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

The UNM Faculty Senate will meet on Tuesday, December 8, 1992 from 3:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

The agenda will include the following items:

1. Summarized Minutes of November 10, 1992
2. Memorial Minute for William J. Martin -- W. Georg Schreiber
3. Memorial Minute for Professor Robert Kelner -- Dean Leonard Napolitano
4. Memorial Minute for Professor Emeritus Bonner Crawford -- Professor Emeritus David Darling
5. Address by Regent President Roberta Ramo (Schedule permitting)
6. Senate President's Report -- Professor Mary Harris
7. Honorary Degrees -- Professor Allen Parkman
8. Candidates for Degrees Semester I, 1992-93 -- Representatives from the Schools and Colleges
9. Student Outcomes Assessment -- Professor Susan Deese
10. Admissions Standards -- Professor Richard Mead
11. Items from the Curricula Committee -- Professor David Null
   a. "Sunset" Law
   b. Budget Review on Branch Campuses
12. Election of Member of Operations Committee
13. Committee Replacements -- Professor Larry Gorbet
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

December 8, 1992

(Summarized Minutes)

The December 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 (Zimmerman Library), Lynneianne Beene (A&S), Joan Bybee (A&S), Bel Campbell (A&S), Edith Cherry (Arch & Ring), Jeff Davis (A&S), Susan Deese (Library), Charles Fiedlerman (Engineering), Kenneth Gardner (Medicine), Robert Glew (Medicine), Larry Gorbik (A&S), Blaine Hart (Medicine), Mary Harris (Education), Roy Johnson (Engineering), Kathleen Koehler (Education), Blaine Hart (Medicine), Mary Harris (Education), Jan Johnson (Engineering), Susan Llull (Centennial Library), Dometra Logothetis (Dental Progs), Vonda Long (Education), William MacPherson (Law School), Kathleen Matthews (University College), Deborah McFarlane (Public Admin), Pramod Pathak (A&S), Glynn Raymond (Pharmacy), Edward Reyes (Medicine), Dianna Shomaker (Nursing), Don Sinclair (Management), Russell Snyder (Medicine) and Erik Trinkaus (A&S).

Absent: Jane Bruker (Gallup Branch), Richard Coughlin (A&S), James Deanes (Gallup), James DePaepe (Education), Michele Diel (Valencia), Luisa Duran (Education), Bradley Ellingboe (Fine Arts), Eva Enchinas (Fine Arts), Walter Forman (Medicine), Robert Greenberg (Medicine), Mary Grizzard (Fine Arts), Shlomo Karmi (Engineering), John Matthes (A&S), Patrick McNamara (A&S), Beth Miller (Gallup), Mark Ondrias (A&S), Gloria Sarto (Medicine), Randy Thornhill (A&S), Henry Trenderitt (A&S), Benjamin Walker (Medicine), James Wallace (Medicine), Nina Wallerstein (Medicine), and Ethierm Wilkins (Engineering).

Minutes of November 10, 1992. The third line of the fifth paragraph on page three was corrected to read 1993 and the minutes were approved.

Memorial Minutes. Memorial minutes were presented for William J. Martin, Professor Robert Kellner and Professor Emeritus Bonner Crawford by W. Georg Schreiber, Dean Leonard Napolitano and Professor Emeritus David Darling respectively.

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

Address by Regent President Roberta Ramo. Roberta Cooper Ramo, President of the Board of Regents, told the Senate that she very much appreciated the opportunity to speak to them. She explained her perception of the role of members of the Board of Regents. That role, she said, includes setting policy, establishing a vision for the institution, acting as advocates for the university, explaining the importance of research at UNM to the community and defending the faculty.
Regent Ramo told the Senate that the following are issues of great importance to the Regents.

- Core Curriculum. She said that the core curriculum is important to the Regents and they wish to resolve the problems involved and assure that a core curriculum is established.

- Quality teaching

- Faculty salaries. She said that UNM has not yet achieved what had been hoped for and that Regent Siegfried Hecker has been one of the strongest advocates for higher salaries for faculty.

- Fostering the best students and improvement in academic advisement

- Improvement of the fiscal situation

- Forwarding of the goals of UNM 2000

She said she feels that the future of the State is dependent upon the success of the University of New Mexico and it is her hope that together, the faculty, the administration and the Board of Regents will communicate the positive values of higher education in such a way that all New Mexicans will be proud of UNM.

