chairman of our cognizant subcommittee, Professor Marek Osinski, to be there also.

cc: Provost Risser
Anne Brown
Mary Harris
Marek Osinski
POLICY AND PROCEDURES ON UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO ON PREVENTING CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED RESEARCH

Policy

Adopted by the University Faculty, June 8, 1966

Introduction

a. Contractual, consulting, and advisory relationships among universities, government, and private industry require attention to possible or actual conflict of interest situations. Standards of conduct, policy, and procedures for dealing with conflict of interest are required not only to assist faculty, students, and staff in recognizing and understanding such situations but also to protect the integrity and public trust of this university.

b. Conflict of interest as used herein is defined as follows:

A potential or actual conflict of interest exists when legal obligations or widely recognized professional norms can likely be compromised by a person's other interests especially if not disclosed.

c. Basic Principles:

A person who accepts a fulltime appointment to the faculty, or fulltime research position, or status as a fulltime research fellow or student, has an obligation to devote his/her primary professional effort and allegiance to the university. Other activities or commitments should be arranged so as not substantially to conflict with or dilute this commitment.
Consulting relationships between university staff members and industry serve the interest of research and education in the university. Likewise, the transfer of technical knowledge and skill from the university to industry contributes to technological advance. Such relationships are desirable, but certain potential hazards should be recognized.

d. Treatment of conflict of interest situations is particularly difficult because:

i. There may be moral implications tending toward explosive public relations and media risks far beyond actual injury or money damages;

ii. The member of the faculty, student body, or staff perceived to be in such situation is likely to be sensitive or even irate when questions are asked and may construe them as a personal attack;

iii. Distinction of "right" from "wrong" is made more difficult because the fact that potential (in addition to actual) impropriety can itself be wrong, and

iv. The concept of conflict of interest is broad, and the applicable statutes, regulations, court cases, and regulatory rulings are few and often provide little guidance.

e. These and other difficulties in defining and implementing conflict of interest policy as well as characterizing possible conflict of interest situations require faculty and other members of this university to rely on finely honed judgment and
wisdom in applying policy guidelines and procedures. This applies directly to "key personnel" who are defined as full or part-time members of the faculty, student body, or staff and who are principal investigators, consultants, and other persons having responsibilities in management, giving of advice, supervision, research or purchasing with respect to research sponsored by federal, state or local government, or by private firms or individuals.

Recognition of potential or actual conflict of interest situations may be quite difficult in some circumstances. Accordingly, where there is doubt, members are encouraged to consult with UNM counsel and/or private counsel as well as to disclose such situations as set forth under “Procedures”.

The increasingly necessary and complex relationships among universities, government, and industry call for more intensive attention to standards of procedure and conduct in government-sponsored research. The clarification and application of such standards must be designed to serve the purposes and needs of the projects and the public interest involved in them and to protect the integrity of the cooperating institutions as agencies of higher education.

The government and institutions of higher education, as the contracting parties, have an obligation to see that adequate standards and procedures are developed and applied to inform one another of their respective requirements; and to assure that all individuals participating in their respective behalf are informed of and apply the standards and procedures that are so developed.

Consulting relationships between university staff members and industry serve the interest of research and education in the university. Likewise, the transfer of technical knowledge and skill from the university to industry contributes to technological advance. Such relationships are desirable, but certain potential hazards should be recognized.
1. Conflict Situations.

1. Favoring of Outside Interests. When a university staff member (administrator, faculty member, professional staff member, or employee) or a key person, as defined above, undertaking or engaging in government-sponsored work has a significant financial interest in, or a consulting arrangement with, a private business concern, it is important to avoid actual or apparent conflicts of interest between his government-sponsored university research obligations and his outside interests and other obligations. Situations in or from which potential conflicts of interest may arise include the following:

   a. Undertaking or steering of the staff member's university research by a key person to serve the research or other needs of the private firm without disclosure of such undertaking or steering to the university and to the sponsoring agency;

   b. Directing potential sponsored research efforts away from the University and toward the person's firm or business;

   c. Purchase of major equipment, instruments, materials, or other items for university research from the private firm in which the staff member has the interest without the disclosure of such interest;

