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

The UNM Faculty Senate will meet on Tuesday, March 10, 1992 at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva. The agenda is long and it is important to have full discussion on each item. Please plan to remain at the meeting until 6:00 p.m.

The agenda will include the following items:

1. Summarized Minutes of February 11, 1992
2. Memorial Minute for Professor Loren Pitcher -- Dr. Leonard Napolitano
3. Memorial Minute for Professor William Woodside -- Dr. Leonard Napolitano
4. Term Limitations for Deans and Chairs -- Professor Connie Thomson
5. Merger of Departments of Communications and Journalism -- Professor Robert Tiemens
6. Change in Charge and Membership of the Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee -- Kari Ward Karr
7. Report from the Core Curriculum Committee -- Professor Paul Davis
8. Report from the Summer School Task Force -- Professor David McPherson
9. Honors Education -- Professor Mary Harris
10. Further Discussion of Tuition vs State Appropriations -- Professor Maurice Wildin
11. Recommendations on Planning -- Professor Maurice Wildin

March 2, 1992
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
March 10, 1992

(Summarized Minutes)

The March 10, 1992 meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Connie Thorsen at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

Senators present: Lyrubianne Beene (A&S), Zella Bray (Nursing), Edith Cherry (Arch & Plng), Marion Cottrell (Engineering), James Dawson (Gallup Branch), James DePaepe (Education), Michele Diehl (Valencia Branch), Jilisa Duran (Education), Marilyn Fletcher (Zinnerman Library), Walter Forman (Medicine), Kenneth Gunther (Medicine), Robert Grew (Medicine), Larry Gorbet (A&S), Mary Grizzard (A&S), Catherine Harris (Public Administration), Donald MacDonald (Management), Priscilla Smith (Gallup Branch), Russell Snyder (Medicine), Ron Storey (Medicine), Connie Thorsen (Zinnerman Library), James Thorsen (A&S), Pauline Turner (Education), Benjamin Walker (Medicine), Ethelene Wilkins (Engineering) and Estelle Zarmes (A&S).

Absent: Gloria Birkholz (Nursing), Susan Deese (Zinnerman Library), Daniel Derksen (Medicine), Bradley Ellingboe (Fine Arts), John Geissman (A&S), Robert Greenberg (Medicine), Donald Kendall (Engineering), Jerry King (Medicine), Vonda Long (Education), William MacPherson (Law), James Standefer (Medicine), Donald Vichlick (Medicine) and James Wallace (Medicine).

Minutes of February 11, 1992. The minutes of February 11, 1992 were approved as distributed.

Memorial Minutes. Memorial minutes for Professors I.oren Pitcher and William Woodside were presented by Dean Leonard Napolitano.

The Senate adopted the minutes by rising vote and Secretary Anne Brown was asked to send copies to the next of kin.

Term Limitations for Deans and Chairs. The Senate Operations Committee recommended that deans should serve terms of five years and chairs should serve terms of four years. Terms would be renewable and mandatory periodic faculty evaluations of deans and chairs should be conducted. Some of the points made during the discussion were:

- that the proposed policy does not conflict with the statement on terms in the current Faculty Handbook but, rather, clarifies it
- that it appears to be a mechanism for evaluating chairpersons' performance
- that a college or school already has a policy of shorter terms or more frequent evaluations which has been adopted by a majority of the faculty of that unit, that policy will supersede this one
After discussion of the proposed policy limiting terms for deans and chairs, the issue was tabled until the April Senate meeting and returned to the Operations Committee for further refinement and inclusion of amendments. Professors Zella Bray and Lynn Dianne Beene agreed to assist the Operations Committee in writing the second draft.

Merger of Departments of Communication and Journalism. Upon recommendation of the faculties of both departments, the Curricula Committee and the Operations Committee, the Senate approved the merger of the Department of Communication and the Department of Journalism. Senate President Connie Thorson said that although the Form C was not included in the agenda, all of the required signatures have been obtained.

Change in Charges and Membership of the Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee. The Senate voted to delete the last sentence in the first paragraph of the proposed charge which says "Other units within the University will not create separate benefits committees." and membership of the Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee is to change the word "Union" in the second paragraph to "bargaining unit(s)". It was then sent back to the Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee to clarify the issue of the number of union members to be included.

Report from the Core Curriculum Committee. Professor Paul Davis, chairman of the Core Curriculum Committee, presented the final report of the Core Curriculum Committee. He explained that the Committee (appointed in the spring of 1990) had been charged to create a core curriculum of 18 to 24 hours, to determine the nature of the subject matter to be included in a core curriculum, and to pay attention to comments and criticism from constituents. The Senate has already approved the concept of a core curriculum in principle. The issue of implementation is not to be addressed at this time.

Three fundamental criticisms of the proposed core curriculum were made. The first was that this is not a core program, that a core should consist of six to eight hours which a student must take. The Committee felt that this is too inflexible for the diverse student body at UNM.

The second criticism was that the treatment of science is inadequate. In reconsidering the proposed core, more time was spent on the issue of science and more science faculty members were added to the committee.

The third problem with the proposed core was the central theme of "Ways of Knowing." Alternatives were considered and rejected after discussion.

Difference of opinion within the Committee, Professor Davis said, were profound and deeply felt and there was a need to reconcile divergent interests. The proposed core is balanced; flexible, in that it reflects a diverse student body; and specific in regard to course content where possible. The proposed core is not politically correct and not traditional.

The Report will be voted on at the April meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Senator Walter Fonnan told the Senate that through the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation grant, the Medical School has established two task forces to examine the issues of humanities in medicine, social sciences in medicine and the "ways of learning." Medical school students have been found to be deficient in these areas. Senator Fonnan stated that there is money available for dealing with the issues both of a core for undergraduate students in general as well the need for medical school students who are better prepared in the humanities and social sciences areas.
This is the type of planning that should be done as a university. He urged that the graduate schools be considered as part of undergraduate development.

President Thorson thanked the committee for its hard work. Additionally, it was suggested that an open forum on the Core Curriculum be held prior to the Senate vote on April 14.

Report from the Summer School Task Force. As a part of the university's reallocation plans to meet the goals of UNM 2000, it was recommended that a task force be established to look into all aspects of the summer school program. In the fall of 1991, the Senate established the Task Force which submitted the report included in the agenda. Upon recommendation of Senator David McPherson, chairperson of the Task Force, the Faculty Senate adopted the Summer School Task Force Report.

Recommendations of the Task Force include improvements in course offerings, more innovative courses, improved scheduling, revised policy regarding summer school faculty salaries, a raise in out-of-state tuition rates for summer and more advertisement of summer course offerings. If no money is forthcoming to implement the recommendations, none of the recommendations are feasible.

Honors Education. President Thorson gave a brief background of current events regarding honors education and explained that the issue does not presently require any action on the part of the Faculty Senate. It is a discussion issue only.

Senator Pauline Turner recognized Miriam Morgan-Smith, president of the Honors Student Advancement Council, who explained that the students of the Honors Program were very concerned about the future of the Program. She said that they were concerned about Dean Wildenthal's possible deanship of a proposed Honors College since he has been an outspoken critic of the Program. Additionally, they are concerned about curriculum, faculty and the facility itself. They would like for the administration to recognize the efforts of the General Honors Task Force which was chaired by Professor Robert Schwartz.

Professor Charles Biebel, Director of the General Honors Program, said that there is much that can be done to improve the Program as it now exists without creating new administrative structures and there is great concern about process.

Senator David Null, chairperson of the Faculty Senate Curricula Committee, told the Senate that any major changes would have to be initiated by the Honors Program itself and presented to the Curricula Committee for approval. If Honors refuses to initiate a "Form C," there would be no paperwork to process.

