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

The UNM Faculty Senate will meet on Tuesday, September 8, 1992 at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva. The agenda will include the following items:

1. Summarized Minutes of May 12, 1992
2. Memorial Minute for Professor Joseph Zavadil -- Professor Paul Davis
3. Memorial Minute for Professor Emeritus Sidney Solomon -- Dean Leonard Napolitano
4. Memorial Minute for Professor Emeritus Arthur Houghton -- Professor James Leith
5. Address by President Richard E. Peck (If no conflict with Regents’ Meeting)
6. Candidates for Degrees, Summer Session, 1992 -- Representatives from the various Schools and Colleges
7. Senate President’s Report -- Professor Mary Harris
8. Committee Assignments -- Professor Larry Gorbet
9. Election of Senate Representative to Faculty Reallocation Committee -- Professor Mary Harris
10. Deletion of Dental Assisting Program -- Assistant Vice President David Stuart
11. Change in Charge of Long Range Planning Committee -- Professor Maurice Wildin
12. Recommendation Concerning the Use of the "W" Grade -- Professor Richard Mead
13. Proposal from the Department of Modern and Classical Languages
14. Information Report from University Planning Council(subcommittee on Budget and Planning -- Professor Maurice Wildin
15. Core Curriculum -- Professor Mary Grizzard

Immediately following the meeting Senators are invited to a get acquainted reception in the Simpson Lounge, Simpson Hall (only a few steps northeast of the Kiva). Please plan to attend.
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

September 8, 1992

(Summarized Minutes)

The September 8, 1992 meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Mary Harris at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

Senators present: Dave Baldwin (Library), LynnDianne Beene (A&S), Joan Bybee (A&S), Bel Campbell (A&S), Edith Cherry (Arch & Lib), Richard Coughlin (A&S), Jeff Davis (A&S), James Dawson (Gallup Branch), Eva Encinias (Fine Arts), Kenneth Gardner (Medicine), Robert Glew (Medicine), Larry Cordet (A&S), Mary Grizzard (Fine Arts), Blaine Hart (Medicine), Mary Harris (Education), Roy Johnson (Engineering), Kathleen Koehler (Education), Harry Llull (Library), Demetra Logothetis (Dental Program), Vonda Long (Education), William MacPherson (Law), Kathleen Matthews (University College), Patrick McNamara (A&S), Beth Miller (Gallup Branch), Donald Natvig (A&S), Pranmod Pathak (A&S), Glynn Raymond (Pharmacy), Edward Reyes (Medicine), Dianna Shomaker (Nursing), Donald Simonson (Management), Russell Snyder (Medicine), Erik Trinkaus (A&S) and Benjiene Walker (Medicine).

Absent: Jane Bruker (Gallup Branch), Susan Deese (Library), James DePaepe (Education), Michele Diel (Valencia Branch), Luisa Duran (Education), Bradley Ellingsboe (Fine Arts), Charles Fiedelman (Engineering), Walter Forman (Medicine), Robert Greenburg (Medicine), Deborah McFarlane (Public Administration), Mark Ondrias (A&S), Gloria Sarto (Medicine), Randy Thornhill (A&S), Nelson Valdes (A&S), James Wallace (Medicine), Nina Wallenstein (Medicine), and Efrem Wilkins (Engineering).

Minutes of May 12, 1992. The minutes of May 12, 1992 were approved as presented.

Memorial Minutes. Memorial minutes were presented for Professor Joseph Zavadil and Professors Emeriti Sidney Solomon and Arthur Houghton by Professor Paul Davis, Dean Leonard Napolitano and Professor James Leith respectively.

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

Address by President Richard E. Peck. University President Richard E. Peck presented a report to the Senate. Following are the major points of his address:

- Thirty three states have experienced cuts in educational budgets.
- UNM has received significant major grants, among them a one million dollar grant to the Biology Department, a ten million dollar grant to the State of New Mexico for improvement of teaching math and science and a three million grant to the U.S.-Japan Program.
- There were four areas of concern to the North Central Association focused review team: 1) relationships of the branch campuses to the main campus, 2) the format of central administration, 3) student outcomes assessment, and 4) the UMN 2000 Plan. The team was satisfied regarding numbers 1, 2 and 4; however, item #3 needs to be resolved and a University committee has been established to deal with it.
Research Park continues to grow and there are more tenants than space available. Refinancing of the current debt may enable UNM to construct another building at the Park. There are plans for a Southwest Airlines Reservation Center to be located on UNM land near the airport.