   d. Transmitting to the private firm without the sponsor's consent or otherwise using for personal gain government-sponsored work products, results, materials, records, or information that are not made generally available. (This would not necessarily preclude appropriate licensing arrangements for inventions, technical data, or consulting on the basis of government-sponsored research results where there is significant additional work by the key person's staff member independent of the person's government-sponsored research).
d. Use for personal gain or other unauthorized use of privileged information acquired in connection with the key person's staff member's government-sponsored activities. (The term "privileged information" includes, but is not limited to, medical, personnel, or security records of individuals; anticipated material requirements or price actions; possible new sites for government operations; and knowledge of forthcoming programs or of selection of contractors or subcontractors in advance of official announcements);

e. Negotiating or influencing upon the negotiation of contracts relating to the key person's staff member's government-sponsored research between the university and private organizations with which the key person has consulting or fiduciary/other significant relationships;

f. Accepting of gratuities or special favors from private organizations with which the university does or may conduct business in connection with a government-sponsored research project, or extending to employees of the sponsoring government agency, under circumstances which might reasonably be interpreted as an attempt to influence the recipients in the conduct of their duties.

Situations requiring disclosure include the following:

a. Direct or indirect interest of a key person in a private firm conducting business in an area that is closely related to the sponsored research, and where the key person (1) has a direct or indirect investment of more than $25,000 or 10% of a company's equity, or (2) holds a position as director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any other position of management in the company, or (3) has a spouse, communal partner, or dependent child owning directly, indirectly, or beneficially an interest of more than $25,000 or 10% in a company's equity, or
(4) has a consulting agreement of more than $5000 per year directly related to the key person's sponsored research.

b. Engaging in activities which, in addition to constituting a potential or actual conflict of interest situation, may also be prohibited by the law of the State of New Mexico. (Faculty members, staff members, and certain students employed by the university are considered to be employees of the State of New Mexico. These statutes are (as of April 17, 1991) NMSA, 1978: 10-16-1 et seq., particularly 10-16-3 to 10-16-8, 10-16-10, 10-16-12, 10-16-13, 13-1-190, 13-1-192, 13-1-193, 13-1-195; 21-1-17, 21-1-35, as amended. For example, a University employee's financial interest in a contract to supply goods or services to the University is statutorily prohibited (21-1-17). As another example, employees are prohibited from using confidential information acquired by virtue of his/her state employment or office for his/her private gain (10-16-6). A list of pertinent state statutes is available at the University Counsel's Office.

2. Distribution of Effort. There are competing demands on the energies of a faculty member (for example, research, teaching, committee work, outside consulting). The way in which he divides his effort among these various functions does not raise ethical questions unless the government agency supporting his research is misled in its understanding of the amount of intellectual effort he is actually devoting to the research in question. A system of precise time accounting is incompatible with the inherent character of the work of a faculty member, since the various functions he performs are closely interrelated and do not conform to any meaningful division of a standard work week. On the other hand, if the research agreement contemplates that a staff member will devote a certain fraction of his effort to the government-sponsored research, or he agrees to assume responsibility in relation to such research, a demonstrable relationship between the indicated effort or responsibility and the actual extent of his involvement is to be expected. Each university, therefore, should—through joint consultation of
administration and faculty—develop procedures to assure that proposals are responsibly made and complied with.

Consulting for Government Agencies or Their Contractors. When the staff member engaged in government-sponsored research and also serves as a consultant to a federal agency, the conduct of a key person is subject to the provisions of the Conflict of Interest Statutes (18 U.S.C. 202-209 as amended) and the President's memorandum of May 2, 1963, "Preventing Conflicts of Interest on the Part of Special Government Employees." When consulting for one or more government contractors, or prospective contractors, in the same technical field as the research project, a key person must be taken care to avoid giving advice that may be of questionable objectivity because of its possible bearing on the person's other interests. In undertaking and performing consulting services, a key person should make full disclosure of such interests to the university and to the contractor insofar as they may appear to relate to the work at the university or for the contractor. Conflict of interest problems could arise, for example, in the participation of a key person, staff member of the university, in an evaluation for the government agency or its contractor of some technical aspect of the work of another organization with which the person has a consulting or employment relationship or a significant financial interest, or in an evaluation of a competitor to such other organization.