Senator Michele Diel observed that in her experience, the UNM Honors Program fosters collegiality and autonomy and is a much better model than that being proposed by Provost Paul Risser.

Senator Pauline Turner said that there are at least two Regents who intend for UNM to have an Honors College whether the faculty of the University want it or not.
Nicholas Donato, an Honors student, told the Senate that an external review had been conducted prior to the work of the Task Force and its conclusions where in concurrence with the Task Force in terms of the basic position that the Program, as it now exists, works. He urged that the Honors Program be left as it is now.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Anne J. Brown, Secretary
UNM FACULTY SENATE

SUBJECT: Term Limitations for Deans and Chairs

REQUESTED ACTION: Approve the Recommendations

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The recommendation on the following page is presented by the Operations Committee for Senate consideration and possible approval.
To: Faculty Senate
From: Senate Operations Committee
Subject: Term Limitations for Deans and Chairs

The Senate Operations Committee makes the following recommendations to the Faculty Senate for consideration and possible approval:

1. Deans should serve terms of five years. Chairs should serve terms of four years.
2. Terms should be renewable, assuming approval of the central administration and the college faculty.
3. A mandatory faculty evaluation of the dean should be conducted in the fourth year of the dean's term. A mandatory faculty evaluation of the chair should be conducted in the third year of the chair's term. Results would then be available late in the penultimate year, permitting a timely decision on whether to open a search during the final year of the term or to announce that a second term is anticipated.

The following are suggested procedures that have been developed from the recommendations received from faculty members:

Both deans and chairs should be evaluated anonymously by their faculty every year. The findings, tabulated by a faculty committee, should be passed on to the chair or dean by his/her immediate supervisor, and an objective summary should be made available to the department or college faculty. Conversations about the evaluations should take place each year. The annual reviews will provide a solid basis for a chair or dean to predict his/her prospects for a second term. Each may seek a second term or not. In the final year of the term, nominations will be sought if the dean or chair chooses not to seek re-election or if the faculty reviews indicate that a change is needed. A change will not be needed if the faculty agrees that the dean or chair is performing well.
SUBJECT: Merger of Departments of Communications and Journalism

REQUIRED ACTION: Approve the Merger

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The proposal to merge the departments of Communications and Journalism represents a proactive response to the University’s reallocation plan. The faculties of the two departments and all other appropriate bodies have approved the merger.
The faculties of the merging departments have approved an undergraduate curriculum which will create a new program leading to a B.A. in Journalism and Mass Communication, while continuing without change the traditional B.A. in Communication degree.

The new curriculum offers four specialized Journalism and Mass Communication sequences built around a core of common courses to be taken by all students in the program. Two of four sequences are new -- broadcast/cable management and public relations. The other two, print journalism and broadcast journalism, are being significantly enriched.

To accomplish this, eight existing courses are being modified to broaden their scope and two new courses are being developed.

These modifications and an across-the-board examination of all other undergraduate offerings, which the faculties undertook in conjunction with developing the new curriculum, permits the merged department to drop 20 courses.

COURSES TO BE Dropped

J-111 (Technical Introduction to Television)
J-277 (Graphic Design)
J-280 (Critical Thinking)
J-288 (Spanish for Professionals)
J-405 (Public Affairs Programming)
J-456 (Microprocessors in Journalism)
J-469 (Media Management)
J-101 (Introduction to Mass Communication)
J-322 (Law of the Press)
J-399 (Internship)
J-496 (Independent Study)
J-499 ("Topics" number)
C-111 (Technical Introduction to Television)
C-260 (Oral Interpretation.)
C-332 (Parliamentary Procedure.)
C-338 (Rhetorical Criticism.)
C-348 (Organizational Communication Analysis.)
C-449 (Training and Development.)
C-464 (Instructional Television Production)
C-472 (Directing Forensics)
NEW COURSES FOR THE NEW CURRICULUM

125. Visual Communication in-the-Media. This will be one of five required core courses. It can be taken concurrent with or after the second writing course (to be redesignated 251.) It would be a prerequisite to the first news photography course, now J-261, to copy editing, now J-312, and Broadcast News I, now J-340.

The contents will be entirely new to the offerings of the two departments. The course will offer visual theory, explanation and demonstration of the technical processes involved in the production of print and video graphics, plus hands-on training in still photography, video photography and tape editing so that students will have the basic skills they will need in higher level courses.

To produce the results intended by the curriculum committee and to handle the numbers of students such a core course is expected to attract, new equipment will be required and the instructor will need a teaching assistant as well as help from the department's video technician and from student interns or work-study students.

305. Introduction to Public Relations. This will be the foundation course for the new public relations sequence, covering principles and procedures in the field. The second writing course, to be redesignated as 251, will be the prerequisite.

COURSES TO BE MODIFIED

The new curriculum will require modification of eight existing courses, to meet the needs of more students than they do now while still providing sequence-specific and necessary instruction. These courses are listed with their proposed titles and numbers.

468 - Mass Media Law & Regulation. This is currently taught at the 300-level in Journalism as "Law of the Press" and at the 400-level in Communication as "Broadcast/Cable Policy and Regulation." The course content will be modified to include both areas and the existing Communication number will be used. This will be one of the five core courses.

495 -- Mass Media Ethics. Now partly covered in some Communication courses, "ethics" is a major course requirement for the existing Journalism degree. Journalism teaches it as J-494 "Mass Media as a Social Force," covering ethical questions in print and broadcast journalism. It will be broadened to include ethical considerations in advertising and public relations. A new
number, 495, is being assigned to avoid duplication. It will be a core course.

301 -- History of the Media. Now a 300-level required course in Journalism called "History of Journalism," it will be broadened to include communications history. It will keep its Journalism number, 301, and will be recommended as an elective in all sequences.

262 -- Radio and TV Performance. Now taught under that number in Communication as Speaking for Radio/Television, it will be modified to increase emphasis on preparation for broadcast news. Such a course has always been beyond the means of the Journalism Department, even though it has been regarded as essential to rounding out the broadcast journalism sequence.

344 -- Interviewing. Now taught under that name and number in Communication, it will be modified to include interviewing to gather information for news stories, and interviewing for live television. As a separate subject, this has always been beyond the means of the Journalism Department.

110 -- Introduction to Mass Communication. Now Journalism's 101 course and Communication's 110, it would keep the higher number and would be modified as the two current instructors and other faculty might agree is necessary.

151 -- Writing for the Mass Media I. Now Journalism 251, News Writing, the title will be changed, the contents will be modified, and the course will be renumbered at the 100 level. Renumbering reflects the reality that once prerequisites are met, freshmen students can enter the program. The new title will reflect a change from writing for the print media only to writing for broadcast as well as print, a change which is fundamental to the new curriculum. This will be a core course.

251 -- Writing for the Mass Media II. This will be a modification of J-252, embodying the changes being made as J-251 becomes 151. The change from 252 to 251 avoids conflict with an existing Communication course (C-252, Introduction to Linguistic Analysis.) The contents will be broadened to introduce students to advertising, public relations and broadcast continuity writing, subjects not now covered in either of the two departments. This will be a core course.

THE CORE CURRICULUM IN JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION

Every student in the four sequences will be required to take five core courses. One is the new 259 course, Visual Communication, and four, as described earlier, are modified versions of courses now being taught. The core courses will account for 15 credit hours, shared by all students.
will be taken in required specialized courses for each sequence, and nine will be taken in electives — resulting in a total of 33 hours in each degree sequence. Thirty-three is the maximum currently permitted by the accrediting agency in Journalism and Mass Communication. The core courses, which have been described in previous paragraphs, are:

151 -- Writing for the Mass Media I (modified J-251).
251 -- Writing for the Mass Media II (modified J-252).
259 -- Visual Communication in the Media (new).
468 -- Mass Media Law & Regulation (modified J-322 and C-468).
495 -- Mass Media Ethics (modified J-494).