- The Library expansion will be finished by next summer.
- Construction will begin in January 1993 on a new 1000 space parking structure which will be built over the new bookstore.
- Yale Park will be a park again soon.
- Construction of the Children's Psychiatric Center Day Treatment Facility has been approved.
- The Centennial Campaign has passed the 65 million dollar mark one year ahead of schedule.
- Enrollment continues to grow with a 5.5% increase this year. There are 18 thousand returning students and credit hours are up as well.
- It is the goal of the University this year to receive full formula funding from the legislature.

Additionally, he mentioned that the general obligation bond issue will be on the November ballot and three new Republican regents must be appointed by Governor King this December. He explained the proposed increase in the UNM Hospital mill levy.

Senator Kathleen Koehler asked President Peck about the plans for the North Golf Course and the barren fairways. He explained that a feasibility study has been done to ascertain whether a portion of the property could be used as a driving range and what it might generate in revenue. The jogging path would not be eliminated and exercise stations would be installed. If done, it would remove less than one quarter of the native plants and natural landscape. It would not affect the longest stretch of the jogging path.

He stressed that a plan has not been finalized.

Candidates for Degrees, Summer Session 1992. Upon recommendation of representatives of the various schools and colleges and the Office of Graduate Studies, the Senate approved the degree candidates for the Summer Session 1992.

Senate President's Report. Senate President Mary Harris yielded the floor to Provost Paul Risser. Provost Risser told the Senate that there are ten issues which he feels should be addressed this year. Those issues are 1) the core curriculum, 2) the Hemispheric Initiative, 3) review of the Honors Program, 4) revision of the Academic Freedom and Tenure section of the Faculty Handbook, 5) the distance learning proposal, 6) review of University College, 7) review of the Library, 8) review of the Geography Department, 9) review of the Department of Computer Science, and 10) review of the Division of Public Administration. He said he feels that too many topics were dealt with last year.

Regarding new faculty hires, he told the Senate that there were 28 new tenure track positions on Main Campus and 24 at the Medical School for a total of 52. Three of the new faculty received undergraduate degrees in New Mexico and 12 received graduate degrees in New Mexico. Six of the 12 are female and 3 are Hispanic. Ten were employed in the state of New Mexico at some time prior to coming to UNM as a faculty member. Fourteen are female, 9 are from historically underrepresented groups, 5 are Hispanic, 1 is Native American and 2 are Asian.
Provost Risser was asked why the reorganization of the School of Medicine was not on the "top 10" list of issues to be addressed this year. He explained that the list consisted primarily of academic issues and that a couple of items could be added, those of campus computing and the reorganization of the Medical School.

Professor Maurice Wildin said that student outcomes assessment and planning at UNM were CO:ncenlS of the NC.A focused visit. Risser responded that, although fewer topics will be addressed this year, the Planning Council does intend to address enrollment management and the budget process as part of the UNM 2000 Plan. Student outcomes assessment is now mandated by the NC.A.

President Mary Harris told the Senators that the mean faculty salary increase was 2.4% and the median 1.45%. Excluding promotion bonuses, the median raise for full professors was 1.3%, for associate professors, 1.5%, for assistant professors, 1.6% and for others, 1.7%.

She said the Staff Council has requested a written explanation from President Peck regarding the violations of budget guidelines which implied that each full-time employee would receive $325 plus .6%.

Dependent Education Benefit Program tuition waivers were awarded to twenty one employees. Every faculty and staff member who qualified and who had an undergraduate student received the benefit. No family received more than one waiver.

The Operations Committee plans to meet with the American Federation of Teachers and the AAUP to discuss the new collective bargaining law which allows bargaining by State employees.

President Harris explained that at the final, May meeting of the 1991-92 Senate, the Senate had voted to ask Provost Risser to request of the Dean of Engineering why he had failed to convene a meeting of the College of Engineering faculty as requested by a group of Engineering faculty members. The reply, dated July 22, 1992, stated that the Dean is working with the Engineering Policy Committee to develop an agenda for the meeting which will be held this fall. The calling of a meeting during exams, he felt, was inappropriate and would result in less-than-full discussion of matters of concern.

The College of Education is in the process of a complete re-structuring. Dean Peggy Blackwell will report to the Faculty Reallocation Committee to report on progress and decide when the issue will be brought before the Senate.

