programs at UNM through the Office of Student Outreach Services. Directors, graduate students, peer counselors and others should be involved directly in local recruitment events, i.e., college fairs, high school visits, etc. Directors should be incorporated into out-of-state visitation days and travel with Student Outreach recruiters.

4. University of New Mexico administrators should name a second phase of the Ethnic Centers Review Committee. This follow-up committee will work with the UNM administration to adopt the goals and objectives outlined in this Interim Report and jointly develop a Final Report of the Ethnic Centers Review Committee. This process will endeavor to establish more positive lines of communication between the ethnic student centers, their constituencies and the UNM administration.

TO: Members of the UNM Faculty Senate
FROM: Barbara Thomas, Office of the University Secretary
SUBJECT: November Meeting

The UNM Faculty Senate will meet on Tuesday, November 9, 1993 from 3:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

The agenda will include the following items:

1. Approval of the Agenda

2. Summarized Minutes of October 12, 1993

3. Senate President’s Report -- Professor Bel Campbell
   a. committee appointments and replacements
   b. student outcomes assessment
   c. committee reports

4. College of Education/Appointment of Dean

5. Report regarding Disabled Student Services -- Anne Thomas, Director of Equal Opportunity Programs

6. Clarification of Faculty Senate Bylaws -- Professor Bel Campbell

7. Resolution from Faculty Senate Budget Committee regarding Division of Continuing Education -- Professor Bel Campbell

8. Summer School Report -- Assistant Vice President David Stuart

9. Proposed Legislator Education Project -- Professor Robert Schwartz (INFORMATION ONLY)

10. Report regarding Minority Centers -- Professor Bel Campbell (INFORMATION ONLY)

11. Memorial Minutes -- Professor Bel Campbell (PLEASE NOTE THAT THE FULL TEXT OF MEMORIAL MINUTES ARE NOW PRINTED IN THE MINUTES)
   a. Jack Campbell, Professor Emeritus of Geography Robert D. Campbell
   b. Henry Weihofen, Professor Emeritus of Law
November 9, 1993

The November 9, 1993 meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Belcampbell at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

Senators present: Dave Baldwin (Zinneman Library), Lyndallene Beene (English), Jane Braker (Gallup Branch), Joan Bybee (Linguistics), Belcampbell (Physics & Astronomy), Jeff Davis (Math & Stats), Michele Diel (Valencia Branch), Eva Enclias (Theatre & Dance), John Finkelstein (Management), Charles Fledderman (Elec & Comp Engr), Robert Glew (Biochemistry), Larry Gorbet (Anthropology), Deborah Graham (Med Centr Lib), Linda Hall (History), Blaine Hart (Radiology), Ray Johnson (Civil Engr), Kathleen Koehler (HPPELP), Tom Kyner (Math & Stats), Cheryl Lean (Nursing), Demetra Logothetis (Dental Frogs), John Matthews (Physics & Astronomy), Elizabeth Nielsen (Spec Educ), Lynette Oshima (CIMIE), Peter Pab1sch (Foreign lang & Lit), Shane Rielean (Political Science), Glynn Raynorl (Biology), Alan Reed (Public Admin), Joe Rothrock (Art & Art History), Richard Santos (Economics), Stephen Schreiber (Architecture & Ping), Herman Schreyeyer (Mech Engr), Jerome Shea (University College), Dianna Shomaker (Nursing), Robert Siclen (Political Science), Henry Toemitt (Journalism), Carolyn Voess (Medicine), and Scott Walker (Psychiatry).

Absent: Larry Barton (Biology), Richard Coughlin (Sociology), Kenneth Gardner (Medicine), John Geismen (Earth & Planetary Sciences), Harry Lull (Centennial Library), William Mactherson (law), Beth Miller (Gallup Branch), Carolyn Mold (Microbiology), Paul Montner (Medicine), Kurt Nolte (Pathology), Leroy ortiz (CIME), Edward Reyes (Pharmacology), Gloria Sarto (Obstet & Gynology), Russell Snyder (Neurology), Gerald Weiss (Physics) and Helen Zongol~icz (Gallup Branch).

Approval of the Agenda. The agenda was approved as presented.

Minutes of October 12, 1993. The summarized minutes of October 12, 1993 were approved as presented.

Senate President's Report. Senate President Belcampbell requested approval of the following committee appointments and replacements: Gregory Bowes (Educ Admin) on the Athletic Council; David Manol, Jr. (Arch & Ping) and Peter Kinggrad (law) on the Budget Committee; Kenil Rose (Management) and Joan Marsh and Demaris Wright (Community Representatives) on the Community Education Committee; Heemang Atbehon (HPPELP) on the Faculty Ethics & Advisory Committee; Robert Glew (Biochemistry), David M. Johnson (English), Martin Kantowitz (Family & Community Medicine) and Richard Nordhaus (Arch & Ping) for Denise Schulz (Th & Dance) on the General Honors Council; Bruce Thomson (Civil Engineering) on the KBE Radio Board; Karl Karistron (Earth & Planetary Sci) for Kathryn Vogel (Biology), John Omali (Biochemistry) for William Sieweoki (Arch & Ping) and Nancy Uscher (Music) on the Research Policy Committee; Charles Beekel (Physics & Astronomy) for Cheryl Freash (English) on the Teaching Enhancement Committee and John Finkelstein (Management) on the Undergraduate Committee.
President Campbell announced that Susan Deese has resigned as member and chairman of the Student Outcomes Assessment Task Force and Patricia Burris Woodall of Planning and Policy Studies has been appointed temporary chair.

There is great concern from both faculty and staff regarding a proposed Dispute Resolution Policy. Anyone with input regarding this policy can contact either President Campbell or Professor Diana Robin.

The Board of Regents approved the 1994-95 Operating Budget funding requirements at their October meeting. Included were a request for a 7% increase in employee compensation, to include merit and promotion adjustments as well as to address market and compaction structures; a 4% inflationary increase in non-personnel operating costs; and a $1.9 million peer adjustment for instruction, primarily addressing faculty compensation. The Finance Committee has recommended against the peer adjustment this year.

Provost Coleman, Vice President David McKinney, the University Planning Council and the Deans are revising preliminary budget planning guidelines for 1994-95. Key features of the revised guidelines are three broad priorities, in ranked order: (1) maintenance of current quality of programs and services, (2) improvement in the competitive level of faculty and staff compensation and (3) investments that improve the quality of existing programs and services; support new programs and services; rolling, three-year budget planning, with four academic units' input each year and during off years, revisions will be accepted to the previously entered three-year plans; submission of capital, equipment and computing budget requests at the same time as operating budget requests.