Senate President's Report. Senate President Mary Harris reported that at the Regents' meeting of November 17, 1992, the Policy on Conflict of Interest was approved with a few minor changes. Also approved were the KUNM Radio Bylaws. Two faculty members will serve on the Radio Board. The beginning steps toward the establishment of a Research Park Corporation were approved as well as two million dollars for a new weight room at the Basketball Arena. President Harris told the Regents that the faculty may be upset at the commitment for a weight room as monies for supplies and travel for faculty are in short supply.

The Council of Deans met on November 17 and discussed a draft of the Sexual Harassment Policy. The Equal Employment Office submitted a new version for future discussion. The EEO Office will handle informal complaints if the complainant prefers and will also handle all formal complaints. The office will also speak with people who have questions regarding sexual harassment and do not wish to give names.

A draft of UNM 2000 with an update of what has been achieved so far has been compiled by the Provost's Office.

President Harris said she has asked Karl Karr, chair of the Faculty Senate Benefits and Welfare Committee to have the Committee investigate the issue of tuition waivers. Also, President Harris talked with Vice President McKinney who said the policy on tuition waivers has not been changed. The policy is, however, interpreted differently by different people. The Faculty Handbook, President Harris said, places no limitations on which classes may be taken by a faculty member.

She reported that she had drafted a proposal regarding filling materials in the Office of the University Secretary, had discussed the idea with the President, the Provost and the Operations Committee and forwarded it to Senator William MacPherson for his comments.
At a meeting of the Operations Committee, the possibility of compiling a list of needs to improve the academic atmosphere at UNM was discussed. The list might include such things as a better computer program for publishing of the UNM Catalog and a better system for scheduling classrooms. Suggestions can be forwarded to President Harris.

The Academic Decathlon for high school students will be held on February 26 and 27. Faculty members and graduate students may volunteer to serve as judges by contacting Debbie Morris in Student Activities.

The establishment of a School of Public Administration, the Honors College, the Distance Education Center and Computer Science will be discussed at the next meeting of the Faculty Reallocation Committee. The Provost has established a Distance Education Center which will be housed with Media Technology Services. The Center will coordinate distance education courses, including ITV courses and an advisory committee will advise the director of the Center. The Operations Committee told the Provost that there is concern about the implication that the Center will establish policy and the Provost agreed to clarify the document to make it clear that academic policies are the responsibility of the faculty.

The Provost has also established a UNM Council on the Americas which will be chaired by Professor Guillermina Engelbrecht of the College of Education. The Council will have approximately thirty members from UNM divisions having representation in Latin America.

The Staff Council has passed a resolution calling for a pause in administrative hiring with any monies saved being applied towards non-administrative staff salaries. Also called for by the Staff Council were a formal evaluation of and long range planning for staff compensation.

President Harris said she has received many calls concerning the reports about a basketball player who enrolled for six hours of course work two weeks before the end of the semester. She intends to discuss the issue with President Peck at a forthcoming meeting. She suggested two things which the Senate might do regarding the issue. One would be to request that the Athletic Council explore the current situation, including under what circumstances athletes are allowed to drop/add courses late in the semester. The other would be to ask the Senate Admissions and Registration Committee to consider the question of when and under what circumstances students ought to be allowed to register for courses after the deadline.

At the meeting of the Board of Regents meeting on December 8, 1992, a proposal was presented for UNM to take over the Taos Education Center. President Harris expressed her concern that such action could not be taken without the approval of the Faculty Senate, since curricular matters are involved and the action would be similar to forming a new division or department. The issue is being considered by the Curricula Committee. The Regents approved the concept subject to resolution of a number of concerns.

Also approved by the Regents were sale of surplus property, acquisition of property, the Lobo Club Bylaws, funding for a modular building for MRI and the State Auditor's report on UNM.

President Harris said she had met with President Peck regarding the Office of the University Secretary. He is considering restructuring the office in ways which may cut administrative costs. She told him that the faculty is less concerned
about who provides support to the Board of Regents and who handles commencement plans than about adequate support for faculty, Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate committees.

President Harris then presented a gift to University Secretary Anne Brown, who will retire on January 31. She expressed the admiration, affection and appreciation of the Faculty Senate for her twenty three years of service.