A special meeting of the General Faculty was held on September 1, 1992 to discuss the core curriculum proposal. The meeting was short and a motion was passed to refer the issue back to the Faculty Senate.

Committee Assignments. Upon recommendation of Senator Larry Gorbet for the Operations Committee, the Senate approved the following committee assignments: Maurice Wildin (Mechanical Engineering) as an additional member on the Long Range Planning Committee and Jim Porter (Anderson Schools of Management) on the Curricula Committee.
Election of Senate Representative to Faculty Reallocation Committee. President Harris explained that the Senate Reallocation Committee was created last year to consider and coordinate issues relating to reallocation. It consists of chairs or their representatives from the Admissions & Registration Committee, the Budget Committee, the Curricula Committee, the Graduate Committee, the Long Range Planning Committee, the Research Policy Committee, the Teaching Enhancement Committee, the Undergraduate Committee and the Operations Committee plus one senator elected by the Senate. Senator Donald Natvig (Biology) was elected by acclamation.

Deletion of Dental Assisting Program. Assistant Vice President David Stuart explained that last spring the decision to eliminate the Dental Assisting Program was made, partly because of low enrollment. If approved, the budget will be reallocated elsewhere and the Dental Hygiene Program will be strengthened.

Upon the recommendation of Dr. Stuart, the Senate approved the deletion of the program with one dissenting vote.

Change in Charge of the Long Range Planning Committee. A resolution was passed adding membership on the University Planning Council and the Faculty Senate Reallocation Committee to the charge of the Long Range Planning Committee. This reflects changes which have already occurred.

Recommendation Concerning the Use of the "W" Grade. Upon recommendation of the Admissions and Registration Committee, the Senate approved the following statement regarding the use of the "W" grade. "The use of the "W" grade will be allowed for assigning to those students listed in the "not attending" box as an extension of its use." It becomes a case of the faculty authorizing the Records Office to assign the grade for them just as they do when faculty responds to a petition.

This statement will apply to those students who are listed on a class list but have not attended classes.

Proposal from the Department of Modern and Classical Languages. Upon recommendation of Senator Joan Bybee and contingent upon approval of the Curricula Committee, the Senate approved the division of the Department of Modern and Classical Languages into two new departments, the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures and the Department of Spanish and Portuguese.

This action has already received the recommendation of the Reallocation Committee and all members of the original department. Professor Erlinda Gonzales-Berry answered questions regarding budget and reallocation considerations.

Senator William MacPherson questioned why the proposal was before the Senate at all since the change has already gone into effect. It is his opinion that the Senate is being asked to "rubber-stamp" the action. Also, he questioned why it was before the Senate without first receiving the final approval of the Curricula Committee. President Harris responded that it was the decision of the Operations Committee to place the item on the agenda and Professor Gonzales-Berry said the department did not know approval of the Curricula Committee was needed and that the committees which had been consulted had responded that approvals were unnecessary since no curricula changes were to occur.

NOTE: The Curricula Committee approved the change on September 22, 1992.
Information Report from the University Planning Council's Subcommittee on Budget and Planning. Professor Maurice Wildin distributed a draft report from the subcommittee and explained that the purpose of the report was simply to inform the Senate of what the committee had been doing. He requested input from Senators.

Core Curriculum. Senator Mary Grizzard explained that the general faculty had held a special meeting on September 1, 1992 and had voted to request that the Senate reconsider the core curriculum. The Senate has already approved the concept of a core curriculum; however, implementation issues have not yet been addressed.

A motion to ask the ad hoc Core Curriculum Committee to reconsider its proposal after gathering additional information was proposed by Senator Mary Grizzard for the Operations Committee.

A lengthy discussion ensued, quorum was lost and therefore the issue of the core curriculum will be put on the October Senate agenda.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Anne J. Brown, Secretary
SUBJECT: Deletion of Dental Assisting Program

REQUIRED ACTION: Approve Deletion of the Program

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
(See following pages)
**FORM C**

**MAJOR AND MINOR CURRICULAR CHANGES**

**Date:** March 5, 1992

**CIP CODE** 17.0101

**Judith Jenkins, DDS**

(Name of Individual initiating curricular change form)

**Interim Director**

(Title, position)

**Division of Dental Programs**

(Dept., Div., Prog.)