Faculty who are interested in contacting their state legislators with a highly focused message regarding UNM and higher education needs, are asked to contact Del Campbell. This will be a vigorous, constituent-based effort to communicate with the Legislature as opposed to direct lobbying in Santa Fe.

Maps of legislative districts and lists of legislators are available in the Office of the University Secretary.

Committee Reports.
Professor Edward Walters, chairman of the Research Policy Committee distribute a report from the Committee highlighting the issues which will be dealt with in the next year. Those issues include the following:
- UNM Technology Development Corporation, UNMTC is a non-profit corporation formed by the Board of Regents for the purpose of benefiting UNM by commercialization of inventions of the UNM faculty. The regents have entered into an agreement with TDC in which UNM intellectual property will be assigned to TDC for development. Certain modifications in policies and procedures will be necessary and the distribution of financial proceeds will change from the present arrangement of 50% to the inventor and 50% to UNM to a new formula of 40% to the inventor, 40% to TDC and 20% to the inventor's department. An Intellectual Property Subcommittee will begin work on these issues in the near future.
- ITV Policy. Negotiations are continuing between the new director of the Distance Learning Center, the Research Policy Committee and the ITV Committee regarding the issue of ownership and control of materials developed by faculty for use on ITV.
Michael. President Sanchez addressed an issue transfer of the scholarships. Approximately 5,365 have been eligible for the scholarships. Professor Walters requested the Senate to review the annual research recognition award. The first announcement for nominations for the annual research recognition award has been made and the RFC again looks forward to participating in this event.

Professor Breda Bova, chair of the Athletic Council explained the role of the Council was advisory, both to the Athletic Director and to the President of UNM and said that there had been good communication with both this year. Each committee member acts as liaison to several sports, which improves communication even more. Professor Bova announced that the Council will host a social gathering for all faculty in early December in Hodgin Hall and invited all faculty to attend and meet the coaching staff and committee members.

She explained that last year a motion was forwarded to President Beck requesting semester to semester eligibility checks for students in their last year of eligibility. It was approved and now student athletes in their last year must pass eight hours in their major in the first semester and be off probation in order to compete in their final spring semester.

Juanita Sanchez, chair of the Scholarships, Prizes and Loans Committee, said that the Committee had reviewed its charge and decided to take a more active role. It had been briefed by John Whiteside, Director of Student Financial Aid and had heard approximately 10 student appeals. Committee members served on the Regents' Scholarship committee which resulted in an excellent group of recipients.

Ms. Sanchez described the various scholarships available and said that, to date, 5,365 have been awarded. This includes institutional, state, federal and private scholarships. The Committee now plans to pursue support for graduate scholarships and transfer and non-traditional scholarships. Any input from faculty can be addressed to Ms. Sanchez at her University College office.

Appointment of Dean - College of Education. The issue of the appointment of the Dean of the College of Education was placed on the agenda by the Senate Operations. It is, however, presented without a proposed motion.

President Campbell pointed out the AAUP statement on the selection of administrators, the policy on the appointment and continuation in office of deans and chalpereons approved by the Senate in April of 1992 and the "Search
The recent 3-year reappointment of Professor Peggy Blackwell as Dean of the College of Education does not meet the letter or spirit of UNM or AAUP policies on faculty participation in selection and retention of administrators

AND WHEREAS, The restructururing of the College of Education, now in its second year of implementation, has repeatedly suspended the faculty governance component of the balance of power between faculty and administration

AND WHEREAS, A legitimate search process for Dean would create dialogue on the goals and implementation of restructuring and the roles of faculty and administration, fostering an atmosphere of academic freedom and intellectual and professional integrity

WHEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate calls upon the Provost to rescind the 3-year reappointment of the Dean of Education, replacing it with a one year extension (for 1994-95),

Professor Koehler said that the resolution expresses the feelings of certain other members of the College of Education faculty to whom she has spoken as well as herself.

Senator Larry Gorbet spoke in support of the resolution. Senator Tom Hyer said his concern is that the issue of restructuring is a separate and complicated one and should not be a part of the resolution. Senator Howard Schreyer requested information concerning the reasons for the appointment of the Dean and also wished to know if the action of the Faculty Senate would have any impact at all on the issue.

Professor Frank Field spoke in opposition to the resolution and explained the difficulty of the re-structuring process in the College. Other College of Education faculty members and Senators spoke in opposition to the resolution and in support of Dean Blackwell. Professor Roberta Burch of the College of Education said that faculty had not been disenfranchised and had been asked for input into the discussion of issues surrounding the restructuring. Senator Joan Hyer asked for additional information concerning the appointment of Dean Blackwell. Provost Coleman responded. She explained that when she made the appointment, she knew that the situation was an unusual one but felt she had followed the letter of the law. She pointed out that the College has had a tumultuous history and had two failed searches for a dean in a short period of time. One of the reasons for the failure to hire a new dean was the candidates' unwillingness to take on the problems of the college existing at that time.

After the two failed searches, Peggy Blackwell accepted a term appointment to the position by then Provost Paul Risser. She explained that Dean Blackwell was willing to take on the responsibilities of restructuring of the College. Provost Coleman said that she was persuaded that colleges of education throughout the
She invited faculty of the College of Education to comment on the selection of a dean as well as other aspects of restructuring. She received fifty-eight responses. The responses, she said, were very thoughtful. Not all were positive about restructuring or about Dean Blackwell’s tenure but more than half of the respondents were positive. As a result of the information she received, she made the decision to appoint Dean Blackwell to a three-year term. She said that deans are generally appointed without terms and that no other dean on campus has a term.

Provost Coleman said that she will not rescind her decision and she feels she has made the right decision.

Senator Elizabeth Nielsen of the College of Education said she is distressed by the implication that nothing has been done in the last two years but that the faculty has simply been doing what they are told to do. She said she has never gone to more meetings or been invited to more meetings and that no one has been excluded and urged against conducting a search at the present time.

Professor Eli Durvea thanked Provost Coleman for not caving in to the pressure and said he believes Dean Blackwell has done a fine job.

Professor Lynette Oshima of the College of Education stressed that the college is still a functioning unit of UNM. She said that it would have been very difficult to conduct a search at the present time but the process is important and she has received input from some faculty members who felt unable to respond to Provost Coleman’s request and who feel that this issue is another example of decision making from the top down.

Senator Alan Reed moved to strike the second and third paragraphs of the resolution and stick to the issue at hand. The amendment was seconded and approved.

President Campbell called for the vote. A show of hands was called and the result was 9 for, 26 against and 1 abstention. The resolution failed.