University Responsibility toward Government-Sponsored Research

The each University participating in government-sponsored research should make known to the sponsoring government agencies:
The steps it is taking to assure an understanding on the part of the university community, administration, and staff members of the possible conflicts of interest or other problems that may develop in the foregoing types of situations, and

b. The organizational and administrative actions it has taken or is taking to avoid such problems, including:

i. Accounting procedures to be used to assure that government funds are expended for the purposes for which they have been provided, and that all services which are required in return for these funds are supplied;

ii-b. Procedures that enable it to be aware of the outside professional work of key personnel/staff members participating in government-sponsored research, if such outside work relates in any way to the government-sponsored research;

c. The formulation of standards to guide the individual university staff members in governing their conduct in relation to outside interests that might raise questions of conflicts of interest; and

d. The provision within the university of an informed source of advice and guidance to its staff members for advance consultation on questions they wish to raise concerning the problems that may or do develop as a result of their outside financial or consulting interests, as they relate to their participation in government-sponsored university research. The university may wish to discuss such problems with the contracting officer or other appropriate government official in those cases that appear to raise questions regarding conflicts of interest.

The above process of disclosure and consultation is the obligation assumed by the university when it accepts government funds for research. The process must, of course, be carried out in a manner that does not infringe on the legitimate freedoms and flexibility of action of the university and its staff members that have traditionally
characterized a university. It is desirable that standards and procedures of the kind discussed be formulated and administered by members of the university community themselves, through their joint initiative and responsibility, for it is they who are the best judges of the conditions which can most effectively stimulate the search for knowledge and preserve the requirements of academic freedom. Experience indicates that such standards and procedures should be developed and specified by joint administrative-faculty action.

Acceptance and Implementation by the University of New Mexico

1. The University of New Mexico accepts as controlling policy the above joint statement of the Council of the American Association of University Professors and the American Council on Education, issued December, 1964.

2. To implement this policy it shall be the responsibility of the office of the Vice-President for Research to inform the faculty member negotiating a government contract or grant of the University of New Mexico conflict of interests policy, and it shall be the responsibility of the individual to inform the University when such a conflict of interest may exist.

Procedures

I. Preface

The purpose of these procedures is not only to enable compliance with all applicable laws and regulations regarding conflict of interest, but also to afford means to protect those persons who may be exposed to conflict of interest situations. This protection may be best afforded by the earliest possible disclosure of a potential or actual conflict of interest situation.
II. Disclosure Statement

Whenever a conflict situation exists, (see "Conflict Situations" as defined and described in the Conflict of Interest Policy), a conflict of interest disclosure statement (see Appendix) must be completed prior to receipt of any support (includes any contract, grant, or gift that provides monies, special instrumentation or other products, services, consultancies, honoraria, or other benefits for research activities) from a government or private sponsor. It is the responsibility of the Principal Investigator to determine if there is any possible conflict of interest which involves the Principal Investigator or any key personnel taking part in the project, and to submit the disclosure statement to the appropriate Conflict of Interest Committee for review. For new or renewal proposals, this disclosure statement must be completed within 30 days of submission of the proposal to the funding agency.

If a disclosure statement for the proposal is not submitted, the Principal Investigator will be required to certify on the internal cover sheet of the grant application form that no conflict situations exist.

If a conflict situation changes or a new conflict of interest arises after acceptance of an award, a disclosure statement should be submitted to the Conflict of Interest Committee by the Principal Investigator within thirty (30) days from the time the Principal Investigator becomes aware of such conflict.

All disclosure statements will be maintained on file by the Conflict of Interest Committee for a minimum of five (5) years. The statements will be kept confidential and may be destroyed after five years in accordance with advice of University Counsel.
III. Conflict of Interest Committees

There will be two Conflict of Interest Committees appointed by the Provost -- one will be appointed to review the disclosure statements for research performed at the main campus and branch colleges, and the other appointed in consultation with the Dean of the School of Medicine to review the disclosure statements for research performed at the School of Medicine. These committees will also provide advance consultation on questions concerning potential conflict of interest related to sponsored research.