THE FOUR SPECIALISED SEQUENCES

Broadcast Journalism: The five core courses plus three required specialized courses, plus appropriate electives.

Required:

340: Journalism's existing "Broadcast News I."
341: Journalism's existing "Broadcast News II.
485: Journalism's existing 470, "News Documentaries," with a new number to avoid duplication.

(Note: With this semester's addition to the Journalism faculty of a second broadcast instructor, after many years of having only one, these three courses are being modified significantly.)

Sequence-specific Electives:

344 Interviewing
262 Radio and TV Performance
492 Internship
301 History of the Media
254 Broadcast Practice (a one-credit course for students who are volunteers at KUNM-FM.)
406 Broadcast elective "Special Programming," on the books but never taught.
**Print Journalism**  The five core courses plus three required specialized courses, plus appropriate electives.

**Required:**

- 312: Journalism's existing "Copy-Editing and Makeup."
- 375: Journalism's existing "Intermediate Reporting."
- 475: Journalism's existing "Advanced Reporting."

**Sequence-specific Electives:**

- 261 News Photography
- 344 Interviewing
- 302 Persuasive Writing
- 301 History of the Media
- 492 Internship
- 322 Magazine Writing
- 361 Photojournalism
- 253 Newspaper Practice (a one-credit course for Daily Lobo staff.)

**Broadcast/Cable Management.**  The five core courses plus three required specialized courses, plus appropriate electives.

**Required:**

- 362 Broadcast Station Operations
- 364 Broadcast/Cable Programming and Promotion
- 428 Mass Communications Research

**Sequence-specific Electives:**

- 268 Introduction to Mass Communication Effects
- 340 Broadcast News I
- 368 Broadcast Criticism
Mass Communication: International Perspectives

301 History of the Media

492 Internship

**Public Relations:** The five core courses plus three required specialized courses, plus appropriate electives.

**Required:**

- 305: The new Introduction to Public Relations
- 334: Campaigns and Movements
- 469: Public Relations Campaigns

**Sequence-specific Electives:**

- 304 Advertising Copywriting, formerly J-403
- 315 Desktop Publishing I
- 302 Persuasive Writing
- 327 Persuasive Communication
- 301 History of the Media
- 340 Broadcast News I
- 364 Broadcast/Cable Programming and Production
- 492 Internship
- 262 Radio and TV Performance

**Elective Courses**

Required courses in any sequence will be valid electives in any other sequence. In addition, a number of non-required courses will be valid electives.

These include the following courses, all to be redesignated with the prefix eventually selected for the merged department.

- J-261 News Photography
- J-300 Introduction to Advertising (renumbering of J-401)
- J-302 Persuasive Writing
- J-304 Advertising Copywriting (renumbering of J-403)
- J-315 Desktop Publishing I
In addition, the curriculum committee of the two departments found a clear need for only one new elective, a course in advertising production -- making commercials for radio and television and designing them for print. The committee regarded such a course as necessary to a well-rounded undergraduate education in advertising, but feels its institution should be delayed until resources permit, or until advertising can be elevated to a degree sequence.
To: B. Hobson Wildenthal, Dean, College of Arts & Sciences

From: Robert K. Tiemens, Chair, Department of Communication; Acting Chair, Department of Journalism

Subject: Proposal to Merge Departments of Communication and Journalism

Date: November 19, 1991

The enclosed document needs no explication, other than to note that the faculties of both departments have voted unanimously to approve it. I heartily endorse their action and submit it for your review and subsequent action.

The proposal to merge the two departments represents a proactive response to the University's reallocation plan; and illustrates how existing programs in both departments can be significantly enhanced and expanded with a relatively modest increase in present resources. We recognize that there is still much work to be done, but we are prepared to act expediently to see it become a reality. Once we have received approval, we will take immediate steps to actualize administrative reorganization and changes in curriculum.

xc: A&S Committee on Reallocation Issues for Communication/Journalism
Merger Proposal for the
Department of Communication and Department of Journalism

INTRODUCTION

Universities are expected to be at the forefront of intellectual and social change, producing new ideas, and new perspectives on old ones. It is no longer a new idea that our culture and others are influenced deeply by many complex means of communication. But many new ideas and new perspectives still await discovery. The faculty concerned with oral, written and visual communication at the University of New Mexico believe the time has come to integrate existing programs.

We therefore propose merging the departments of Journalism and Communication into a single department. The case for such a merger could be made simply on the basis of saving money by streamlining administrative structures and curricula. The two faculties are convinced, however, that the intellectual bonus will be much broader, putting the new department at the cutting edge of teaching, scholarship and research.

The timing is right, paralleling the university’s current reallocation program and the development of UNM 2000. Like UNM’s broader programs, this plan offers short-term solutions that will mold the department of the future. It is not exhaustive. We anticipate that unexpected details involved in merging two well-established departments will need further resolution. With that reservation, six broad areas are addressed in this proposal: the department’s name; departmental and administrative structure; faculty appointments and status; faculty review and evaluation; curriculum; and resources and facilities.

DEPARTMENT NAME

We propose that the new unit be named the Department of Communication and Journalism. There are good reasons to retain the identity of both components associated with the former units. Both have constituencies with distinct identities, and that must be recognized. Alumni in the two fields often prefer to hire graduates with a familiar background. The proposed name is a reminder, moreover, that separate degrees will still be offered, and that this is a merger, not the absorption of one department by another.

DEPARTMENTAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

The chairperson will be appointed by the dean of the College of Arts & Sciences. The department chair will be advised by an executive committee comprised of four members: an associate chair for undergraduate studies, an associate chair for graduate studies, and two tenured faculty members representing the undergraduate degree programs offered by the department. The committee will be appointed by the department chair after consultation with the faculty. The secretarial and professional staffs of the two departments will be combined into one staff under the supervision of the chair.
FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND STATUS

Members of the communication and journalism faculties will join the new department at their current rank and tenure status. But a distinction will be drawn between graduate and undergraduate faculty after the merger. Only those who hold a doctorate or terminal degree in an appropriate field will be eligible for graduate faculty status and thus eligible to chair master's thesis committees. All faculty in the department will be eligible to sit on master's thesis committees and teach graduate courses in their areas of specialization, but only those who are members of the graduate faculty may chair thesis committees. The merger, of course, will provide the opportunity for the new department to add to the current offerings in communication and journalism a mass communication specialization at the master's level.

FACULTY REVIEW AND EVALUATION

Faculty reviews for tenure and promotion will be conducted according to newly developed criteria which incorporate standards previously used by the two departments. The document accompanying this report will become the official statement on promotion and tenure for the new department (see Appendix A).

CURRICULUM

A significant purpose of the merger is to create a focused curriculum that broadly meets student needs. The most obvious and immediate change will be in the journalism and mass communication curricula. Benefits for students will include a wider selection of courses; consolidation of overlapping courses; combined expertise of instructors with media experience at both theoretical and professional levels; strengthening of courses and formalizing of programs in public relations, advertising and broadcast management; and the introduction of more research into the overall program.

The department will offer two undergraduate degrees, one in Communication and one in Journalism and Mass Communication. The degree in Communication will continue to offer emphases in Intercultural Communication, Interpersonal Communication, Organizational Communication and Rhetorical Communication. Requirements for the degree in Communication will not change, except that the existing emphasis in Mass Communication will be altered to reflect the shift of this emphasis to the Journalism and Mass Communication degree program.