Report regarding Disabled Student Services. President Campbell introduced Anne Thomas, Director of Equal Opportunity Programs at UNM who explained some of the types of learning disabilities and reviewed the materials which had been distributed to the Senators regarding the Americans with Disabilities Act, its key provisions and how it affects the faculty. The regulations require that we modify any of our policies and procedures in order to accommodate the qualified disabled individuals. The University must, she explained, provide all services and programs to qualified students with disabilities unless such action would fundamentally alter the programs and services offered. She explained that the intent of the Act is that we invest in disabled individuals in a positive manner rather than simply "taking care" of them which ultimately costs more if they are unable to work.

The ADA does not dictate what, where or how to teach but requires that disabled people be held to the same standards as everyone else. It does not violate the academic freedom of the faculty, she said. It does require a case-by-case analysis. She also stated that it is the responsibility of the student to make arrangements ahead of time for any modifications by the faculty. The main points of impact on faculty are (1) that faculty may be required to accommodate students with disabilities by modifying their policies, practices and procedures, (2) that students with disabilities are only required to provide documentation to Disabled Student Services, (3) that in determining what is the most appropriate reasonable accommodation, the students are the best source of information, (4) that the
University is required to provide communications to students with disabilities in alternative formats and (5) that it is the responsibility of the students to raise any special needs they have with their professors.

Ms. 'Ihanas explained that the department is responsible for low cost accommodations to meet ADA compliance requirements and that costs considered excessive may be submitted through proper administrative channels to the appropriate vice president.

Professor Ralph DeMarr expressed his dissatisfaction with arrangements made by Disabled Student Services for giving exams to disabled students enrolled in his classes.

Clarification of Faculty Senate Bylaws. It was explained by President Campbell that at the April 1990 Faculty Senate meeting, a motion was approved which changed the elected officers from a president and a vice president to a president and a president elect. The rationale for this action was that it would insure continuity in Senate leadership.

There has been considerable confusion as a result of the action and a number of options for clarification were presented by the Operations Committee.

After discussion of the various options available, the Senate voted to rescind the April 1990 action and return to the election of a president and vice president each year.

Resolution from Faculty Senate Budget Committee regarding Division of Continuing Education. Upon recommendation of the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, the Senate approved the following resolution.

Whereas the current operations of the Division of Continuing Education have evolved over many years without systematic external review by the Faculty Senate, and

Whereas the current operations of the Division of Continuing Education have direct significance for the future quality and efficiency of the University’s services to its constituents, and

Whereas the operations of the Division have direct consequences for departmental budgets and programs, and

Whereas the retirement of Dean Rupert Trujillo creates an unusual opportunity to review the staffing, budget, and functions of the Division, be it resolved that

The Faculty Senate Budget Committee requests that the administration of the University constitute a committee to study, to conduct open hearings, and to make recommendations about the Division’s mission, staffing, and operations prior to establishing a search for a permanent replacement for Dean Trujillo, and be it further resolved that

The Faculty Senate Budget Committee pledges its support to the work of the committee to be constituted, and be it further resolved that

The Faculty Senate Budget Committee invites the Faculty Senate as a whole, and the Long-Range Planning Committee, to endorse this resolution.
Assistant Vice President David Stuart presented a report on summer school. He told the Senate that even though there was a modest decline in summer school enrollment from the summer of 1992, in light of national trends, UNM's campus did quite well. Although enrollment did not increase, we did hold on to recent gains whereas many other colleges and universities did not. It is his belief that the growing number of "magnet" summer programs are one reason we are doing well. Some of those magnet programs are the Arts in the Americas coordinated by the College of Fine Arts, the Summer Writers Workshop and the French and German Summer Schools at Taos.

Vice President Stuart thanked the Faculty Senate for its support and urged the continuation of that support. Senator Lynn Beene voiced her concern about the decrease in the number of freshman English classes offered and Vice President Stuart agreed that they would meet to discuss possible solutions to the problem.

MEMORIAL MINUTE FOR ROBERT D. CAMPBELL

Dr. Robert D. Campbell died of cancer September 25, 1993 at his home in Albuquerque, New Mexico at age 78. He earned a B.A. in English from the University of Colorado, Boulder in 1938, a M.A. in Geography from the University of Colorado in 1940, and a Ph.D. in Geography from Clark University in 1949. He served as Aerological Officer with the United States Navy 1943-46 and Geographer-Climatologist with the Office of the Quartermaster General 1946-47. In 1947, he founded the Department of Geography and Regional Science at The George Washington University and served as its chair until 1966. He was President of Area, Inc, Arlington, VA. 1962-64 and Regional Planning Consultant with the Ford Foundation Advisory Planning Team, Calcutta, India 1964-66. From 1966-70, he was Vice President and Chief Scientist with Matrix Research Company, Alexandria, VA. In 1970, he became Professor of Geography at the University of New Mexico from which he retired in 1980.

When I came to UNM, I filled the position Bob Campbell vacated upon retiring, but I never replaced him. Until recently, he remained an active, integral part of the Department, teaching a course, refining and elaborating upon his systems model, and acting as a mentor, especially to the junior faculty.

Almost as soon as I arrived on campus, I realized that the vacancy I was filling had been occupied by an outstanding teacher. I was a little disheartened by the disappointment students expressed when they learned that I, and not Professor Campbell, was teaching Introduction to Human Geography. Enrollment in the course went down by 50% from the previous Fall. The course he continued to teach for several years on Psychological Geography, which was an outgrowth of psychological geography, which was an offshoot of Psychological Geography, which was an influential article he published entitled "Personality as an Element of Regional Geography", was widely acclaimed at UNM. Even though the course has not been offered in over a decade, I received
an inquiry about it as recently as August of this year. One reason his classes were so successful was his ability to unify geography via perspectivism instead of the more usual division of the discipline through reductionism. He brought this same philosophy to his research projects, which were grounded in the theory of systems. An excellent example of his skill as a researcher can be found in an article he published entitled "Evaluation of Man-Environment Systems". His experiences from travel and work in nearly 50 countries, colonies, and territories, and his Fulbright Lectureships at Alexandria University, Egypt 1952-53, Oxford University, Great Britain 1955, and University of Peshawar, Pakistan 1957-58 provided source material for both his lectures and articles.

But the greatest contribution that he made to the Department and its individual members, especially after officially retiring, was his role as mentor to the junior faculty. In my own case, he provided critiques of almost all my early research, evaluations of my teaching, and advice on how to cope with departmental and university politics. And I wasn't alone. He helped Steve Thompson refine his conception of entropy and develop his course on human/environment systems, which he inherited from Bob; Susan Place was given suggestions on additional ways to evaluate the human impacts on the Costa Rican environment; and Bill Hodges was continually encouraged to publish his work.