At this point, Senator Erik Trinkaus stated that there is a crisis concerning library funding at the same time that the Board of Regents has approved a two million dollar expenditure for an athletic weight room and urged that the Senate take some action. President Harris said that the Operations Committee has a meeting planned with the Dean of Library Services, Robert Migneault. Also, the view of the Board of Regents, the Director of Development and others is that the money earmarked for the weight room will not ultimately come from University funds but through donations from the Idaho Club.

President Harris explained that it takes a 2/3 vote to take action on an item not on the agenda and that the issue also could be discussed at the end of the meeting or at the February meeting of the Senate. A motion was made to suspend the rules, change the agenda, and discuss the matter.

A motion was then made to demand that a solution to the library book and journal purchasing crisis in the library be undertaken by the Regents of the University.

Senator Kathleen Koehler proposed a friendly amendment to the original motion and after discussion, the following motion was approved by the Senate.

Whereas, the Library is the most important resource at the University to faculty and students;

Therefore, the Faculty Senate expresses its dismay at the current budgetary crisis in library acquisitions,

Urges the administration and the Regents to seek a solution to the cut in book and journal acquisitions, and to

Seek all sources of support to maintain these acquisitions, and

Requests a report on this matter from the Administration or Regents at the next Senate meeting.

It was asked who would present this resolution to the Regents and who normally communicates with the Regents. President Harris explained that it is the University President and other administrators. No mechanism exists for faculty input except for the presence of the Senate President serving in an advisory capacity at Regent meetings.

Honorary Degrees. Upon recommendation of Professor Alan Parkman for the Honorary Degree Committee, the Senate approved granting honorary degrees to poet Robert Creeley and Ferrel Heady, former President of the University of New Mexico. Robert Creeley will receive a Doctor of Letters and Heady the Doctor of Laws.

Candidates for Degrees, Semester I, 1992-93. Upon recommendation of the various schools and colleges and the Office of Graduate Studies, the Senate approved the degree candidates for Semester I, 1992-93.
Student Outcomes Assessment. Senator Susan Deese presented a motion to create an ad hoc Student Outcomes Assessment Committee. She explained that during the past several years, colleges and universities across the country have become actively engaged in designing comprehensive and innovative programs of student outcomes assessment. Much of this effort has arisen due to various mandates from state legislative and/or accrediting bodies as a means of seeking quality assurance in post-secondary education. The University of New Mexico is similarly under a new requirement of its institutional accrediting board, the North Central Association, to conduct student outcomes assessment and utilize that information for the improvement of programs. Further, an overriding goal of UNM 2000 is to increase the quality of the University and of undergraduate education in particular. One means of ensuring the accomplishment of that goal is to carefully and systematically examine the outcomes of students’ experiences at UNM, what students know and what they can do, and then use that information for the improvement of programs and student performance.

Associate Provost Janet Roebuck spoke in favor of the Student Outcomes Assessment program and Senator Deese moved that the motion to establish the program be approved and that the Operations Committee be asked to appoint the appropriate committee members. The following motion was approved.

To appoint an ad hoc Committee for Student Outcomes Assessment.

Membership: The committee will have ten to fifteen members. Membership on this ad hoc committee and/or its subcommittees will be representative of the following areas: Faculty from the Faculty Senate Operations Committee, Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate Undergraduate Committee, Faculty Senate Long Range Planning Committee, Faculty Senate Teaching Enhancement Committee, and from the present Advisory Group on planning student outcomes assessment, and other interested Faculty; Administrators from the Office of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, from the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs, and from the Council of Deans; Professional Staff from Planning and Policy Studies, CIRP and Student Affairs Divisions (Admissions, Registrar); Students; Alumni, and representatives from the Branches. The expectation for members would be for a three-year commitment of concerted effort.

Charge: To promote, develop, and oversee the implementation of appropriate programs for student outcomes assessment and their integration into the processes of evaluation and improvement. More specifically, the committee will: organize efforts to improve the climate at UNM of favorable and informed attitudes about student outcomes assessment; identify and recognize current student outcomes assessment efforts and their uses at UNM; develop and recommend policies and procedures for student outcomes assessment; integrate and coordinate planning for all forms of student outcomes assessment at UNM; provide assistance to units as they develop and implement student outcomes assessment; consider the financial impact of recommendations for student outcomes assessment.