Each committee will have four (4) regular members and one liaison member. Two of the regular members and the liaison member shall be members of the faculty, one regular member will have no affiliation with the University and one ex-officio administrative member will be a university official responsible for signing or approving grant applications or contract proposals. Each regular member and the liaison member shall have one vote. Each regular member shall serve for a term of three (3) years; the term to be renewable. The liaison member shall serve for a term of two (2) years, with alternating appointments from the main campus (and branch colleges) and the School of Medicine. In order to provide for rotation and continuity of members, the initial appointments will be as follows: one of the regular faculty members -- 1 year; the other regular faculty member -- 3 years; the liaison faculty member -- 2 year appointment from the main campus; and the unaffiliated member -- 2 years.

Both Conflict of Interest Committees will maintain close contact through the liaison member. The role of the liaison member, who will serve on both committees, will be to assist the two committees to develop and maintain equal standards in treatment of conflict of interest disclosures considered by either committee. If the committees cannot agree on a common position regarding a particular issue, the matter shall be referred to
the Research Policy Committee for development of policy standards to be applied in future cases.

IV. Review of Disclosure Statement

A. The Conflict of Interest Committee shall regularly review all disclosure statements and decide that: (a) there is no potential conflict of interest, or (b) there was a conflict of interest which has been resolved according to one or more of the possible remedies described below (V.), or, (c) there is a conflict of interest which has not been resolved. The committee in its discretion may seek the advice of additional individuals under conditions of confidentiality to reach a final decision. Care will be exercised at all times to ensure confidentiality and to protect the safety and privacy of persons involved in the review.

B. If the committee determines that there is a conflict of interest, the Provost will be notified and acceptance of the award may be delayed. The committee is encouraged to work with the Principal Investigator and key personnel to find a remedy for the potential conflict of interest. If the conflict of interest cannot be resolved as described below (V.), the Provost will be notified by the committee. The Provost has the authority to decline acceptance of the award.

C. If a disclosure statement is submitted to the Conflict of Interest Committee after acceptance of an award or contract, further spending of funds provided by that award or contract will be contingent upon appropriate resolution of the conflict by the Conflict of Interest Committee. The committee is required to review the relevant documentation and reach a decision as described in A. above. If it is determined that there is no conflict of interest or if a remedy is found, the funds
may be spent according to the guidelines of the funding agency. If no resolution to a conflict of interest can be found, the Provost will be notified. The Provost shall normally advise the funding agency of the unresolved conflict. The funding agency or sponsor may require or request the University to return part or all of the funds. The Provost may then recommend to the President that the University take disciplinary or legal action against any individual(s) involved.

D. If a party other than the Principal Investigator suspects a potential conflict of interest that has not been disclosed, that party is encouraged to first bring the matter to the attention of the Principal Investigator. If such a meeting does not resolve the issue, or if for any reason a meeting with the Principal Investigator is not feasible, then the party should report the matter to the chairperson, director, dean, or Provost. The potential conflict of interest will then be referred to the appropriate Conflict of Interest Committee. The Committee shall follow the procedures of A, B and C to either resolve the issue or find that a conflict of interest exists. If, on the other hand, the Committee finds that a party's allegations were malicious, intentionally dishonest, or irresponsible, the Committee may recommend that steps be taken by the University to investigate the party and to take appropriate administrative or legal action.

V. Remedies for Conflict of Interest

If a conflict of interest is established, the Conflict of Interest Committee shall help resolve the conflict. The committee may designate other University officials to assist in this process. Remedies may include, but are not limited to:
A. The key person having the conflict of interest may remove conflicts by relinquishing either (1) responsibility in the research project or (2) the matter causing the conflict (e.g., holding, position or title, financial interest, conflicting support, honoraria, consultation, etc.).

B. The Conflict of Interest Committee may determine that even though there is a conflict of interest, an exception should be allowed, and a waiver may be issued by the Provost. This may occur when the conflict is such that the individual involved cannot materially influence the direction of the research, the research results or the manner of reporting or disclosing of the results, or will not derive a special advantage because of the nature of the research results or other information obtained. The Provost will advise the sponsor in accordance with the sponsor's requirements, and if appropriate, grant a waiver.

VI. Distribution of this Document

This document shall be distributed to all faculty, staff and students involved in sponsored projects.

VII. Treatment of Federal Agencies' Rules

As federal (and other) agencies issue their own rules on Conflict of Interest, such rules will govern when applicable, e.g., when required in the terms of a contract or grant.