On many a Tuesday and Thursday, we would gather in Bob's office for lunch to discuss everything from the state of the world, to the state of geography, to the state of the cookies he kept in his filing cabinet. He will be missed.

Memorial contributions may be made to: The George Washington University, Robert D. Campbell Endowment Fund. Send to: The George Washington University, Development Office, 701 G榄man Library, Washington, D.C. 20052.

Presented by Bradley T. Cullen, Acting Chair, Department of Geography, November 9, 1993.

The memorial minute for Professor Weihofen will appear in the December Faculty Senate Minutes.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Thomas, Secretary
Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators

The following statement, a revision and expansion of the 1974 statement on Faculty Participation in the Selection and Retention of Administrators, was prepared by the Association's Committee on College and University Government. It was adopted by the Council of the American Association of University Professors in June 1981 and endorsed by the Sixty-seventh Annual Meeting as Association policy.

The 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities rests largely upon the conviction that interdependence, communication, and joint action among the constituents of a college or university enhance the institution's ability to solve educational problems. As one facet of this interdependence, the Statement on Government asserts the expectation that faculty members will have a significant role in the selection of academic administrators, including the president, academic deans, department heads, and chairs. As a corollary, it is equally important that faculty members contribute significantly to judgments and decisions regarding the retention or nonretention of the administrators whom they have helped select.

THE SELECTION OF ADMINISTRATORS

The Statement on Government emphasizes the primary role of faculty and board in the search for a president. The search may be initiated either by separate committees of the faculty and board or by a joint committee of the faculty and board or by faculty, board, students, and others; and separate committees may subsequently be joined. In a joint committee, the numbers from each constituency should reflect both the primacy of faculty concern and the range of other groups, including students, that have a legitimate claim to some involvement. Each major group should select its own members to serve on the committee, and the rules governing the search should be arrived at jointly. A joint committee should determine the size of the majority which will be controlling in making an appointment. When separate committees are used, the board, with which the legal power of appointment rests, should either select a name from among those

1 According to the "Joint Statement on Government," (Academe 76 [May-June 1990]: 45-46), joint effort of a most critical kind must be taken when an institution chooses a new president. The selection of a chief administrative officer should follow upon cooperative search by the governing board and the faculty, taking into consideration the opinions of others who are appropriately interested in the selection of academic deans and other chief academic officers should be the responsibility of the president with the advice of and in consultation with the appropriate faculty. The chair or head of a department, who serves as the chief representative of the department within the institution, should be selected either by departmental election or by appointment following consultation with members of the department and of related departments. Appointments should normally be in conformity with department members' judgments. The chair or department head should not have tenure without approval of the faculty. The chair or head should serve for a stated term but without prejudice to reélection or to reappointment by procedures which involve appropriate faculty consultation.
submitted by the faculty committee or should agree that no person will be chosen over the ob­
jections of the faculty committee.
The role of the faculty in the selection of an administrator other than a president should re­
fect the extent of legitimate faculty interest in the position. In the case of an academic adminis­
trator whose function is mainly advisory to a president or whose responsibilities do not include
academic policy, the faculty’s role in the search should be appropriate to its involvement with
the office. Other academic administrators, such as the dean of a college or a person of equiva­
 lent responsibility, are by the nature of their duties more directly dependent upon faculty sup­
port. In such instances, the composition of the search committee should reflect the primacy of
faculty interest, and the faculty component of the committee should be chosen by the faculty of
the unit or by a representative body of the faculty. The person chosen for an administrative
position should be selected from among the names submitted by the search committee. The
president, after fully weighing the views of the committee, will make the final choice. Nonethe­
less, sound academic practice dictates that the president not choose a person over the reasoned
opposition of the faculty.

THE EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

Institutions should develop procedures for periodic review of the performance of presidents
and academic administrators. The purpose of such periodic reviews should be the improvement
of the performance of the administrator during his or her term of office. This review should
be conducted on behalf of the governing board for the president, or on behalf of the appointing
administrator for other academic administrators. Fellow administrators, faculty, students, and
others should participate in the review according to their legitimate interest in the result, with
faculty of the unit accorded the primary voice in the case of academic administrators. The govern­
ning board or appointing administrator should publish a summary of the review, including a state­
ment of actions taken as a result of the review.

THE RETENTION OF ADMINISTRATORS

A more intensive review, conducted near the end of a stated term of administrative service,
may be an appropriate component of the decision to retain or not to retain an administrator.
When used for such a purpose, the review should include such procedural steps as formation
of an ad hoc review committee, with different constituencies represented according to their legiti­
mate interest in the result; consideration of such added data as the administrator’s self-assessment
and interviews with appropriate administrators and faculty and students; and submission of
a report and recommendations, after the subject administrator has had an opportunity to com­
ment on the text, to the board or appointing administrator. The board or appointing adminis­
trator should accept the recommendations of the review committee, except in extraordinary cir­
cumstances and for reasons communicated to the committee with an opportunity for response
by the concerned parties prior to a final decision. The report should be made public, except for such
sections as the board or appointing administrator and the review committee agree to be
confidential, together with an account of actions taken as a result of the review.
All decisions on retention and nonretention of administrators should be based on instru­
tionalized and jointly determined procedures which include significant faculty involvement.
With respect to the chief administrative officer, the Statement of Government specifies that the
“leadership role” of the president “is supported by delegated authority from the board and
faculty.” No decision on retention or nonretention should be made without an assessment of
the level of confidence in which he or she is held by the faculty. With respect to other academic
administrators, sound practice dictates that the president should neither retain an adminis­
trator found wanting by faculty standards nor arbitrarily dismiss an administrator who
meets the accountability standards of the academic community. In no case should a judgment
on retention or nonretention be made without consultation with all major constituencies
with the faculty involved to a degree at least co-extensive with its role in the original selection
process.
The president and other academic administrators should in any event be protected from ar­
bitrary removal by procedures through which both their rights and the interests of various con­
stituencies are adequately safeguarded.
The new policy on the Appointment and Continuation in Office of Deans was also approved. Both will be included in the next revision of the Handbook and are printed below.

APPOINTMENT AND CONTINUATION IN OFFICE OF DEANS

Preamble: The following policy guidelines will be utilized for the appointment, periodic review, and terms of office of Deans at the University of New Mexico. All appointment policies will be in accordance with affirmative action guidelines.