The proposed new curriculum for the Journalism and Mass Communication degree will substantially enhance and modernize the education offered to students. Five core courses will be required, emphasizing written communication skills, visual communication skills, and law and ethics in specific areas. Four specialized sequences will be offered: Broadcast Journalism; Print Journalism; Broadcast/Cable Management; and Public Relations and Advertising. Several existing electives will be restructured to make them pertinent to students in all four sequences.

This plan makes it possible to consolidate several courses, enabling the merged department to drop six from the Communication curriculum and ten from Journalism.
courses already were dropped in Communication course revisions in the Spring of 1991. Eight Communication and Journalism courses will be modified to eliminate duplication and make them relevant to the needs of more students. Three new courses, one in public relations, one in advertising, and one in visual communication, are being proposed to round out the plan.

RESOURCES AND FACILITIES

As department structure improves, so must faculty, staff, equipment and the use of space. Most of what is needed is apparent. First, vacant faculty positions should be held open. Mounting a new sequence in public relations, for which there is clear demand, will require filling present and future faculty positions left vacant through resignations and retirements. At the same time, reassignment of faculty and realignment of courses for the new sequence will increase workload efficiency for the department as a whole. In addition, increased enrollment may produce the need for additional faculty positions.

A second major priority is enhancement of the current graduate program in Communication. In recent years the Communication faculty has committed itself to develop this program with an increased emphasis on intercultural perspectives throughout the program. UNM is an ideal setting, with its high Hispanic and Native American enrollment. Its ethnic richness makes it a living laboratory. Indeed, it has generated pioneering work in Intercultural Communication, including many language and culture studies, the influential Harvard value studies, and the work of Edward T. Hall, who was among the first to generate interest in the field. The Communication department has reinforced the program by hiring faculty with expertise in Intercultural Communication, developing programs with universities in Japan and Mexico and acquiring outside grants for research. With regard to intercultural studies, a long-term goal of both departments has been the development, should resources permit, of Latin American programs. Several members of both faculties already have substantial experience in Latin America. More faculty positions will be needed as the program expands. However, one of the benefits of the merger will be to increase the pool of graduate teaching assistants available to help teach undergraduate courses.

Improvement of space and equipment needs to continue. With the recent move of Communication to remodeled space, some progress has been made. But the merger requires more. Both of the old units have struggled with extremely limited facilities, and this is an opportunity to bring them up to date.

One of the most basic needs is for space to house faculty in a common area. Three Journalism faculty now work out of offices in Marron Hall across the street from the Journalism Building. They should be moved quickly to new offices on the second floor of the Journalism Building. Proximity is critical to faculty identity, cooperative teaching and research, and availability to students.

Expansion of the building's computer laboratory also is important. The current lab is used at about 95 percent of capacity, a very high rate. CIRT administrators consider it one of their major success stories. To meet growing student demand and to accommodate larger class sizes, the classroom next door to the current lab needs to be remodeled to provide
additional workstations. An expansion of the computer laboratory will provide additional resources and enrichment for the professional writing program in the Department of English.

A vital need is to begin upgrading the new department's instructional facilities to the point that University of New Mexico students have access to facilities at least minimally equal to those available to students at Eastern New Mexico and New Mexico State universities, at some two-year colleges and even, by repute, some New Mexico secondary schools. Technology is central to communications in the present and the future, and UNM students need up-to-date facilities in the form of an upgraded television studio and a media technologies classroom. This facility should include technology for video conferencing, playback and recording, advanced equipment for electronic news gathering, and computer-generated graphics. In addition, growing use of electronic technology in communication and journalism will require an electronic photo-processing system and more video and audio editing rooms.

An immediate need is to complete the ethernet system in the building. In recent remodeling, the west end of the building -- not the east end -- was provided conduit and cable for ethernet connections. The original remodeling plan called for installing connections throughout the entire building, connecting the wiring center for the building, and installing required electronics for faculty and administrative connections. Ideally this work would be completed along with the new computer pod since the new pod must operate through an updated wiring center. Important benefits will include faculty members' ability to work through the university computer system, to prepare material in their offices for transfer to the file server in the new pod, and to communicate readily with colleagues through electronic mail.

Completion of videotaping facilities for the communication research lab also is needed. This will entail installation of mounted video cameras and microphones in the lab, bringing it up to functional use and provide important faculty and graduate student research opportunities.

SUMMARY

The University of New Mexico can be at the forefront of innovation in a multi-ethnic setting. The proposed merger and continued improvement of undergraduate and graduate programs in Communication and Journalism are concrete ways to reallocate resources and invest in the future at acceptable cost, to the profit of everyone concerned. The faculty of Communication and Journalism are ready to move forward.
Adopted by the faculties of the Department of Communication and the Department of Journalism, November 13, 1991.
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UNM FACULTY SENATE

SUBJECT: Change in Charge and Membership of the Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee

REQUIRED ACTION: Approve the Changes

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee has approved the changes as stated on the following page. This action will significantly increase the number of staff members on the committee.
FACULTY AND STAFF BENEFITS COMMITTEE

The Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee recommends the following changes in charge and membership of the committee.

Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee The Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee shall review current University benefits—including, but not limited to, the retirement and insurance plans and health care—and investigate the feasibility of additional benefits as may occur to the committee or be suggested to the committee. The committee shall then recommend changes in, or additions to, these benefits. Other units within the University will not create separate benefits committees.

Eight faculty members, including the chairperson, nominated by the Faculty Senate; three staff persons members, 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 Staff Council; two staff members nominated by the Union; and the following ex-officio members: the Vice President for Business and Finance, the Associate Controller for Payroll, and the Associate Director of Human 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.)
SUBJECT: Report from the Core Curriculum Committee

REQUIRED ACTION: Accept the Report

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The Core Curriculum Committee was appointed by the Faculty Senate in 1987 and was asked to gather information and to recommend to the Senate appropriate action for establishing a core curriculum at UNM.

Since that time, the committee has been active and has held numerous meetings. Its members have gathered information from various sources, including faculty members, students, and other university constituents. The committee's goal has been to develop a curriculum that would provide a solid foundation for all students while allowing for flexibility and specialization.

The committee has considered several models of core curriculums from other institutions and has reviewed the experiences of students who have completed them. It has also conducted surveys of faculty and students to gather input on the feasibility and desirability of a core curriculum at UNM.

The committee has prepared a report outlining its findings and recommendations. This report has been distributed to the Faculty Senate. The report includes a detailed analysis of the proposed curriculum, including suggested courses, credit requirements, and evaluation methods.

The Faculty Senate is expected to consider the committee's report at its next meeting. If the Senate chooses to adopt the committee's recommendations, a core curriculum would be implemented at UNM. If the Senate chooses not to adopt the report, the committee will continue its work to refine the curriculum and gather further input.

The committee is committed to ensuring that the core curriculum meets the needs of all students and contributes to their personal and professional development. It is hopeful that the Senate will support the committee's efforts and make a decision that will benefit all members of the UNM community.
25 February 92

To: Members of the Core Curriculum Committee

From: Paul Davis

Subject: 'Finalization'

The report is complete, submitted to the Senate. It will be on the agenda for the 10 March meeting. It will probably be introduced in March and voted on in April, so we may have to meet once more during the intervening month if any issues arise. I may also want to call on you individually to meet with colleges or departments if there are requests for such meetings.

The report is largely as approved at the last meeting. I did negotiate a few changes with Professor Elston. The most significant, I think, was an added sentence in the Core 6 "Content" indicating that a minority on the committee had a somewhat different view from the majority.

Minutes: 20 Feb
Present: Bock, Bruker, Crossey, Elston, George, Hansen, Jameson, Johnson, Moret, Okunor, Oshima, Panitz, Davis

The science sub-committee submitted its recommendations for the science course and, after brief discussion, the Committee adopted their recommendations.