It shall be the responsibility of each Principal Investigator and key personnel to be familiar with the contractual requirements of the sponsor on conflict of interest.

VIII. Continuing Review of Policy and Procedures
These University policies and procedures relating to Conflict of Interest shall be under continuing review and modified in light of experience. Suggestions for revision should be sent to the University of New Mexico Research Policy Committee.
SUBJECT: Proposed Policy on Tuition and Fee Waivers for UMM Employees' Dependents

REQUIRED ACTION: Approve Policy

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The attached proposed policy has been reviewed by the Faculty/Staff Benefits Committee and is brought to the Senate for approval.
TUITION AND FEE WAIVERS FOR
UNM EMPLOYEES' DEPENDENTS

(Proposed Policy)

WHEREAS: The University desires to improve employer-paid benefits for faculty and staff as a contribution to employee morale and enhance recruitment.

WHEREAS: The current University sponsored educational benefit program is limited to tuition and fee waiver of one course per semester for an employee or spouse.

WHEREAS: Many Universities have employer sponsored educational benefits that include partial or complete waiver of tuition and mandatory fees for dependent children.

THEREFORE: The University of New Mexico establishes the following education benefits program for employee dependents.

1.0 DEPENDENT EDUCATION BENEFITS

1.1 An eligible faculty or staff member's spouse and/or dependent children may receive a waiver of the value of tuition for up to eight (8) consecutive semesters, not including summer session.

1.2 The maximum number of dependent waivers which an individual employee may have at any time is two.

1.3 The eight consecutive semester limitation is applicable irrespective of whether the dependent enrolls as a full-time or part-time student. A semester eligibility is used, irrespective of the number of credit hours enrolled.

2.0 ELIGIBILITY

2.1 All full-time faculty and all full-time, permanent staff employed at UNM for more than one year (9 month academic year faculty appointment is recognized as one year of employment) are eligible to apply for the Dependent Educational Benefit.
2.2 The University administration may limit the number of tuition waivers for the Dependent Educational Benefit for fiscal reasons.

2.3 When selected to participate in the program, the dependent is automatically continued in the program up to eight (8) consecutive semesters, excluding summer sessions, as long as the dependent maintains a cumulative GPA of 2.0. If there is a break in the eight (8) consecutive semester enrollment, reapplication would be required for resumption of tuition waiver benefits.

2.4 Dependents of full-time faculty or full-time, permanent staff employed at the Albuquerque Campus, the three branches, and the Graduate Centers are eligible to participate in the Dependent Educational Benefits program.

2.5 Participant Selection Criteria:

2.5.1 The following criteria will be used to select the participants each semester in the Dependent Educational Benefit:

- Must qualify for regular admissions to the University.
- Consideration will be given to level of academic work intended, with priority given to undergraduate program enrollment.
- Full-time enrollment will be given priority consideration.
- Number of tuition waivers will be limited by the amount of total funds allocated for the program.
- Time/date of application submission will also be considered.

2.5.2 The University's Financial Aid Office will receive all applications and make recommendations to the President of the University for awarding the tuition waiver benefits, in accordance with these general policy guidelines.

2.6 Employee/Spouse Participation:

2.6.1 Employees are eligible for the current Employee Educational Benefit tuition waiver program, but are not eligible for the Dependent Educational Benefit program.
2.6.2 Spouses of full-time employees may apply for either the current Employee Educational Benefit tuition waiver or the Dependent Educational Benefit program but not both programs.

2.7 Dependents Receiving University Financial Aid:

2.7.1 Dependents receiving need-based and/or merit-based financial aid may not substitute or add to those financial aid program awards by participating in the Dependent Educational Benefits program.

3.0 ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

3.1 Dependents may obtain tuition waivers under this Dependent Educational Benefits program for enrollment in any course offered for academic credit in the undergraduate, graduate, law, and medical education programs offered by the University of New Mexico, Albuquerque campus. Dependents must meet all normal prerequisite requirements for enrollment.

3.2 Dependents of University employees enrolled in academic courses offered by the branch campuses are eligible for the tuition waiver provided this Dependent Educational Benefit program is adopted and funded by the respective branch campuses. Branch campus employees’ dependents who enroll in academic courses at University of New Mexico, Albuquerque campus are included in this program.