1. Deans will normally serve terms of five years. Administrative equivalents at branch campuses will also serve terms of five years.
2. Terms of office may be renewable. Recommendations for both the initial appointments and reappointments to terms of office are to be made by the Provost to the President and by the President to the Regents after consultation with departmental faculty and chairs and other such persons as they shall see fit. The appointment of the Dean of Graduate Studies shall be recommended by the Provost to the President and by the President to the Regents after appropriate consultation with the Senate Graduate Committee, University Officers, the graduate faculty, and other interested persons. The consultation with college faculty and chairs shall include the taking of a vote by secret ballot on any potential appointment. A mandatory evaluation by faculty and chairs in the fourth year of the Dean's term is required. Reappointment must also be subject to the stated willingness of the Dean to continue in that position, the results of the evaluation in the fourth year, and the willingness of the faculty and chairs, evidenced by secret ballot, to have the Dean continue in office.
3. It shall be understood that a policy of terms of office for Deans does not abrogate the long-standing policy of the University that Deans serve in any college at the pleasure of the Provost and that a Dean's appointment and continuing appointment occurs with the advice and consent of the faculty and chairs of the college. This means, simply, that Deans may be replaced during a term of office; also, they may resign.

Resolution of a Disagreement:
In the case of disagreement between the administration and the faculty and chairs of a college, an amicable resolution of the problem will be negotiated. A Dean serves at the pleasure of the Provost, but a Dean's appointment and continuing appointment occurs with the advice and consent of the faculty and chairs of the college. A Dean who has lost the confidence and support of his or her faculty and chairs cannot provide the positive leadership needed by the college.

APPOINTMENT AND CONTINUATION IN OFFICE OF DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRPERSONS

(The old text is stricken. New text is underlined.)

Preamble: The following policy guidelines will be utilized for the appointment, periodic review, and terms of office of departmental chairpersons at the University of New Mexico unless a college faculty adopts a modified policy pertaining to appointment, periodic review, and terms of office for departmental chairpersons in that college, that would decrease the term by no more than one year. All appointment policies will be in accordance with affirmative action guidelines.
1. An evaluation shall be made of all chairpersons by January 1, 1979, by both administrators and faculty members to determine the appropriateness of their continuation in office. Evaluative criteria for their chairmanship will be established by the individual departments in consultation with the dean. Deans of various colleges will be responsible in this evaluation for implementing the procedures as set forth in paragraph 3.

2. On July 1, 1979, all departmental chairpersons or heads of other college administrative units then in office will be considered to have begun on that date terms of four years.

1. Department chairs will normally serve terms of four years. Administrative equivalents at branch campuses will also serve terms of four years.

2. Terms of office shall be renewable, but ordinarily for not more than one additional term. Recommendations for both the initial appointments and reappointments to terms of office are to be made by the dean after consultation with departmental faculty and other such persons as he/she shall see fit. In the case of appointments to departments conducting graduate programs, consultation with the dean of Graduate Studies will also be included. The consultation with departmental faculty shall include the taking of a vote by secret ballot on any potential appointment. A mandatory faculty evaluation in the third or penultimate year of the chairperson’s term is required. Reappointment must also be subject to the stated willingness of the chairperson to continue in that position; the results of the evaluation in the third or penultimate year, and the willingness of a majority of the faculty, evidenced by secret ballot, to have the chair continue in office.

4. It shall be understood that a policy of terms of office for chairpersons does not abrogate the long-standing policy of the University that chairpersons serve in any college at the pleasure of the dean of that college. Additionally, a chair’s appointment and continuing appointment occurs with the advice and consent of the faculty. This means, simply, that chairpersons may be replaced during a term of office; also, they may resign.

Explanation: As indicated in the preamble, any college may decide its own policy for terms of department chairpersons. For example, a college might decide to adopt five-year terms, or two- or three-year terms, or variable terms. The above is to be the policy of a college only if it does not adopt some different policy to decrease its term of office for chairpersons to three years.

Resolution of a disagreement:

In the case of disagreement between the administration and the faculty of the department, an amicable resolution of the problem will be negotiated. A chair serves at the pleasure of the Dean, but a chair’s appointment and continuing appointment occurs with the advice and consent of the faculty. A chair who has lost the confidence and support of his or her faculty cannot provide the positive leadership needed by the department or college. Approved by Faculty Senate, April 24, 1992.

It was understood that appropriate changes would be made in the Faculty Constitution.
I. Introduction. The selection of candidates for senior administrative and academic positions is among the most important responsibilities shared by members of the university community. These guidelines attempt to specify methods for identification and selection of candidates for such positions, so that the relevant constituencies may participate in the process and enhance the quality of the resultant appointments. Because no procedures can anticipate all circumstances, these guidelines should be applied flexibly. For individual searches, the President of the University may, for adequate cause, modify the guidelines with the concurrence of the President of the Board of Regents and the President of the Faculty Senate. These guidelines have been considered and approved by the Faculty Senate, the Administration, and the Board of Regents.

II. General Responsibilities of Search Committees. A search committee will normally be formed for every open position at or above the level of directors of programs. Searches for the positions of academic director, dean and vice president should draw upon national or local pools of candidates whichever is appropriate. Specific responsibilities of the committees include:
A. to develop, with the concurrence of the official responsible for the search, a job description and written guidelines for the search;

B. to identify and attract qualified applicants for the position;

C. to screen the applicants according to their qualifications and suitability for the positions;

D. to recommend to the official responsible for the search a slate (ranked or unranked) of the most qualified candidates;

E. and to assist in interviewing and gathering additional information about finalists for the position.

A search committee should represent the constituencies served by the person to be hired. Committee members should be chosen from among those whose background and expertise demonstrate excellence and who have working relationships with the administration and broad understanding of both the university as a whole and the position that is to be filled. Committee members should be sensitive to their own constituents but should ultimately serve the greater interests of the university.

The search committee's responsibilities end when it has selected a list of finalists. The decision on appointment rests with the president, according to the Regents' Policy Concerning Procedure in Key Appointments.

III. The composition of search committees. Careful selection of search committee members will be critical for the
successful discharge of their responsibilities. They should reflect the university's commitment to affirmative action by including women and protected minorities. Committee members should be familiar with the procedures set forth in the Affirmative Action Manual and the Regents' Policy Manual.

The administrator with line responsibility for the office being filled (as indicated in the Faculty Handbook organization chart) will convene the committee, appoint a chair from among the members, and meet with the chair and the President to define the details of search procedures.

The constituent groups that select members for search committees should establish open, clear, consistent, and democratic methods for choosing their representatives. They should attempt to select persons of demonstrated excellence who are also as broadly representative as possible. In the academic units, the faculty must determine the methods of selection.