---

**This form is for Dental Assisting**

Name of New or Existing Program

This program is or would be located in current catalog page ____________

---

**I. Major Change—Mark appropriate category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Revision of existing degree</th>
<th>Deletion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Revision of existing major</td>
<td>Deletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Revision of existing minor</td>
<td>Deletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Revision of</td>
<td>Deletion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Give exact title and requirements as they should appear in the catalog. (See current catalog for format within the respective college). Attach additional sheets if necessary.

---

**II. Minor Change—**

Minor name change of existing degree, major, minor, or concentration. New Name of Program

Minor program revision (3-5 hours) Please specify below:

---

Reasons for Request: (attach statement) University Reallocation

Effective Date of Proposed Change: Fall 1992

Budgetary and Faculty Load Implications: (attach statements)

Does this change impinge in any significant way on my other student or departmental programs? Yes No

Reduction of Budget of Division through University Reallocation

If yes, have you resolved these issues with department involved? (attach statement)

Signature: Dr. Judith L. Jenkins

Department Chair

---

**Approvals:**

Dean of Library Services: Date: 3-9-92

CIRT: Date: 4-27-92

College Curricula Committee: Date: 5-8-92

(If necessary) College of School Faculty: Date: 3-9-92

College or School Dean: Date: 4-27-92

FS Undergraduate Academic Affairs: Date: 5-8-92

and/or

FS Graduate Committee: Date: 3-9-92

Office of Graduate Studies: Date: 4-27-92

FS Curricula Committee: Date: 5-8-92

Assoc. VP of Academic Affairs: Date: 3-9-92

Faculty Senate: Date: 4-27-92
DATE: August 27, 1992
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: David E. Stuart, Assistant Vice President, Academic Affairs
RE: Form C/Deletion of Dental Assisting Program

In late Spring of 1992, the Provost made the decision to reduce the budget of Dental Programs from approximately $450K per annum to $300K per annum (see enclosed memo dated 6-22-92).

This change is based on a reallocation decision made by the Provost, and influenced by the low enrollments of the Dental Assisting Program. As of this date, all of the students remaining in the Dental Assisting Program have graduated and no new students are being recruited/admitted. The future of the Division of Dental Programs is now focused entirely on the Dental Hygiene Program, which is going well.

DES/dmm
June 22, 1992

TO: Dave Stuart, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs

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

SUBJECT: 1992-93 Budget for the Dental Programs

This is to reaffirm that the total 1992-93 budget for Dental Programs will be no more than $300,000. Please ensure that expenditures do not exceed this amount.

Thanks.

PGR:dt
cc: Richard Holder
SUBJECT: Change in Charge of Long Range Planning Committee

REQUIRED ACTION: Approve the Change

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The change submitted by the Long Range Planning Committee recognizes changes that have already occurred.

(See following page)
Revised charge to Long Range Planning Committee (P. A-22, Faculty Handbook)

Long Range Planning Committee. The Faculty Senate Long Range Planning Committee is an integral part of the University's planning process. Its primary function 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 faculty point of view shall be considered in all University planning.

The Committee shall evaluate the effectiveness of policies and offices that are established for the purpose of planning. The Committee may also participate in monitoring program reviews. At its discretion the Committee shall conduct periodic surveys of faculty opinion and/or preference regarding proposed policies, overall University operations and other relevant matters. Reports of the results of such monitoring and surveys are to be made to the Faculty Senate as often as necessary, and in the Committee's annual report each April. The Committee shall meet with the Budget Committee for coordination purposes as often as necessary, but at least once each semester.

(Fourteen faculty members nominated by the Faculty Senate from at least seven schools or colleges: three voting members shall be appointed by the administration to represent each of the following three areas: academic affairs, administration and planning, and business and finance. Additional non-voting members shall be appointed to represent other permanent or ad hoc planning groups on campus, as requested by the Committee. With the exception of the administrative representatives, the voting members shall serve three year, staggered terms, and are limited to two consecutive terms. The chairperson and vice-chairperson are to be voting faculty members elected by the Committee at its first meeting each year.)