Admissions Standards. After a discussion of the effects of raising admission standards, it appeared that many questions remain unanswered. The item was therefore tabled until the next meeting of the Faculty Senate.
Items from the Curricula Committee. Professor David Null for the Curricula Committee explained that there are nearly 1000 courses listed which have not been taught since fall of 1990. Some departments list over 60 such courses and the Committee feels that this amounts to false advertising. He explained that in the fall of 1994, the Scheduling Office will send a list to departments of courses to be dropped, giving the departments time to respond to the Curricula Committee if there are courses they wish to keep on the books. It will still be possible to reinstate any course which had been deleted within 18 months.

The following policy was approved by the Faculty Senate:

Beginning retroactively to fall of 1990, any course which has not been taught in 4 years will be dropped from the catalog, unless the offering department can justify to the Faculty Senate Curricula Committee why the course should be left in the catalog(s).

The second item from the Curricula Committee concerned branch campus budgets. It was explained by Professor Null that at the Faculty Senate meeting of October 13, 1992, the following was approved:

The Faculty Senate will approve no new programs, new academic units, nor major revisions of academic programs or units, unless estimates of cost and sources of other needed resources for the first three to five years of operation of the new or revised program or unit accompany the proposed change.

Since branch campuses are funded separately from the main campus, both as line items in the state budget and by local tax initiatives, Professor Null requested that the following line be added to the policy as stated above:

Such programs or revisions to programs on branch campuses will be expected to have undergone a budget review on the respective campus.

Upon recommendation of Professor Null, the addition of the sentence was approved.

Election of Member of Operations Committee. Professor Roy Johnson (Civil Engineering) was elected to serve on the Operations Committee to replace Mary Grizzard.

Motion re Athletics. At this point in the meeting, Senator Susan Deese made a motion that the Faculty Senate ask the Athletic Council to investigate and report on the most recent incident involving a basketball player, including the surrounding circumstances and the student's progress towards a degree and that the Senate Admissions and Registration Committee provide the Senate with the number of students who add/change courses as well as the circumstances under which such changes are allowed. The Senate approved the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 5:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne J. Brown, Secretary
Subject:
Motion to create a committee to plan and oversee implementation of a comprehensive, university-wide program of student outcomes assessment

Requested Action:
Pass the motion

Background Information:
During the past several years, colleges and universities across the country have become actively engaged in designing comprehensive and innovative programs of student outcomes assessment. Much of this effort has arisen due to various mandates from state legislative and/or accrediting bodies as a means of seeking quality assurance in post-secondary education. The University of New Mexico is similarly under a new requirement of its institutional accrediting board, the North Central Association (NCA), to conduct student outcomes assessment and utilize that information for the improvement of programs. Further, an overriding goal of UNM 2000 is to increase the quality of the University and of undergraduate education in particular. One means of ensuring the accomplishment of that goal is to carefully and systematically examine the outcomes of students’ experiences at UNM - what students know and what they can do - and then use that information for the improvement of programs and student performance.

An Advisory Group for planning student outcomes assessment was appointed by the Provost in February 1992. That group prepared a set of preliminary materials on student outcomes assessment for review by an NCA team during its focused site visit to UNM in May, 1992. Considerable work remains to be done with regard to deciding policy issues, conceptualizing, planning, and implementing a program of student outcomes assessment. Further, it is recognized that it is in the purview of the Faculty to design, implement, evaluate and modify the academic and academically-related programs of the University. As such, the following motion is presented to the Faculty Senate by the Advisory Group for Planning Student Outcomes Assessment.
Motion:
Appointment of Ad Hoc Committee for Student Outcomes Assessment

Membership: The committee will consist of ten to fifteen members. Membership on this Ad Hoc Committee and/or its subcommittees will be representative of the following areas: Faculty from the Faculty Senate Operations Committee, Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate Undergraduate Committee, Faculty Senate Long Range Planning Committee, Faculty Senate Teaching Enhancement Committee, and from the present Advisory Group on planning student outcomes assessment and other interested Faculty; Administrators from the Office of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, from the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs, and from the Council of Deans; Professional Staff from Planning and Policy Studies, CIRT and Student Affairs Divisions (Admissions, Registrar); Students; Alumni; and representatives from the Branches. The expectation for members would be for a three-year commitment of concerted effort.