3.3 Mandatory student fees and special course fees assessed for participation in instructional academic credit courses and fees charged for courses offered for non-academic credit are not included in the Dependent Educational Benefit program.

4.0 TAXABLE BENEFIT

4.1 Any employee whose dependents participate in this Dependent Educational Benefit program will have the value of the tuition waiver included on the W-2 report to the Internal Revenue Service as supplemental income, in accordance with IRS regulations.
October 31, 1991

TO: President's Council
    Deans' Council
    Senate Operations Committee
    University Planning Council
    Staff Council
    AS/UNM President
    GSA President

FROM: Paul G. Risser, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Planning for the Implementation of a Comprehensive Program of Student Outcomes Assessment and Program Review at UNM

I would like to propose that we begin immediately a planning process for the implementation of a university-wide, comprehensive program of student outcomes assessment and program review. My reasons for this are as follows:

We have stated in UNM 2000 that a "goal of the University is to provide academic programs of the highest quality for the intellectual and personal development of its students" and in his inaugural address, President Peck emphasized our commitment to making the University of New Mexico the "home to the best undergraduate education in the Southwest." To evaluate our success in achieving these goals, we must conduct a deliberate and thoughtful examination of what our students gain from their education here and of the relationship between this assessment and academic program development and improvement.

Of course, various forms of useful student outcomes assessment and processes for program review already exist on this campus. Many academic units have institutionalized their own independent programs. For example, the Psychology Department completed a transcript study of a sample of its undergraduate students which was useful for determining the actual coursework taken by majors and for evaluating the program's course requirements. The College of Nursing has a comprehensive assessment effort which includes student surveys at the end of each semester, at graduation and one year after graduation. Students evaluate the quality of the program based on meeting certain specified performance goals, indicate whether their knowledge and skills which were taught. Alumni are asked whether they can apply the knowledge and skills which were taught and to evaluate the adequacy of the curriculum in terms of their present job. This student feedback is used by the College for curriculum revision. These successful examples indicate the type of effort needed in programs across the University.
Furthermore, as you may know, the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, along with other higher education institutional accrediting organizations, has recently added a requirement that institutions implement a comprehensive program of student outcomes assessment. The central purpose of such a program is to provide information which will be used for the improvement of programs and the academic achievement of students, a purpose in tune with UNM's goals outlined above. Our accrediting Association's goals, however, add urgency to our own and require that we complete the development of plans for our assessment program in short order. UNM is scheduled for a focused visit from NCA in May, 1992, and included on the agenda for that visit will be a review of our plans for an outcomes assessment program.

Patricia Burris-Woodall has assisted me in recommending how we might structure this planning process and about what characteristics the resulting plan might exhibit.

The development of a comprehensive program of student outcomes assessment and program review should recognize that the "faculty has the ultimate responsibility for determining the policies, practices, and the content of the academic programs and the performance expectations of students" (UNM 2000) and thus will substantially be the result of the faculty's thought, creativity, and effort. At the same time, we recognize that students are "partners with an active voice" (UNM 2000) in the University and we will incorporate into the assessment process various means to assess their needs and their evaluations of the programs in which they have participated. We also recognize that staff have a commitment to providing high-quality services and programs to the students at UNM and we will include their insights into the design of this assessment plan. The development process itself, as well as the resulting plan, will demonstrate the values of scholarship, critical inquiry, integrity, and commitment to excellence.

The plan should have the following characteristics:

* Flow from the mission of the University and from the goals, objectives and unique characteristics of the individual programs it serves;
* Provide explicit evaluation procedures, measurable characteristics of program quality when possible, and incorporate multiple measures and methods of assessment;
* Provide information which is useful to improve programs and student learning and which is integrated into decision-making and planning processes;
* Outline the step-by-step implementation of assessment and program review efforts (including pilot efforts when appropriate) over a two- to four-year period;
* Be cost-effective, and include a process for evaluating the assessment program itself.