Research Allocations Committee. The Research Allocations Committee supervises and allocates the Faculty Research Fund. The committee shall communicate and meet with the Vice President for Academic Affairs or the Vice President for Academic Affairs' designated representatives. They shall formally meet at least once

* add: and this shall include representation from this committee on standing and ad hoc committees, including University Planning Council and Faculty Senate Reallocation Committee.
Recommendation Concerning the Use of the "W" Grade

REQUIRED ACTION:
Approve the Recommendation

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

(See following page)

The Senate finds that such students are created by the "W" grade to avoid the intention of the regulations governing the "W" grade for retroactive withdrawal. Consequently, there is no policy governing the use of the "W" grade for any other reason except for intentionally avoiding the "W" grade for retroactive withdrawal. They are usually based on the student's failure to communicate with the instructor or the department, or until the individual case is resolved. This seems to be an inappropriate use of the "W".
April 22, 1992

To: Faculty Senate Operations Committee

From: Admissions and Registration Committee

Subject: Use of the "W" Grade for Retroactive Withdrawal

This concerns students who have been recorded on the Grade Sheet (pink envelope) by the instructor in the box on the reverse side as "listed on class list but not attending".

This most often happens in classes with large enrollments that have a midterm exam, paper and final exam format. The faculty member often does not take roll and thus has no indication that a student wasn't there until the end of the semester. They could just flunk them but they take the trouble to write all of them in by hand. If the student is listed there as well as being listed in the "attending but not registered" box of another section, the Records Office routinely does the Drop/Add to correct the record. The Records Office also tries to straighten out other problems where they have direction from the faculty member concerned with the problem.

The committee finds that such students are covered by the spirit but not the letter of the regulations governing the "W" grade for retroactive withdrawal. Currently, there is no policy covering students who have been in the "listed on class list but not attending" box. They have been dealt with on a case-by-case basis in the past which was very time-consuming and often involved the official petition process. With the newest computerized grade process, the grade for these students stands as "NR" (not recorded), unless or until the individual case is resolved. This seems to be an inappropriate use of the "NR".

The Committee went back and looked up the previous A&R minutes and the Senate minutes and the Chair listened to the tape of the Senate debate and as a result we make the following recommendation: The use of the "W" grade be allowed for assigning to those students listed in the "not attending" box as an extension of its use. It becomes a case of the faculty authorizing the Records Office to assign the grade for them just as they do when faculty responds to a petition.
SUBJECT: Proposal from the Department of Modern and Classical Languages

REQUIRED ACTION: Approve the Proposal

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The proposal to reconstitute the Department of Modern and Classical Languages into the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature and the Department of Spanish and Portuguese is explained on the following pages.

It is hoped that the approvals as required by the Form C will be attained by September 8. If not, the Senate may be asked to approve the proposal subject to other required approvals.
To: The Faculty Senate, University of New Mexico
From: The College of Arts and Sciences
Subject: Reconstitution of the Department of Modern and Classical Languages
Into the Department of Foreign and Languages and Literatures and
the Department of Spanish and Portuguese

I. BACKGROUND: For several years the faculty of the Department of Modern and
Classical Languages have deliberated a proposal to split this department into two entities, one
constituted by the faculty of Spanish and Portuguese and the other of the faculty of the
remaining languages taught in M&CL. In Fall, 1989 an extramural team reviewed the
academic programs of the Spanish and Portuguese division of the Department of Modern
and Classical Languages. All three evaluators concluded that it was in the best interest of
the Spanish and Portuguese division to form a separate department. In Fall, 1991 Dean
Hobson Wildenthal appointed a committee to study the feasibility of such a split.

II. ACTIONS TAKEN TO DATE: In November, 1992, Professor Lee Bartlett, Chair of the
M&CL Reallocation Committee issued a final report recommending that:

"MCL should be split into two departments as of the fall 1992 semester--the Department of
Classical and Modern Languages and Literatures and the Department of Spanish and
Portuguese Languages and Literatures. CMLL will be composed of core members Classics,
French, German Russian, and Italian, with adjunct members including Japanese and Chinese;
SPLL will be composed of core members Spanish and Portuguese. The two Departments
will continue to increase their level of coordination, but each will be a separate
administrative entity--separately consulting with the Dean on such questions as program
requirements, the initiation of new programs, faculty hirings, faculty salaries, S&E, travel
funding, and etc."

In accordance with this recommendation Dean Wildenthal communicated the following to the
faculty of the Department of Modern and Classical Languages:

"The essence of the Committee's recommendation is very simple. UNM should create a new
Department of Spanish and Portuguese Language and Literature, constituted out of the
appropriate faculty and staff of the current Department of Modern and Classical Languages.
This step has been recommended in the past by many of the Spanish and Portuguese faculty
and by external authorities brought into review the program. This step seems consistent
with, and even required by, a close reading of UNM 2000. It is also being recommended by
the current Hemispheric Initiative Advisory Committee as an important step in advancing
towards the University of the Americas concept."