The positions for which search committees will be formed fall into three groups:

A. academic vice presidents (academic, student affairs, research) and administrators in their offices;

B. deans and directors of academic programs;

C. other vice presidents and directors.

Composition of search committees will vary according to the level at which the vacancy occurs. Conveners of committees should propose adding members when appropriate for particular searches, for example more students for the vice
president for student affairs or scientists from the laboratories for the vice president for research. In addition to the membership on search committees, as described in parts IV, V and VI, below, there may be added one Regent, if requested by the President of the Board of Regents.

IV. Academic vice-presidents, Search committees for these vice presidents will consist of eight members:
   A. one academic dean, director, chair or faculty member to be appointed by the president;
   B. four members of the faculty at large, selected by the president from a slate of 8 proposed by the Faculty Senate;
   C. one member of the professional staff of the unit, to be selected by the president;
   D. one graduate or professional student, to be selected by the Graduate Student Association (GSA);
   E. one alumnus/a to be selected by the Alumni Association.

V. Deans and directors of academic programs. Search committees for deans and directors will consist of seven members:
   A. one dean or director from outside the unit, to be appointed by the responsible official;
   B. four faculty members from the college or program involved. If the unit has no faculty formally under its jurisdiction, the Faculty Senate shall select persons who have worked with and are knowledgeable about the unit;
C. one alumnus/a from the college or program, selected by the relevant alumni organization. In the event such a person is not available, an alumnus/a of the university who has worked with and is knowledgeable about the unit will be selected by the Alumni Association or another appropriate group;

D. one student, selected by the ASUNM, the GSA, or the relevant student group.

VI. Non-academic vice presidents and directors.

Search committees for other administrators will consist of eight members:

A. one senior administrator or faculty member to be appointed by the president;

B. four members of the professional staff in the unit, to be selected by the president;

C. one faculty member selected by the Faculty Senate;

D. one alumnus/a selected by the Alumni Association;

E. one student selected by the ASUNM, the GSA, or relevant student group.

VII. Additional procedures. The first steps in the search process must be the formulation of the job description, guidelines for the search, a timetable, and a published announcement. The convening official should give the committee clear, written instructions for carrying out these duties. Normally, these instructions should be developed in consultation with at least the chair of the committee.
During the advertising period, committee members should actively identify qualified candidates and encourage them to apply. A good search committee will make the position known more widely than a published announcement. All recruitment efforts should be recorded by the chair and be available to the Affirmative Action Office.

The committee should evaluate the qualifications of candidates in order to compose a short list of finalists, normally not less than three persons. The official responsible for the search may request a ranked or unranked list. Before the list is set, the chair should confirm the continued interest of the finalists in the position.

Committee members should act with integrity and discretion in dealing with personnel matters and confidential information gained during the search. They should make no public statements unless authorized by the responsible official.

The list of finalists may be disclosed to the public at the discretion of the responsible official. Search committee members should be included in campus interviews, along with as broad a range of faculty, students, administrators, alumni, and community members as circumstances allow.

If the responsible official finds none of the finalists acceptable, he or she may form a new search committee or request the existing one to reexamine the pool or to reopen the search.
Testing Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

Timeliness of Requests for Testing Accommodations

Students with disabilities are encouraged to notify faculty of any accommodations they may need early in the semester. However, some persons with disabilities are reluctant to inform faculty of their special needs until it becomes necessary for fear of being stigmatized.

Several faculty have expressed frustration regarding last minute requests for testing accommodations from disabled students. The federal regulations state that we are required to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures unless the modification would fundamentally alter the nature of the program or activity.

Though a last minute request for an accommodation is frustrating, it would be difficult to prove that providing the accommodation would fundamentally alter the nature of teaching. Accordingly, faculty are required to provide the testing accommodations requested.

Confirming the Authenticity of Requests for Testing Accommodations

With regard to the validity of requests for testing accommodations, faculty have the right to confirm that the student is entitled to the accommodation. However, faculty can not base the granting of the accommodation on receipt of a medical statement from a doctor detailing the student's disability.

If the student has contacted Disabled Student Services (DSS) for assistance, faculty can contact DSS to confirm that the accommodation requested is appropriate given the student's disability. In the interest of protecting the student's right to privacy with regard to their health, DSS will not convey the details of the student's disability, only that they are entitled to the accommodation requested.

If the student is requesting the accommodation on their own, faculty can demand some form of proof that they are entitled to the accommodation. However, a statement from a physician stating that the student needs the accommodation will be sufficient. It does not have to give specific information about the disability itself.

The fact that faculty can confirm the student's need for the accommodation requested protects them from students who may try to misuse the accommodation policy.

10/23/93
PROPOSED CHANGE IN FACULTY SENATE BY-LAWS

Background

On 10 April 1990, upon recommendation of the then Operations Committee, the Faculty Senate voted for annual election of a president-elect instead of a vice president, in order to insure continuity in Senate leadership. The specific vote was (1) to substitute the words "president-elect" for the words "vice president" wherever they appear in the Bylaws, and (2) to change Article I, Section 6(d) of the Faculty Constitution to read as follows:

Article I, Section 6(d): Organization and Procedures: The members of the Faculty Senate shall determine how the Senate shall be organized and what procedures shall be established to carry out the responsibilities delegated to it by Sec. 6(a) above; provided, however, that the president and the president-elect of the Senate shall be elected by the voting membership from among their number; that the senate term of the president-elect shall automatically be extended to two years, if necessary; and that the Secretary of the University shall serve as the secretary of the Senate.

The effect of this vote was to leave ambiguous the automatic ascension of the president-elect into the presidency in the academic year following his or her election. This ambiguity was exploited in the election of the Senate's current president.

Recommended Action

This year's Operation Committee believes that this ambiguity must be resolved. We therefore propose the following options:

[1] rescind the motion of April 1990, returning the relevant parts of the Bylaws to the old and unambiguous version; this would (temporarily) return the president and vice president positions to annual election;

[2] amend the now current Bylaws to reflect the apparent intent of the April 1990 Senate; this would establish the position of president-elect who would ascend to the presidency automatically in the year following his or her election.