As a suggested procedure, we might establish a small Advisory Group (of perhaps 3-4 members) to oversee the planning process. We can then incorporate several task-oriented, short-term Work Groups which will focus on the following areas: use and integration of existing student data to provide information on student outcomes and examination of possible implementation of a longitudinal student tracking system, examination of present program assessment efforts and identification of possible external funding sources, assessment in the assessment efforts and identification of possible external funding sources, assessment in the assessment efforts and identification of possible external funding sources, assessment in the assessment efforts and identification of possible external funding sources, assessment in the assessment efforts and identification of possible external funding sources.
of general education, assessment of basic and/or higher order skills, assessment of specified attitudes or values, alumni assessment, program review of retention and student support services and programs, and assessment of the quality of student effort.

Attached is a proposed schedule of activities.

Please let me know of your thoughts about this process and recommendations about who might wish to participate as a member of the Advisory Group or in other parts of the effort.

Thanks.

PGR:mb
Attachment
cc: Patricia Burris-Woodall
Proposed Schedule of Activities

Form Advisory Group

Advisory Group tasks:

* Discuss issues of credibility of planning for assessment/program review and motivation of participants
* Anticipate questions and concerns from work group participants
* Define work group topics
* Recommend and recruit work group participants

Form Work Groups

Work Group participants meet all together with Advisory Group to:

* Discuss general purpose, goals, and concerns about this activity
* Discuss each specific work group's topics
* Discuss general process for accomplishing task
* Prepare a time line for completion of work

Work Groups meet with outside outcomes assessment expert for:

* Detailed discussion of relevant resource material, contacts, appropriate focus, range of alternatives of methods and measures, important issues and controversies, costs, suggested steps to take in formulating a plan, etc.

Work Groups work on their own with review of progress by Advisory Group

Work Groups submit their plans/proposals

Report Writing Group formed, composed of some combination of Work Group participants and Advisory Group members

Report Writing Group tasks:

* Prepare a draft report of an integrated plan
* Obtain estimated cost of the plan
* Facilitate review of plan by appropriate parties
* Revise plan

Draft Report of Assessment/Program Review Plan is sent to outside consultant for review and critique

Assessment/Program Review Plan is revised based on consideration of reviewer's critique prepared for internal review and review by NCA.
MEMORANDUM

To: Connie Thorson, President, Faculty Senate
   Richard Meador, Chair, Admission and Registration Committee
From: Karen M. Elder, Associate Vice President & Dean of Students
Re: Modifications regarding Academic Dishonesty for the Student Standards and Grievance Procedure and statement in the Faculty Handbook regarding Dishonesty in Academic Matters

Enclosed please find minor modifications and changes to the above procedure and statement which will be presented to the Regents in an upcoming meeting. These are "housekeeping" items and reflect current practices and clarification rather than substantive changes. If you have any concerns or questions, please call me at x6448.

KMG:jz
Enc.
Section 1.8 Other Matters Not Included Under These Procedures

1.8.6. **DISPUTES TRANSFERRED, REFERRED, OR APPEALED TO THE STUDENT STANDARDS AND GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO OTHER OFFICIAL UNM PROCEDURES SHALL BE HEARD BY THE COMMITTEE UNDER THE APPLICABLE ARTICLES OF THIS PROCEDURE.**

**ARTICLE 3. ACADEMIC DISHONESTY**

3.1 Scope

This section sets forth procedures which shall be followed in cases of suspected academic dishonesty. The rules defining academic dishonesty are set forth in the University of New Mexico Catalog, the Faculty Handbook, and in the Pathfinder. Academic dishonesty includes but is not limited to cheating, plagiarism, or other instances of taking credit for work performed by others, and also instances of hindering the academic work of other students. These procedures are not exclusive; various university departments and programs may have additional policies and procedures on academic dishonesty. Academic dishonesty is defined in the policy on academic dishonesty.

3.2.2 The faculty member **MAY BE ENCOURAGED TO** report the matter in writing to the Dean of Students. The report shall describe the facts, including the discussion with the student and any resulting sanction. A copy of such report shall be sent to the student, the faculty member's chairperson and dean, and the dean of the student's college, if different.