Dean Wildenthal then called for a vote by the faculties of M&CL and of A&S on this issue.
There was 1 dissenting vote in M&CL, and the faculty of A&S voted 3 to 1 in favor of the
split. In May, 1992 Dean Wildenthal appointed Professor Erlinda Gonzales-Berry Chair of Spanish and Portuguese and, in June, he appointed Professor Diana Robin to chair the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures. The two entities are currently functioning as separate departments.

III. BUDGETARY IMPLICATIONS: The split is progressing de facto without placing undue budgetary demands on the College of Arts and Sciences. Space has been redistributed, equipment and resources from the various sections of DFL have been pooled, and no new personnel have been added. The Administrative Assistant of M&CL is currently doing the paper work for both departments. However, Professors Robin and Gonzales-Berry agree that this arrangement should not continue beyond this year, and they will request the appointment of an Administrative Assistant to DFL in the following fiscal year. If approved, this will be the only added cost created by the new configuration.

RECOMMENDATION: We recommend that the Faculty Senate of the University of New Mexico approve the proposed reconstitution of the Department of Modern and Classical Languages into the Department of Spanish and Portuguese and the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures.
The University of New Mexico

DATE: September 3, 1992

To: Faculty Senate

FROM: Operations Committee

SUBJECT: Committee Appointments

The following are submitted for Senate approval:

Long Range Planning Committee: Maurice Wildin, Mechanical Engineering
Approval requested as an additional member of the Committee as of May 1993

Curricula Committee: Kim Porter, Anderson Schools of Management as of May 1994
A. Description of the planning process for 1993-94 budgets

An effort to encourage coordinated planning and budgeting in preparation of 1993-94 operating budgets has been initiated by the University Planning Council (UPC). One of the primary objectives is to encourage planning prior to and during preparation of budgets. The process will involve exchanges of information and ideas between the units and those to whom they report, i.e., the Provost or a Vice President, in three successive cycles. The focus of these budget planning guidelines is the Main Campus I&G appropriated budget. However, budget planning for Auxiliary Enterprises and Internal Services clearly impacts the Main Campus I&G budget and these units are therefore included in the process. Budget planning guidelines for units of the Medical Center will be issued separately by the Director of the Medical Center/Dean of the Medical School following the calendar outlined below.

The first cycle begins with issuance of this draft of proposed guidelines for preparation of preliminary operating (i.e., non-capital) budget plans. Suggestions and recommendations for improvement in the proposed guidelines are requested, including questions and suggestions regarding the objectives, budget planning environmental factors, institutional priorities, and instructions for preparation of preliminary budget plans, as set forth below. Responses should be submitted to the UPC through academic deans and non-academic directors. Please direct your response to the UPC; our mail address is the office of the Vice President for Business and Finance. The responses will be considered, and final guidelines will be prepared for consideration and action by the UPC at its September meeting. For your input to receive consideration, it must be in our hands no later than September 11.

The second cycle will begin with issuance of the guidelines for preparation of 1993-94 budgets on October 1. Preliminary operating budget requests, together with supporting information that describes the unit's strategic plan and that shows how the budget is related to this plan, plus any additional information requested by the Provost or the appropriate Vice President, will be due in the Provost's or Vice President's office by February 1, 1993. This will be followed by individual discussions between unit supervisors, such as deans or directors, and representatives of the Provost's or Vice President's office and of the UPC. Open budget hearings will be conducted after these discussions.

The third cycle will begin with development of an allocation plan and with preparation of recommendations to the university administration and the Board of Regents regarding tuition and fee policies. Following action by the Regents, final operating budgets will be prepared at the unit, e.g., department and college, level. Subsequent to submission of the budgets, a brief written presentation describing how the final budget relates to the
B. Budget Planning Objectives

Preparation of the 1993-94 budget planning guidelines seeks to achieve several key objectives, including the following:

- Provide opportunities for units, including the students enrolled in academic units and the faculty and staff of those units, to participate in the budget planning process by sharing plans and aspirations consistent with overall institutional planning priorities.
- Encourage evaluations of a unit's current programs and services, in support of the unit's internal reallocations to improve programs and services.
- Integrate into each unit's planning process institutional planning priorities. Specifically, the goals and objectives of UNM 2000 should be addressed comprehensively.
- Encourage efficient and effective use of resources including reallocation within units and between units.