There are other options:

(a) adopt [1] above without further action; this would make permanent the yearly election of both president and vice president;

(b) adopt [1], but change [2] to require Senate re-affirmation of the president-elect before he or she ascends to the presidency;

(c) adopt [1] and [2], with a proviso that the changes take effect after the term of the current (1993-94) vice president.

bc 10/28/93
To: Faculty Senate Budget Committee  
From: Wayne Lazorik and David Colton  
Subject: Draft Resolution on Continuing Education

Whereas the current operations of the Division of Continuing Education have evolved over many years without systematic external review by the Faculty Senate, and

Whereas the current operations of the Division of Continuing Education have direct significance for the future quality and efficiency of the University's services to its constituents, and

Whereas the operations of the Division have direct consequences for Departmental budgets and programs, and

Whereas the retirement of Dean Rupert Trujillo creates an unusual opportunity to review the staffing, budget, and functions of the Division, be it resolved that

The Faculty Senate Budget Committee requests that the administration of the University constitute a committee to study, to conduct open hearings, and to make recommendations about the Division's mission, staffing, and operations prior to establishing a search for a permanent replacement for Dean Trujillo, and be it further resolved that

The Faculty Senate Budget Committee pledges its support to the work of the committee to be constituted, and be it further resolved that

The Faculty Senate Budget Committee invites the Faculty Senate as a whole, and the Long-Range Planning Committee, to endorse this Resolution.
September 10, 1993

TO: Richard Holder, Associate Provost, Academic Affairs
     Members, Dean's Council

FROM: David E. Stuart, Assistant Vice President, Academic Affairs

RE: Summer School 1993 VS Summer School 1992

There are two reports enclosed. The first is a several page narrative summary of enrollments and summer school programs as recently prepared for the President's Office. The second, is a two page table "1993 Summer School VS 1992 Summer School". I am commenting herein on the two tables which constitute the second report. The first report is self explanatory.

For planning purposes it is useful to note that summer school 1993 cost a bit more ($2,066,769) than summer school 1992 ($1,973,560). In spite of the increased costs the number of scheduled courses declined modestly from 746 to 732. The only large colleges which increased the number of scheduled classes from awarded funds were Arts & Sciences and Engineering.

Overall, there was a modest drop in headcount and credit hours (see report 1-part of a national trend) this, coupled with liberalized pay policy for faculty teaching shorter courses, raised our costs per credit hour from $43.71 to $46.81. The cost of credit hours offered has been computed for each program and varies significantly from a low of $25.00 (Women's Studies, EWDP, Continuing Ed.) to a high of $357.00 (African American Studies). Small programs rather logically tend to cost more than large programs per credit hour.

There were significant credit hour declines in the College of Engineering, University College, General Honors, and Public Administration. These tended to be smaller programs (except Engineering) where significant statistical differences can be created by just a few courses. Of the large programs Arts & Sciences lost the fewest credit hours—evidence of continued strong demand for programs in that college.

A number of programs significantly increased their credit hours (Pharmacy, Architecture & Planning, Law, Dental Programs), but again these tended to be small programs where just a few courses overly influence averages.

Compared to the nation and the region, UNM Main Campus was rather stable as a whole. Next year, with careful planning, we could again see an increase in SCH, combined with further development of our "magnet" programs. I will ask Deans to review these data and help us plan efficiently.
### 1993 SUMMER SCHOOL vs. 1992 SUMMER SCHOOL (MAIN CAMPUS ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>1,601</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>6,716</td>
<td>6,731</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5,762</td>
<td>5,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson's School of Mgmt</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>1,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>4,836</td>
<td>4,604</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>4,073</td>
<td>3,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Fine Arts</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nursing</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Pharmacy</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; Planning</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Honors</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Programs</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Studies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army ROTC</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Writer's Workshop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Institute</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening &amp; Weekend Program</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>2,827</td>
<td>3,182</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>15,477</td>
<td>15,027</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13,112</td>
<td>12,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>24.72</td>
<td>23.37</td>
<td>20,046</td>
<td>2,017</td>
<td>765,710</td>
<td>830,000</td>
<td>$38.19</td>
<td>$39.40</td>
<td>20,017</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson's School of Mgmt.</td>
<td>29.64</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>3,783</td>
<td>1,468</td>
<td>24,84</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>$24.84</td>
<td>$24.26</td>
<td>3,601</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>12,434</td>
<td>4,028</td>
<td>390,400</td>
<td>495,000</td>
<td>$39.40</td>
<td>$41.46</td>
<td>12,028</td>
<td>495,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>13.82</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>64,800</td>
<td>$47.59</td>
<td>$43.60</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Fine Arts</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>2,526</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>50,61</td>
<td>143,000</td>
<td>$36.19</td>
<td>$41.15</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>143,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nursing</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>26,28</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>$28.42</td>
<td>$25.06</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Pharmacy</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>6,670</td>
<td>$6.14</td>
<td>$32.06</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>6,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; Planning</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>97.77</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>$41.15</td>
<td>$121.67</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>102.43</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>$20.43</td>
<td>$91.32</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Honors</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>76.51</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>$32.88</td>
<td>$123.65</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Programs</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>117.93</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>$102.43</td>
<td>$92.74</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>73.82</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>$22.14</td>
<td>$83.75</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Studies</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>369.04</td>
<td>32,300</td>
<td>$46.87</td>
<td>$357.23</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Studies</td>
<td>20.66</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>46.87</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>$46.87</td>
<td>$25.06</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army ROTC</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>25.17</td>
<td>25.32</td>
<td>3,517</td>
<td>3,039</td>
<td>82,74</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>$22.74</td>
<td>$25.67</td>
<td>3,039</td>
<td>78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Writer's Workshop</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>24,800</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>24,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Institute***</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening &amp; Weekend Program</td>
<td>37.66</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>2,128</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>$18.45</td>
<td>$25.31</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano Studies</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Studies</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holder's Contingency</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Unassigned SCH</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>17.57</td>
<td>17.40</td>
<td>45,151</td>
<td>44,144</td>
<td>1,973,560</td>
<td>2,066,769</td>
<td>$43.71</td>
<td>$46.81</td>
<td>44,144</td>
<td>2,066,769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funded increased numbers of science labs in Summer '93, which reduced credit hours.

**Southwest Institute is co-funded by Albuquerque Academy & its SCH are included in the college/department which lists the classes.
DATE: August 13, 1993

TO: Judy Jones, Executive Assistant to President

FROM: David E. Stuart, Assistant Vice President, Academic Affairs
       Richard Holder, Associate Provost

RE: Summer School 1993

In the summer of 1993 enrollments and headcount on the main campus at UNM declined modestly from Summer 1992. In 1993, there were 9,071 students enrolled compared to 9,177 the previous year for a decline of 1.16% in headcount. Student credit hours declined 2.23% from the prior year. Students took marginally fewer credit hours. These figures need to be considered in light of regional and national data for Summer 1993.