Charge: To promote, develop, and oversee the implementation of appropriate programs for student outcomes assessment and their integration into the processes of evaluation and improvement. More specifically, the committee will: organize efforts to improve the climate at UNM of favorable and informed attitudes about student outcomes assessment; identify and recognize current student outcomes assessment efforts and their uses at UNM; develop and recommend policies and procedures for student outcomes assessment; integrate and coordinate planning for all forms of student outcomes assessment at UNM; provide assistance to units as they develop and implement student outcomes assessment; consider the financial impact of recommendations for student outcomes assessment.

Supporting Documents:
Statement from:
President Peck
November 13, 1992

To: Mary Harris, President, Faculty Senate
From: Richard E. Peck, President

SUBJECT: COMMITTEE ON STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

Thank you for providing me with a copy of the material on the proposal for the Faculty Senate to create a student outcomes assessment committee. Clearly, we must devote considerable time and attention to this effort, not only because of the new requirement of the North Central Association, but also to assure we are fulfilling our mission to educate our students.

With regard to financial support for the work of the committee (possibly for such things as attending meetings, hiring consultants and graduate students, conducting workshops), it would be my suggestion that the committee begin its work by developing a workplan and preliminary budget, at least for the first phase of its efforts. I would then be glad to review the budget request and determine the extent and source of funds that could be made available.

As for the membership of the committee, I concur with your approach of including both faculty and administrators, as well as students and alumni. Since the University is committed to effective student outcomes assessment, I can assure you that the vice presidents and I will work with you to identify appropriate members from the administrative areas.
November 17, 1992

TO:       Mary Harris, President, Faculty Senate
FROM:     Paul G. Risser, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
SUBJECT:  Faculty Senate Committee on Assessment

I would like to take this opportunity to encourage the Faculty Senate to establish a Committee on Student Outcomes Assessment. This is an important topic which must be addressed by the University, partly in response to our obligations to the North Central Association and partly because it is a necessary step in the development of the University. I would encourage the Committee to be diligent in its efforts on this complicated task, but especially mindful that the ultimate value will be the ways that the assessment information is reintroduced to further enhancement of the curriculum.

The Office of the Provost will provide staff support to the Committee and will commit up to $3,000 in funding if necessary.

May I take this opportunity to reiterate the value of this endeavor and to encourage the Faculty Senate to proceed on the matter.

PGR:mb
cc: Max Kerlin
November 20, 1992

TO: Mary Harris, Professor, Educational Foundations

FR: Orcilia Zuñiga Forbes, Vice President, Student Affairs

I was pleased to learn of the Faculty Senate's proposal to establish a Committee on Student Assessment. The Division of Student Affairs has initiated a number of studies to evaluate and assess student services. We welcome this effort to study students' educational outcomes.

Please let me know how we can assist in this effort.

cc: Provost Risser
ADMISSIONS STANDARDS

The Faculty Senate Admissions and Registration Committee proposes the following increase in freshmen admissions standards which is in keeping with the UNM 2000 plan.

FOR IMPLEMENTATION IN FALL 1994

Plan A - Increase the required grade point average on both the high school overall and on the required 13 units of college preparatory courses to 2.25.

Plan B - Increase the formula admissions to the fifth step of the originally proposed six step formula. (This includes a 2.25 GPA requirement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Rank</th>
<th>ACT Composite Score</th>
<th>SAT Composite Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 25%</td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>720-860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 50%</td>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>870-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 75%</td>
<td>25-28</td>
<td>1010-1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Rank Req.</td>
<td>29 or higher</td>
<td>1190 or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan C - Retain the Special Admissions category at approximately 5% of the entering freshman class.

FOR IMPLEMENTATION IN FALL 1997

Plan A - Increase the required grade point average on both the high school overall and on the required 13 units to 2.50.

Plan B - Increase the formula admissions to the sixth step of the originally proposed six step formula. This includes a 2.50 GPA requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Rank</th>
<th>ACT Composite Score</th>
<th>SAT Composite Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 25%</td>
<td>19-22</td>
<td>780-930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 50%</td>
<td>23-26</td>
<td>940-1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 75%</td>
<td>27-31</td>
<td>1090-1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Rank Req.</td>
<td>32 or higher</td>
<td>1350 or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan C - Retain the Special Admissions category at approximately 5% of the entering freshman class.