Final revisions in the draft document were adopted. The chair was asked to negotiate the remaining differences with Professor Elston. With these revisions the report was adopted unanimously by those present at the meeting. Professors Ben David, Null, and Smith indicated subsequent to the meeting their concurrence with the report.
The Core Curriculum: A Follow-up Report

In the Spring of 1990, as the result of extensive discussion at three meetings of the Faculty Senate, including one meeting devoted solely to the issue of the Core Curriculum, the Senate adopted, by a nearly unanimous vote, the proposition that "UNM should establish a core program required of all candidates for baccalaureate degrees." Further, the Senate agreed that the program should be limited to 18-24 credit hours, and should include subject matter from a broad range of content areas, including "social sciences, fine arts, humanities, mathematics, science and technology." Then the rest of the core proposal was returned to the Core Curriculum Committee with instructions to the Committee to reevaluate its curricular recommendations, responding to the discussions in the Senate, to meetings with departments, colleges, and faculty, and to written statements to the Committee from many interested faculty, students, and administrators.

The Committee has spent the several months, meeting almost weekly, to carry out this charge. We have reviewed the criticisms of our initial proposal; indeed, some of our most vocal critics from last year have served on the revision committee. We have reconsidered both the underlying principles on which our curricular recommendations were based, and each of our specific course proposals. We have added to and subtracted from, revised and refined our original recommendations.

In this follow-up report, we have constructed our charge narrowly and limited ourselves as much as possible to curricular issues—to the courses and the course sequence that we recommend for the Core Program. By doing so, we have deferred questions of implementation until we achieve agreement on the program we wish to implement. The Committee expresses its concern about such questions as who will teach in the Core Program, where the money will come from, how the courses will be chosen, how the program will be administered, and how the program will affect existing programs. But such issues distract attention from the prior curricular issues. Until we can agree on the curriculum, most implementation questions are moot.

After the Senate approves a curriculum, then we recommend that the Senate take steps, in concert with appropriate administrators and students, to develop an implementation plan. Our committee has discussed many of these implementation issues and can contribute a good deal to the discussion.

The Criticisms of the Initial Curricular Recommendations

We received many position papers, departmental resolutions, and individual statements in response to our initial proposal. Some gave unqualified praise, others unmitigated criticism. Overall, the communications we received corroborate the results of the recent poll by the New Mexico Association of Scholars. In that poll, as in responses to our initial report, there was general acceptance of the principle of the core, but there were widely differing ideas about what the UNM Core Program should be. In reviewing our original proposal and developing our present recommendations, we have tried to respond to the most frequent criticisms of our work and to develop a balanced and flexible program that reconciles at least some of the divergent points of view.

Most of those who responded to our original proposal offered alternative schemes or suggested particular revisions to our recommendations. Three criticisms of our curriculum reappeared in many of the responses we received:

1. Science. By far the most common complaint was that we had ignored science, or denigrated it, or included it inappropriately. In our reconsideration process, we have spent more time on this issue than on any other topic. We recommend a specific science requirement in this Core Proposal.

2. The proposal was not a core program. Several critics objected to the flexibility in our proposal which allowed for alternative courses that would satisfy each of the core requirements. Some argued that a core was not a core unless it specified a particular list of courses required of every student. We were offered several such lists, each very different from the others.
The committee considers such approaches too restrictive and believes there are compelling reasons, both curricular and practical, for an approach that allows for some flexibility in the courses that satisfy each of the core requirements. This is an approach to core requirements used by many universities, for example, both Stanford and UC Berkeley.

3. The program was not sufficiently content-based. There were several reasons why some of our critics felt that our original proposal needed to specify the subject matter in the core courses. Some felt that specifying particular content was the only way to assure breadth in the core program. Others thought that core courses would be superficial, “mickey mouse” courses because there was no specified content. Others saw difficulties with transfer students and accreditation committees if the core courses were not identified by content areas.

The committee has reviewed these arguments and made some specific revisions in our recommendations to define and limit the content in particular core requirements. But we have not limited our core proposal to a specific list of six or eight courses as some of our critics suggested. We continue to believe that such a limited program would be inflexible and would narrow student choice and faculty participation too severely. We reaffirm our recommendation for a conceptually-based core allowing some options to students and involving a wider range of faculty. We believe this is an appropriate approach for UNM.

Alternative Approaches to Core Curricular Design

We would remind the faculty of other approaches that we have considered and our reasons for not adopting them. In our original report we outlined the reasons for these choices as follows:

We looked at several different kinds of core programs as possible models and we rejected many of them as inappropriate for UNM. We began with the 50 Hours program proposed by the National Endowment for the Humanities, but we found it too extensive and constraining, for by requiring 50 hours it would constitute all of the non-major work for many students, especially those in professional programs. We agreed that our program should be limited one, one that allowed individual colleges and departments to set general education requirements of their own to complement the core. We set as our goal a program that would constitute about half of the general education courses taken by most students, somewhere between 18 and 30 hours, leaving an equal number of hours for courses required by individual colleges.
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and offered so many choices, that they seemed no better to us than the distribution systems they replaced. For one of the virtues of a core program—perhaps its greatest virtue—is that it provides a common experience that all students share and thus promotes intellectual discourse and community on the campus. Such benefits are lost, we think, when the core program offers too many choices.

Great books programs which begin with a list of canonical texts that define the core do provide a common experience for all students, but often they do so by imposing a narrowly defined culture on all students. Such narrowness may not be inappropriate at a small, selective college that defines its mission in terms of a particular ideology or perspective, but it did not seem an appropriate approach to take at a diverse and pluralistic public university like UNM. In fact, when we considered the distinctiveness of UNM, it was its acknowledgement and recognition of native cultures, oral traditions, and indigenous ideas that marked its character. For many decades our programs in anthropology, archeology, Spanish language, literature, and folk culture, the visual and performing arts have been central in defining the character of the institution. More recently Latin American Studies programs have extended regional interests to hemispheric ones. New Mexico with its multicultural heritage has an ethical imperative to promote intercultural tolerance, understanding, and social pluralism. We considered suggestions to require courses on New Mexico history or culture as ways to incorporate New Mexico’s distinctiveness into the core program, but instead of such specific requirements, we have tried to develop our whole core proposal in relation to the values and challenges of diversity which seemed to us to define the distinctive character of both UNM and the state.

In our reconsideration we have reevaluated these basic decisions and have spent a good deal of time discussing an integrated, historically-based, interdisciplinary approach—similar to the one suggested by the National Endowment for the Humanities—before reaffirming the conceptual model we originally proposed. As a result of these discussions, we have made significant revisions in the requirements we recommend, especially to define the subject matters in several of the requirements more narrowly and specifically. The concepts on which this curriculum is based can only be taught as they are embodied in particular subject matters. We have also attempted to present a balanced proposal, one that includes both traditional courses like our Core 4, Western Traditions requirement, and more revisionist courses, like those in our Core 6, American Cultures requirement. However, the committee, by a substantial majority, remains convinced that the conceptual approach we recommend can more broadly and accurately express the intellectual perspectives of our faculty and the diversity in our student body and state than a more traditional, historically-based core program could.

How the Conceptual Core Would Work

Our core proposal is not a list of six or eight courses that all students will take. Rather, we identify five conceptual/content areas for which courses may be proposed by departments, colleges, or individual faculty members. The guidelines for each of these areas will specify certain concepts and content that all courses offered in that area will include. All five core areas can include courses from more than one department or discipline; all five can accommodate interdisciplinary courses. Some existing courses will meet the guidelines for each of the core areas; often existing courses can meet the guidelines with moderate revision. We would also encourage the development of new courses, especially interdisciplinary ones.