3.3. Academic Dishonesty in Other Settings

When academic dishonesty occurs **OTHER THAN** in connection with any test or examination not connected with a course, the person who observes or discovers the apparent violation **SHALL TRANSMIT IN WRITING TO THE DEAN OF STUDENTS A STATEMENT DESCRIBING THE OCCURRENCE.** With a course, but administered by an officer of the University or in connection with any non-disclosure or misrepresentation in filling out applications or other University records, the person who observes or discovers the violation shall transmit in writing to the Dean of Students a statement describing the occurrence. A copy shall be sent to the student. The Dean of Students shall determine the sanction following the procedures set forth in Section 3.4. This subsection does not apply to applicants who have not been admitted to the University.
6.2.1. A student seeking a change in his or her academic record within the scope of this Article shall submit a petition to the ADMISSIONS AND REGISTRATION SUBCOMMITTEE, AT THE Records Office under the Admissions and Registration Subcommittee. The petition shall state the nature of the request, and shall specify the semester involved, the course and section number, the student’s name, I.D. number, mailing address and telephone number. The petition shall state the reason for granting the request, and shall include documentation of extenuating circumstances, such as medical, family, or employment needs. The petition shall be typed and signed.

6.2.3. Within one week of receipt of the instructor’s response (or lack of response), the Subcommittee shall take action on the petition. If the Subcommittee denies the petition, it shall issue to the STUDENT AND INSTRUCTOR a brief statement giving the reasons for the denial. It SHALL, UPON THE STUDENT’S REQUEST, ALSO FORWARD TO THE STUDENT ANY RESPONSE FROM THE INSTRUCTOR.

6.3.5. The student may appeal a denial of the petition by the Grade Petition FACULTY GRADE PETITION Committee to the Faculty Admissions and Registration Committee. Letters of appeal shall be addressed to the Chair of the Committee and delivered to the Records Office.

6.4.1. The Admissions and Registration Committee shall grant or deny the petition under the procedures set forth in 6.3.3. and 6.3.4. The Committee’s decision shall be final.

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

Each student is expected to maintain the highest standards of honesty and integrity in academic and professional matters. The University reserves the right to take disciplinary action, up to and including dismissal, against any student who is found guilty of academic dishonesty or otherwise fails to meet the standards. Any student judged to have engaged in academic dishonesty in coursework may receive a reduced or failing grade for the work in question and/or for the course.

Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, dishonesty in quizzes, tests, or assignments; claiming credit for work not done or done by others; misrepresenting academic or professional qualifications within or without the University; and nondisclosure or misrepresentation in filling out applications or other university records.
The UNM Faculty Senate Budget Committee has completed their study of the student share of the cost of education and has reported their findings to the Senate (and subsequently to the faculty). Their findings and conclusions include but are not limited to the following:

1. Relative to every objective indicator considered, tuition and fee rates at UNM are too low.

2. The University needs a policy on steady gains and maintenance in tuition and fees relative to the appropriate indices.

3. The appropriate mechanism for ensuring adequate access to the University for low income students should be addressed, but adequate access should not be the reason for keeping tuition and fees unreasonably low.

4. Historically, procedures for setting tuition and fees at UNM have not served the state or the institution well, and, in fact, have divided the University community.

5. It appears from the data and the analysis that a 30% student share of the cost of education is an acceptable and reasonable long term goal if coupled with adequate student financial aid.

Therefore, the following policy is proposed:

1. Over the next four years tuition and fees should rise in an amount that will increase the student share of educational costs (definition from FSBC: Tuition and fees divided by total I & G expenditure per student FTE) by no less than 1% per year, as long as the resulting tuition and fee increase does not exceed the Regents' Policy of a 10% maximum increase per year. This increase will continue each year of the four years until a 26% student share has been achieved. This share increase will be in addition to student share that has been achieved. This share increase will be in addition to student share that has been achieved.

2. Access to UNM for low income residents of New Mexico must be assured by a parallel rise in financial aid dollars available. Low income, qualified students will not be denied access to UNM for financial reasons.

3. Prior to the end of the fourth year, the UNM Faculty Senate and other bodies within UNM will examine the impact of these tuition and fee increases. If total funding from tuition and fees, legislative appropriations, and other sources has improved UNM's relative peer standing, its ability to hire and retain strong faculty, its library collections and services, and its financial ability to improve graduate assistant stipends and student stipends consistent with the base indices, then the UNM Faculty Senate may recommend extending its tuition and fees share policy for another four years to achieve a 30% student share.