After the official Fall 1996 Enrollment Report is generated, the A&R Committee should conduct an assessment to ensure that the goals of increased academic preparation, improved retention, improved academic performance and increased diversity are being met. The committee at that time will have 3 years of data after the first step and can evaluate the wisdom of completing the second step proposed above.

The A&R Committee unanimously passed this proposal at its November 10, 1992 meeting.
CURRENT FRESHMAN ADMISSIONS STANDARDS

Plan A - The required grade point average on both the high school overall and on the required 13 units is 2.00.

Plan B - The formula admissions are on the fourth step of the originally proposed six step formula.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Rank</th>
<th>ACT Composite Score</th>
<th>SAT Composite Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 25%</td>
<td>17-19</td>
<td>660-770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 50%</td>
<td>20-22</td>
<td>780-930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 75%</td>
<td>23-26</td>
<td>940-1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Rank Req.</td>
<td>27 or higher</td>
<td>1090 or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan C - The Special Admissions category has been reduced from 12.43% of the 1988 entering freshman class to 6.24% of the 1992 entering freshman class.

Plan A has remained constant since 1983 when it was first instituted. Plan B was originally proposed as a six step formula to be implemented over a period of time. It should be mentioned that a new "enhanced" ACT test was implemented in 1990 and changes in Plan B were delayed until effects could be noted. Plan C, the Special Admissions category, has undergone a number of changes over the past 9 years; in part, due to the opening and subsequent closing of the General College. The current target is that Plan C students make up approximately 5% of an entering freshman class.

The general high school GPA has remained constant at 2.00.

UMN 2000 PLAN STATEMENT

"Objective 2 - The University will monitor and is expected to increase admissions standards which will be designed to admit only those well-prepared students judged by selected criteria as likely to be successful at the University. Moreover, the University will seek to maximize entry by Plan A, which requires a rigorous high school curriculum. The result will be a freshman class by year 2000 with the following characteristics: 90% will have entered by the Plan A admissions criteria; 50% will be in the top quartile of the ACT distribution of admission test scores for the state; and the average composite ACT score will be at least 23".

The entering 1992 freshman class has 74.43% admitted under Plan A and the average composite ACT score is 22.0. The average HS GPA is 3.12. Figure 1 presents the trends in freshman admission showing the increase in Plan A students and decreases in Plan B, Plan C and in the overall number of freshmen.
Figure 1: Freshman Admissions

- **Plan A**
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Total
While an increased percentage of Plan A freshmen has been noted, the overall numbers have dropped by 13%. This has been accompanied by an increase in undergraduate degree-seeking transfer students. Table I details this increase. Thus we make up the loss of freshmen who are not sufficiently prepared by admitting students later in our programs.

Table I: Undergraduate Degree-Seeking Transfer Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 1988</th>
<th>Fall 1989</th>
<th>Fall 1990</th>
<th>Fall 1991</th>
<th>Fall 1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>823</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>1178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1989</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF INCREASED STANDARDS

Any increase in GPA standards applies to both Plan A and Plan B. Thus if an increase is made, students are added to the Plan C pool. One must look at increasing the standards from the weakest action to the strongest to get a picture of what will happen.

PLAN B STEP INCREASES

Table II details what impact going to Step 5 and Step 6 would have had on this year's entering freshman class. It is presented in terms of ethnicity to show effects on cultural diversity.

Table II: Impact of Plan B Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Excluded by Step 5</th>
<th>Excluded by Step 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One can easily see that increases in the required test scores do not impact a great number of students.

MINIMUM GPA CUTOFF INCREASES

There is no way of knowing if a given student may be included in several categories when you examine the composite information about an entering freshman class. Thus, when one starts talking about a GPA increase for Plan B students, they might have already been excluded by a test score increase. One must remember this when looking at the next few tables and let each stand alone.
A Minimum 2.25 GPA on the Overall High School Record

If we just looked at the overall GPA, there would be no incentive to do well on the required 13 units of college preparatory courses. However, the data on this increase applied to this year's freshman class follows.

Table III: Impact of a 2.25 Overall GPA Minimum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan A</th>
<th>Plan B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we will apply the 2.25 to the 13 core units.