This is not an unusual approach to core curricular planning. It is the approach used, for example, by both Stanford and U.C. Berkeley. It offers several advantages over other approaches as a way to develop and implement a core program:

1. It eases the transition from a distribution system by retaining some choice in each core area and by utilizing existing courses.
2. It permits considerable flexibility in the content of core courses, drawing on the particular interests of different students, faculty, and departments, thus promoting more engaged teaching and learning.
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3. It creates no sinecures for particular courses or departments, but rather opens opportunities in each of the core areas for departments to propose appropriate courses.
4. It builds experimentation and growth into the core program through the process of ongoing review of core courses. At institutions where this approach has been used, each of the core areas typically "sorts itself out" in a few years to a fairly stable group of six or eight courses that meet each of the core requirements.
5. It encourages the development of interdisciplinary courses to emerge as part of the continuing review and implementation process.
6. It is compatible with existing administrative and departmental structures.

The Theme of the Core Program: Ways of Knowing

We believe the core program should seek to foster intellectual self-awareness. Students must know how their expertise relates to other ways of knowing, appreciate both the possibilities and limitations in their own point of view while being open to learning from the perspectives of others. They must recognize that each scholar, each project, each scholarly study is part of a larger intellectual enterprise that serves larger social ends.

The core program should continue throughout the student's undergraduate years. It should:

1. Introduce the map of learning. The core should make students aware of the broad differences between the main areas of learning—humanities, social science, natural science, mathematics, and fine arts—as key concepts, established ideas, and important subject matters in each of these areas, and of some of the different approaches to pursuing knowledge taken by different disciplines.
2. Develop critical thinking skills. The core should teach students to analyze texts, problems, and situations; to approach different subjects in appropriately different ways; to recognize the limitations inherent in any approach; to develop conclusions consistent with the evidence and with the approach taken.
3. Encourage intellectual independence. The core should concentrate on primary materials—original texts, data, statistical claims, field experiences, problems, laboratory experiments—so that students can develop their own strategies for analysis and understanding and reach their own conclusions. By working with particular problems and looking at them from the perspectives of several disciplines, students can learn the importance of accurate data and gain an appreciation for the complexity of issues.
4. Develop an understanding of difference. The core should make students aware of how knowledge is related to its context, its historical situation, and the perspectives and interests of those who produce it.
5. Facilitate the integration of knowledge. The core should help students make sense of their total university experience and relate their specialized studies to broader concerns and uses.
6. Encourage active involvement in the community. The core should open up ways for students to use their education, not simply in their vocation, but as educated and engaged members of the community.

The Ways of Knowing theme articulates these goals. These concepts are especially important for the learning process in a state that prides itself on its cultural diversity. In such a social context the search for truth must include an understanding of difference.

The Program We Propose

The Committee recommends that we begin with a 23-hour program: one course in each of the seven core areas described below, plus one additional course chosen from core areas two through six.

Ideally the core courses would be taken throughout a student's undergraduate years, not all at once. We recommend that Core 1 be prerequisite for any further courses in the Core and that one course each in Core 2, Core 3, and Core 4 be prerequisite to Core 5 and Core 6.
In the descriptions of the seven core requirements that follow, we indicate the conceptual assumptions underlying each core requirement, then we briefly describe the content of the requirement, and finally we indicate the kinds of guidelines that we suggest for course proposals that will meet the requirement. In the guidelines for all of the core requirements we stress the use of original texts, field experiences, laboratory work, for we believe that students can only develop their abilities to understand, analyze, and reach independent conclusions when working with such primary materials.

CC 1: Introduction to the Core (1 hr.)
Assumptions: There are many ways of knowing by which humans understand themselves and their world; most topics can be approached from more than one perspective; different subjects call for different approaches; the ways of knowing that we employ strongly influence both what we know and what we believe.

Content: This first course for all students introduces the central concepts of the core curriculum: that there are many different ways of knowing, and that most topics can be approached and studied from more than one perspective, that some approaches are more appropriate than others, and the approach taken influences the conclusions reached. The course will demonstrate how different modes of learning can be brought to bear on specific topics. These ways of knowing might include, but would not limited to, rationalism, empiricism and the scientific method, authority, aesthetic experience, textual interpretation, historical explanation.

Guidelines: This one-hour course will be presented in large lecture format and in video format for individual study. The topics covered will introduce students to several ways of learning as they are employed in the arts and humanities, the social sciences, mathematics, and the natural sciences. It will also provide students with an understanding of the overall design of the core program and with an "intellectual map" of the university, its departments and resources. Core 1 will be a prerequisite to all other courses in the core program.

CC 2: Ways of Knowing (3 hrs.)
Assumptions: We can become more skillful in a particular way of knowing by studying its expression in a variety of contexts, by learning its methodology, by appreciating its possibilities and its limitations.

Content: Each course in Core 2 introduces a particular approach to knowledge. There are two ways of doing this: these courses may work within a particular discipline and study the different approaches to a common subject matter or to a particular problem, showing how these different approaches conceive the subject, employ methodologies, and reach different conclusions. Core 2 courses may also study how a particular way of knowing (e.g., statistical analysis or historical explanation) is used in several disciplines.
Guidelines: Each course will use some primary texts, cases, or situations to present the way of learning, its methodology, its results, and its limitations.

CC 3: Science (4 hrs.)
Assumptions: In Western culture since the Renaissance, empiricism has been the dominant model for learning: an understanding of the scientific method, its potentialities and limitations, is essential for scientific literacy.

Content: Core 3 courses lay the foundation for scientific literacy, as discussed by Rutherford and Ahlgren in Science for All Americans (1990), "Scientific literacy—which encompasses mathematics and technology as well as the natural and social sciences—has many facets. These include being familiar with the natural world and respecting its unity; being aware of some of the important ways in which mathematics, technology, and the sciences depend on one another; understanding some of the key concepts and principles of science; having a capacity for scientific ways of thinking; knowing that science, mathematics, and technology are human enterprises, and knowing what that implies about their strengths and limitations; and being able to use scientific knowledge and ways of thinking for personal and social purposes."

Guidelines: Courses meeting Core 3 guidelines will be interdisciplinary, studying selected key concepts and principles in science. These courses are expected to introduce the scientific world view, survey methods of scientific inquiry, show relationships to other disciplines, and discuss how scientific activity proceeds within the individual, social, and institutional framework. A hands-on laboratory experience, essential to attaining scientific literacy and consistent with the Core Program's stress on primary experience, requires an additional hour for the science course. The Committee encourages the development of "gateway" science courses—like the interdisciplinary course currently being planned for the General Honors Program; such courses must be developed at the departmental level, with provisions for using a team-teaching approach.

CC 4: Western Traditions (3 hrs.)
Assumptions: A society's cultural traditions define its identity and influence what is known; knowledge of these traditions and the key works that establish them are essential to cultural literacy.

Content: Although the assumption supporting this requirement applies to any intact culture, Core 4 courses will be restricted to the western Euro-American tradition. These courses longitudinally survey aspects of the Western tradition through the study of ideas contained in philosophic, literary, and scientific classics; works of art, music, and architecture; and technological artifacts. Core 4 courses seek to develop a knowledge of the development of Western culture, its major periods and ideas, and an awareness of the challenges to these ideas, both historical and contemporary.

Guidelines: Core 4 course proposals should describe broad survey courses covering, for example, the Western tradition from pre-history through the Renaissance or from the seventeenth century to the present. The syllabus should include a significant list of primary texts, works of art, architecture, music, dance, theater, or items of technology. To facilitate looking at the Western tradition from more than one perspective, the syllabus must include some works that challenge or present alternatives to the dominant traditions, especially works produced by non-Westerners, by women, or by members of minority cultures within the West.
CC 5: World Cultures (3 hrs.)
Assumptions: Knowledge and belief are constructed differently in various cultures. Study of (or immersion in) another way of life enables us to learn about that culture and about our own, making us aware of the role that reason, experience, authority, and rhetoric play in shaping our convictions, while enhancing our appreciation of human diversity.