C. Budget Planning Environmental Factors

There are several important external trends and constraints that need to be taken into account in the budget planning process.

- The economic and social context within which the university operates is changing continuously. The university must respond in terms of the educational and other services it provides.
- UNM can expect to experience continued substantial overall enrollment growth, particularly at the undergraduate level.
- There are continuing demands for UNM to provide educational services outside the Albuquerque and Santa Fe metropolitan areas institutions in the state.
- Funding for higher education in New Mexico is about 17% of the General Fund appropriation, and this is not likely to increase due to pressure for funds for other services. New Mexico's economy but an increase in higher education funding above the level of economic growth is not anticipated.

Pressures for greater accountability by higher education in New Mexico, including 1) increased diversity of students, faculty and staff, 2) improved articulation with the 2-year sector in New Mexico, and 3) quality assurance, such as assessment of student learning outcomes to improve learning and teaching, will continue to increase. Also, UNM must develop and present a plan for student learning outcomes assessment by 1995 to satisfy its accreditation body, the North Central Association.

There will continue to be externally-imposed or unavoidable increases above the rate of inflation in the costs of some items, such as health insurance, library acquisitions, and utilities.

D. Budget Planning Priorities

It is expected that, given the above, priority consideration in the allocation of new or reallocated funds will be given to the following:

- Improving the competitive level of compensation for faculty, staff and students.
- Improving the quality of instructional programs, such as through reduced student-faculty ratios, and increased support for equipment, such as computers.
- Addressing the effects of changes in enrollment, whether the services are delivered on-campus or off-campus.
- Covering externally-mandated programs and services, such as higher costs of employer-paid benefits, library acquisitions, and legislative and regulatory mandates.
- Addressing the goals and objectives of UNM 2000 and the accountability issues identified above.

E. Instructions for Preparation of Preliminary College and Division Budget Requests

Each Dean will submit to the Provost, and each non-academic unit Director to the President or their Vice President, the following information by February 1, 1993:

I. Units supported totally or partially from the Main Campus Instruction and General Funding:

A. A summary of changes in programs and services delivered by the unit that will be supported by restructuring of the organization and redistribution of current funding level. The information should give...
special attention to how the changes reflect the unit's strategic plan and the University's budget planning emphasis described above, including the specific benefits anticipated from the changes.

B. A summary of the increased investment in programs and services that could be implemented with an increase in funding up to 5% or $50,000 (whichever is greater) of the current level of I & G allocation. Focus should be on institutional priority budget issues described above. If the level of service (enrollment, etc.) is expected to change, what is the current level and what are the projected changes?

Information should be specific in terms of changes in staffing and other operating budget changes. Identify what portion, if any, of the funding requests include one-time or term-funding increases. Each item should be justified in terms of the unit's strategic plan. If more than one item is requested, identify the priorities. The request should include a rationale identifying expected benefits from the request if funded.

C. Changes in employee compensation is a university-wide budget issue to be addressed during development of the budget allocation plan. Deans and Directors should not address this issue in their preliminary budget requests.

II. Units not receiving Main Campus Instruction & General Funding (Internal Services, Research, Public Service, Auxiliary Enterprises, Athletics, Social and Cultural Activities, etc.)

A. A preliminary budget plan that shows projected results of the current year and projected changes for 1993-94. The format should follow that shown in Attachment A, omitting detached salary lines. For preliminary compensation change projections, four percent (4%) should be used.

B. Attached to the projected budget forms should be a brief explanation of the sources of additional revenues to support the projected increases in budgeted expenditures. Also, any changes in price for services provided should be specifically identified and explained. No changes in rates of charges or fees may be implemented without specific approval.

Administrative Overhead: A complete review of the Administrative Overhead rate is expected to be completed this fall. Until such time as it is completed, 6.5% of the total projected expenditure budget, less the amount budgeted for administrative overhead and depreciation allowances should be used.

Fringe Benefits: Organizations need not detail the budget for employee benefits by individual benefit component. An overall average of 25% may be used to project departmental fringe benefit costs, if there is a mix of salary ranges in the organization. For those units that have a large group of employees in a few salary ranges, the following schedule may be used to more closely project departmental costs for fringe benefits:

**PAYROLL BENEFITS AS PERCENT OF SALARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Total Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-$15,000</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$25,000</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$35,000</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$50,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$75,000</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000+</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For employees in positions classified as "hazardous", add 5.8% to the departmental benefit costs.