Table IV: Impact of a 2.25 GPA Minimum on 13 Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan A</th>
<th>Plan B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The net result of the proposed 1994 changes would have reduced this year's entering freshman class by approximately 5% and would have shifted another 5% to lower categories.

A Minimum 2.50 GPA on the Overall High School Record

To complete the picture, we need to look at the impact of the proposed 1997 standards on this year's freshman class.

Table V: Impact of a 2.50 Overall GPA Minimum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan A</th>
<th>Plan B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now we apply the 2.50 to the 13 core units.

Table VI: Impact of a 2.50 GPA Minimum on 13 Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan A</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The net result of the proposed 1997 changes would have impacted approximately 22% of this year's entering freshman class.

COMMENTS

The plan proposed by the Admissions and Registration Committee is reasonable and would give the high schools time to respond. We wish to include both proposed increases in the UNM Catalog to reinforce our commitment to increased standards. Some students would be forced to seek an alternative to entering UNM directly. The impact of the 1994 proposed step at this time is not viewed as particularly harsh. But, going directly to the 1997 standards would be severe. We hope that any increase in the standards would be accompanied with increases in support programs to assure that freshman who are admitted stand a better chance of surviving than they do currently. The Cohort Reports show a large decrease after 2 semesters.

Below you will find a clipping showing that Louisiana State University has taken the same kind of action in a slightly different manner.

LSU BOARD APPROVES TOUGHER, MORE FLEXIBLE ADMISSION STANDARDS

The LSU Board of Supervisors approved tougher but more flexible academic admission standards for entering freshmen at the Baton Rouge campus.

The new standards raise the high school grade point average necessary to enter LSU to no less than a 2.3, up from the current 2.0 gpa. Any high school graduates with a grade point average of 3.5 on a rigorous college preparatory curriculum and an ACT score of 28, or an SAT score of 1170, would be eligible for admission.

LSU officials said studies have shown that the most accurate indicator of a student's ability to succeed at LSU is his or her high school grade point average. The new gpa standard applies to those grades received in 17.5 units of recommended high school courses. Students lacking some of those high school units in the recommended course can still enter LSU under a sliding, offsetting scale of gpa and ACT or SAT test scores. For example, a student with a 2.6 gpa on 16 units will need an ACT score of at least 20 or an SAT score of at least 830. A student with a 2.3 gpa would need an ACT score of at least 21 or a minimum SAT of 880.
November 23, 1992

TO: Faculty Senate Operations Committee
FROM: David Null, Co-Chair, Curricula Committee
RE: "Sunset" Law

The Curricula Committee would like to propose the following policy:

Beginning retroactively to Fall of 1990, any course which has not been taught in 4 years will be dropped from the catalog, unless the offering department can justify to the Faculty Senate Curricula Committee why the course should be left in the catalog(s).

This has been a problem for quite some time, and was raised again recently when the Scheduling Office did a review of courses which had not been taught since Fall of 1990. There are nearly 1000 such courses, including some departments with over 60. We feel that this is, at best, false advertising, and that departments should delete from the catalog those courses which they are no longer teaching. If there is a legitimate reason to leave the course in the catalog, the Curricula Committee will certainly consider that.

We would also continue the current policy, that if a department wishes to reinstate a course which has been deleted within the last 18 months or so, we will do that pretty much pro forma.

Setting the clock to Fall of 1990 gives departments a year or so of warning and time to look at their courses. In the Fall of 1994, the Scheduling Office will send a list to departments of courses to be dropped, giving the departments time to respond to the Curricula Committee if there are courses they wish to keep on the books.
TO: Faculty Senate Operations Committee  
FROM: David Null, Co-Chair, Curricula Committee  
RE: Policy on budget requirements for new programs/major changes in existing programs

At its meeting on October 13, 1992, the Faculty Senate passed the following motion:

The Faculty Senate will approve no new programs, new academic units, nor major revisions of academic programs or units, unless estimates of cost and sources of other needed resources for the first three to five years of operation of the new or revised program or unit accompany the proposed change.

Since branch campuses are funded separately from the main campus, both as line items in the state budget and by local tax initiatives, we would like to propose adding the following line to the policy.

Such programs or revisions to programs on branch campuses will be expected to have undergone a budget review on the respective campus.