Content: Ideally Core 5 courses will take place within another culture and study that culture holistically. Where foreign study is impossible, Core 5 courses will relate several aspects of the culture being studied, as in an area studies approach. There are rich faculty resources for courses in many world cultures; the Committee believes that UNM has especially good resources for Core 5 courses on Mexico and other Latin American cultures.

Guidelines: Core 5 courses will include some direct experience of the culture being studied, by visiting the culture, reading primary materials from the culture, viewing films, etc. Knowledge of the language can be required as a prerequisite for some Core 5 courses, but courses that do not have a language prerequisite will always be offered.

CC 6: American Cultures (3 hrs.)
Assumptions: The United States is itself a pluralistic culture. Persons of different ethnicities, races, and genders relate to "American culture" differently, and operate with different social experiences and expectations. It becomes increasingly important to understand our society from diverse perspectives and to recognize the many communities of shared experiences and values that create the broader national culture. Self-perceptions, approaches to knowledge, and values significantly depend on socially and historically constructed roles and statuses.

Content: Core 6 courses treat important themes in American history, society, and culture from the perspectives of groups thus far marginalized in traditional academic discourses by virtue especially of class, race, ethnicity, or sex. They study issues that are relevant to ethnic, gender, and cultural difference, and explore what difference in a pluralistic society means to less powerful groups. A minority on the Committee holds that class, race, ethnicity, and gender need not be the only focus of the course, but could be explored in the context of other aspects of American society.

Guidelines: Core 6 courses will focus on the experiences and expressions of class, of women, and of racial and ethnic groups in the United States. These courses, where appropriate and possible, will use primary texts, field experiences, and projects.

CC 7: The Capstone Program
Assumptions: 6. We test the efficacy of our ways of knowing by seeing if they help us answer important questions and solve real problems. We judge the usefulness of our education by the way it integrates our world view and enriches our life.

Contents Many of the faculty who commented on our last proposal were particularly enthusiastic about the capstone seminars we presented in that document. We remain committed to the concept of a capstone course. We have discussed several alternative possibilities for the capstone course, but we have not reached consensus on any particular program. Besides the project seminars we proposed, we have considered a final paper evaluating the student's educational experience at UNM, or one developing his or her philosophy of life. We have discussed creative projects, interdisciplinary seminars, and a current issues forum. Our recommendation at this point is that the possibilities for the capstone course be studied further during the first year or two of the Core program with a specific recommendation being submitted at that later time.
Next Steps
The Core Curriculum Committee recommends that, after the curricular design is approved, the Senate undertake an implementation plan. This plan should be developed in consultation with faculty and students with from all instructional units (on the main and branch campuses) that participate or have an interest in bachelor's degree programs. The Core Curriculum Committee recommends that, insofar as possible, all UNM faculty should teach in the Core and that no special Core Curriculum faculty be created. Such general participation would greatly benefit both students and faculty by enriching everyone's educational experience and promoting truly interdisciplinary courses. It would endow UNM, a large state institution, with some of the benefits traditionally ascribed to small private colleges, namely, more personalized education, more intimate contact between students and faculty, more awareness of other disciplines and activities within the university, and, incidentally, better student retention.
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SUBJECT: Report from the Summer School Task Force

REQUIRED ACTION: Accept the Report

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: As a part of the University's reallocation plans to meet the goals of UNM 2000, it was recommended that a task force be established to look into all aspects of the summer school program. In the fall of 1991, the Senate established the Task Force which submitted the report on the following pages.
The University of New Mexico has an opportunity to use its geography, culture, and array of course offerings to build an outstanding summer school to better serve the citizens of the state and to attract more students from out of state. But we are not making the most of this fine opportunity. Enrollment, for instance, is in a no-growth pattern, and student credit hours were actually down 3.4% from 1990 to 1991 (see appendix).

Significant improvements will be possible only if the funding formula is increased so that UNM gets the same amounts per student credit hour as in the fall and spring (currently we get less than half of the usual amounts). We urge the UNM Administration to make this change a very high priority in Santa Fe.

If the funding formula is increased, the new money thus generated should be earmarked both for improvements in course offerings (both regular and innovative) and for improvements in summer faculty salaries. Compensation for department chairs' year-round work should no longer be concealed as summer salary for them, and the cap on summer salaries should be abolished.

In the following sections we offer both justifications for the recommendations above and some additional recommendations.
I. Improvements in course offerings

A. Regular offerings

1. If we offer a wider choice of courses—especially those required on popular degree plans—we can better serve our in-state students. Public school teachers, for instance, would have a wider choice of the courses they need for re-certification and advanced degrees.

2. This policy, in turn, would probably increase enrollment.

B. Innovative courses

1. More courses of the innovative sort (e.g. the "total immersion" language courses already offered by both the German and the French sections of the Department of Modern and Classical Languages) should be offered. We strongly recommend new or revitalized courses which take advantage of New Mexico's geography and tri-cultural environment. Such courses would be more likely to draw additional students from out of state. A few more examples: we are pleased to learn that the Spanish section of M&CL is planning a program similar to the German and French programs already mentioned. Summer institutes in creative writing would work well in the English Department. The College of Fine Arts offered in 1990 a course featuring Southwestern arts.

2. Innovative scheduling is going to be necessary. For example, with Albuquerque Public Schools moving toward year-round schooling, all UNM units need to think about offering more evening and three-week courses (the length of the vacations in the new APS pattern).
II. Summer faculty salaries

A. If the cap (a policy which states that no faculty member--no matter what his or her salary--can be paid more than a set amount per course [$3,750 in 1990]) were removed, more professors would want to teach and could be encouraged to propose more innovative and exciting courses.

B. A considerable percentage of total summer faculty salary money currently goes to department chairs. Our investigations have convinced us that this money for chairs is primarily a reward for their year-round work, and is only secondarily compensation for labor in summer. Compensation for chairs should be removed from the summer budget and placed into the regular year budget. The present practice makes it appear that more money is being spent on summer school than actually is being spent. Such distortions impede our ability to secure additional funds for summer school offerings.

C. Since innovative scheduling is going to become increasingly necessary (see I.B.2 above), we urge a re-examination of the policy which says that pay per course must be decreased if course duration is less than the full eight weeks.

III. Other recommendations

A. The University should consider raising out-of-state tuition rates for summer, especially for courses which take advantage of New Mexico's geography and cultures. If the courses are attractive enough, money will not keep affluent visitors away. Scholarships should be available for those who are not affluent.
B. We urge more advertising of summer school, both in state and out. Borrowing from a report by Assistant Vice President David Stuart, who recently attended a meeting of the North American Association of Summer Sessions, we see one valuable medium for such advertising as being the Summer School Catalogue itself. If it were spectacularly designed, it might help attract students.

David McPherson, English, A&S (Chair)
Douglas George, Art and Art History, Fine Arts
Richard Holder, Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs and Summer School Administrator
Ronald Schrader, Math, A&S
Carolyn Wood, Educational Administration, Education
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APPENDIX TO REPORT OF FACULTY SENATE TASK FORCE ON SUMMER SCHOOL
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
Enrollment Services
Summer 1991 Official Enrollment Report
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August 20, 1991

SUMMER 1991 TOTALS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEADCOUNT</th>
<th>SCH</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUMMER 1991 TOTALS:</td>
<td>8,908</td>
<td>42,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% CHANGE FROM 1990:</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>-3.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
SUMMER SESSION HEADCOUNT COMPARISON

Comment: Headcount for Summer 1991 is up 0.39% over Summer 1990. This increase is largely attributable to increases in Graduate Programs and Law School headcounts.
SUBJECT: Honors Education

REQUIRED ACTION: Discussion Only

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: One of the goals set out in the UNM 2000 Report was the formation of an Honors College. Provost Risser appointed a Task Force, chaired by Professor Robert Schwartz, to study the feasibility of establishing such a college. The Task Force reported to the Regents in December 1991 and recommended that an Honors Division be created to incorporate the general honors program and provide support for the college and departmental honors programs.

On February 17, 1991, Provost Risser sent a memo, copied on the following pages, to Dean Wildenthal asking that he "consider the possibility of forming a College of Letters and Science and an Honors College."

Other materials will be distributed at the meeting.
February 17, 1992

TO: Hobson Wildenthal, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
FROM: Paul G. Risser, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
SUBJECT: Honors Education

This memorandum follows our preliminary discussions concerning the Report of the Honors Task Force. As I noted, this is an excellent statement and I agree with virtually all of the recommendations. However, on the basis of conversation with President Peck, I would like for us to consider going even further in the development of programs for our most accomplished students. Specifically, I want us to consider forming a "college," and also, the possibility of granting degrees through this college. Obviously the latter issue is ultimately within the domain of the faculty.

There are two legitimate concerns about the formation of a college. First, there are those who believe that honors students should not be "isolated" from the conventional academic departments and colleges. Second, there is the fear that formation of a college will draw distressingly scarce resources from the current colleges who so desperately need additional funding. I share both of these concerns, but believe there may be an alternative arrangement that would foster a stronger honors education here at the University while at the same time minimizing or eliminating the impacts of the above concerns. In this context, I am asking you to consider the possibility of forming a College of Letters and Science and an Honors College; under these conditions you would have the deanship responsibility for both academic units. In consideration of this issue, please recognize the following principles:

(a) Any Honors College would be campus-wide in orientation and program development. Though perhaps the preponderance of interactions would be with the current College of Arts and Sciences, the Honors College would be designed to serve the entire campus in a completely equitable manner.

(b) Any degree program through the Honors College would be led and administered thorough the involvement of the campus-wide faculty, and it would be built on the unique characteristics of an interdisciplinary program with the highest of academic expectations.

(c) Honors "programs" would be continued and strengthened in the colleges and departments through leadership in these academic units and with the facilitation of the Honors College.
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(d) Funding for the Honors College and the college and departmental honors programs would be increased as possible. A major portion of the funding to the Honors College would be ultimately transferred to the colleges and departments as faculty members are involved in the programs of the Honors College.

Please discuss this concept widely among your colleagues. We will also discuss the idea at the next Deans’ Council and the Planning Council.

Thanks.

PGR:mb  
cc: President’s Council  
Planning Council  
Deans’ Council
SUBJECT: Further Discussion of Tuition vs State Appropriations

REQUIRED ACTION: Discussion Only

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The 1992 Legislature approved appropriations for the University which assumed a 5% tuition increase. The Long Range Planning Committee would like discussion on the implications of this action.
Colleges, Universities Get $363 Million

By Nancy Tipton JOURNAL STAFF WRITER

The state’s 23 publicly funded colleges and universities will get $363.8 million from the state’s general fund for the upcoming year, an amount called “pretty good, all things considered,” by the interim executive director of the Commission on Higher Education.

The package is a 4.5-percent increase from last year and includes enough money for a 2-percent pay increase for faculty and staff. It also assumes tuition will go up for most students by about 5 percent.

Danny Earp said the figures, subject to approval by Gov. Bruce King, include money “I thought was gone” under an across-the-board spending cut passed by the Senate. The “sandpapering” was eliminated by the House-Senate conference committee that worked out the final budget of $2.1 billion.

For the six four-year universities, support for instruction and general budgets will go up $4.8 million, a 2.4-percent increase. The two largest universities, University of New Mexico and New Mexico State University, will get the lion’s share of the increase — about $3.5 million. The overall instruction and general expenditure appropriation for the four-year schools is $205.8 million.

The two-year sector, including branch campuses of UNM and NMSU along with community colleges and the three vocational schools, will get $66 million in instruction and general funding — an 8-percent increase.

The difference is because the two-year colleges are growing faster than the four-year schools and the appropriation is based on a formula that is weighted heavily toward enrollment.

The largest appropriation for two-year schools went to Albuquerque Technical-Vocational Institute at $20.5 million, a 7.2-percent increase from last year. It is by far the largest two-year school in the state and, in fact, is right behind UNM and NMSU in enrollment.

Legislators assumed the schools would raise tuition by about 5 percent and deducted that from the appropriation base, but in turn increased the state’s two basic financial aid programs by 5 percent each.

The New Mexico Student Incentive Grant will get $5.6 million next year while the work-study program will get $3.7 million.

Future health-care workers got the biggest boost in aid. The state will set aside $274,000 for nursing students and $250,000 for medical students.

Help for student parents will also get a boost with a $500,000 appropriation.
SUBJECT: Recommendations on Planning

REQUIRED ACTION: Adopt the Recommendations

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: One of the charges of the Long Range Planning Committee is "to work with the administration and the faculty on the formulation and implementation of University policies and organization for effective long range planning."

The recommendations are presented in compliance with this charge.
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERING

DATE: January 27, 1992

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Long Range Planning Committee, M. W. Wildin, Chair

SUBJECT: Recommendations on Planning

The Long Range Planning Committee has adopted and recommends your approval of the following Attributes of Effective Planning.

1. Establish criteria and targets

To start the annual planning cycle, the UNM administration should present UNM’s objectives, measures of progress and targets for each objective, and priorities to be placed on each objective during that cycle. (Example: priorities and targets among lower division, upper division, graduate, and professional enrollments should be stated.) (Example: weightings and targets for teaching, sponsored research, scholarship, and service should be established.) (Example: programmatic priorities and targets within the UNM 2000 framework should be identified.)

Each planning unit (College, School, Division, Department) then should prepare its annual plan within the larger institutional framework, showing relationships between the unit’s plan and the UNM criteria and targets.

2. Develop a Comprehensive Environmental Assessment

A general UNM forecast and environmental scan should be made available to planning units, identifying trends and events likely to affect the entire institution (Example: demographic projections; state and federal and private revenue forecasts.) Each planning unit then should conduct its own environmental scan of contextual factors pertaining to its unique mission and programs.

3. Assess the Potential Contribution of Each Planning Unit

Unit plans and forecasts should be presented in general budget hearings open to all stakeholders. These hearings should include not only presentations, but also discussions of them.
4. Provide Feedback

The central administration should provide feedback to each planning unit, noting strengths and weaknesses, and providing opportunities for adjustment.

5. Increase the Participation of University Stakeholders

At each of the foregoing stages, stakeholders should be involved. Administrative performance reviews should assess such involvement.

6. Improve the UNM Planning Infrastructure

The administration should develop and implement a comprehensive planning/budgeting process, and provide support for it (e.g. management information systems, environmental scanning capabilities).

7. Define Planning Responsibilities

Each of the entities involved in planning should have unique and clearly defined sets of responsibilities and schedules. Planning responsibilities should be lodged as closely to decision points as possible.

8. Assure Process Comprehensiveness

Since all of the units of the organization are interconnected, change in one affects all. Therefore the planning process should exempt no one.

9. Coordinate Planning Processes

UNM Planning processes should be coordinated with those of outside agencies such as the Commission on Higher Education.

All of this will take time to install and perfect. Considerable progress already has been made. The current reallocation enterprise, quite aside from its officially-intended outcomes, should be used to expand and improve upon the effective planning attributes already in place.