After consultation with the National Association of Summer Schools, we have learned that an average range of enrollment loss was -5% to -25%, with a rough national average (still formally being computed) at-8% to 10%! Our various branches, collectively, lost 4% in headcount. In light of these broader trends, UNM main campus did quite well in Summer 1993!

We also did well on an historical basis, since headcount had fluctuated between 8,800 and 8,900 students in summer session on main campus for many years. In short, even though we would have liked to have continued to build enrollments this summer, we held on to recent gains whereas many others in the region and nation did not.

We believe that our growing number of “magnet” summer programs are one reason we are doing so well. Some of the more important magnet programs are as follows:
1. "Arts in the Americas". This program created and coordinated by the College of Fine Arts includes Music, Theater, Dance, and Visual Arts focusing on cultures of the Americas (the Hispanic theme is strong). This program has drawn much attention to UNM summer programs and to the College of Fine Arts. There have been numerous positive print reviews in regional media. This program is a winner!

2. Summer Writer's Workshop. Now in its third season, this workshop (a special project of the Provost's Office/D. Stuart) is a multidisciplinary program shared between English, Communication & Journalism, and Honors. This summer 116 students participated in workshops offered by six authors (four New Mexicans) all of whom had won national awards for their writing. There is enormous interest in this program and students want us to expand it. Next year we hope to bring Penny Marshall, Hollywood Producer/Actor and a graduate of UNM!

3. French and German Summer Schools at Taos. These programs are now a number of years old. They immerse students in the language, literature, and culture, simultaneously. This is done in a "field" setting where distractions are few. Pedagogically, these programs are very highly regarded.

4. Guanajuato Law Program and Architecture Programs. These two separate programs take students to Mexico and enable both North American and Mexican scholars to cooperate in the educational enterprise. As such, these programs both promote the theme of a "University for the Americas". We predict that these programs will grow over the next several years.

5. Honors/Connexiones. This is a program in the Honors College which involves both Spanish language and cultural instruction in Mexico. UNM students are given a "summer abroad". Most of this year's activity took place in Jalapa, Mexico. As such, this program also promotes "A University for the Americas".

6. Summer Field Geology Program. This program of the department of Earth and Planetary Sciences put students in both lecture and field settings for Junior and Senior undergraduate students from both UNM and other universities. Given the excellence of the department and the solid initial coordination of this program, we expect it to grow and be better supported in the future. For the moment we consider it an "emerging" magnet summer program.
There are other excellent summer programs at UNM such as the African-American Institute, Water Resources Institute (Public Administration), and the Anthropology Department's Field Schools, but the ones listed above may not be familiar to everyone, so are briefly described herein.

Our overall strategy for summer school is to offer a balanced combination of service courses (relieves pressure from Fall and Spring semesters), combined with truly excellent magnet programs which reflect the special character and strengths of UNM. Two years of applying this strategy is only a start. But in those two years, UNM summer session has grown from 4th largest to 3rd largest of ten regional Ph.D. granting public university programs, and is currently out-ranked in size only by ASU and U of A.
To: Bill MacPherson
From: Rob Schwartz and Bill Zimmer
Re: Legislator education proposal
Date: 17 September 1993

As you suggested last week, we are submitting to you our proposal for a plan to encourage individual members of the faculty to educate legislators about the University of New Mexico. Our plan would take volunteer faculty members and assign them to individual legislators, with the charge that they educate those legislators about the University. While such education is indistinguishable from lobbying, in one sense, we propose that those who participate would not be asked to pursue any particular agenda; i.e., they would not be representative of the University administration, the faculty senate, their department or program, or anything else. We also propose that the faculty members engaged in this project generally meet their legislators outside of the legislative session, when it will be possible to focus on developments at the University rather than anyone’s agenda for a legislative session. Finally, we propose that any faculty member who wishes to participate in this program be invited to do so, and that we impose absolutely no restrictions on the form or content of any participant’s encounters with legislators. While this program may attract some irresponsible participants, and while it surely will attract many faculty members who disagree with us (and with each other), we believe that it will be worth it.

The premise behind the proposal is that the legislature does not fully understand the extraordinary value that the University offers to the state, and that a free, open, and uncontrolled relationship between legislators and faculty will help them develop that understanding. Further, an individual legislator is more likely to develop trust in a faculty member with no agenda other than doing good geology (or whatever) than in a paid emissary from the University administration, and this program would allow faculty members to develop their relationships with legislators over many years. While the University has had fine lobbyists, no one can provide the explanations and the attention that can be provided through a one-on-one faculty-legislator interaction. In essence, this proposal is based on the belief that an honest account of the activities of the University — showing its warts along with its more handsome features — will develop support for the University as an institution, and for programs generally widely supported by the faculty.

The University administration has not approved this project, and we cannot be sure that it will provide all of the resources that we believe that it should. A list of the administrative resources necessary to carry off this program appears in the attached letter, which we will send to all faculty members at the University if this proposal is accepted by the faculty senate and the administration. While we do not need any senate or administrative approval to carry out this plan, of course, we are not capable of doing the work without considerable administrative support, and the administration, appropriately, is not interested in reviewing the proposal unless it has been approved by the faculty senate.
The Americans With Disabilities Act
How it Impacts Faculty

1. Faculty may be required to accommodate students with disabilities by modifying their policies, practices and procedures.
   - For example: if a student informs a professor that (s)he has a learning disability and needs more time to take a test, the professor may be required to extend the time for taking the test.
   - A professor may be asked to wear a microphone with a transmitter so that a student with a hearing impairment using a receiver can hear the professor during the lecture.
   - Individual faculty members can and will be held accountable for blatant discriminatory actions that deny students their rights.

2. Students with disabilities are only required to provide documentation to Disabled Students Services. Professors may contact Disabled Student Services to verify the student requesting accommodations is in fact entitled to them. Professors cannot require students to provide them with proof of their disability.

3. In determining what is the most appropriate reasonable accommodation, the students are the best source of information. Their preferences should be given primary consideration unless an equally effective accommodation is available.

4. The University is required to provide communications to students with disabilities in alternative formats.
   - Examples of alternative formats for written materials include computer diskette, braille, and audio cassettes.
   - Examples of alternative formats for audio materials include transcripts, closed captioning, and sign language interpretation.

At present, Disabled Student Services has readers that can read material onto audio cassette. The University is in the process of creating a central clearinghouse for disability issues which will include a communications resource center. It is anticipated that this center will be staffed with readers and sign language interpreters and will have equipment, such as a braille printer. Until the center is realized, however, you should contact Disabled Student Services for information on how/where to transcribe communications into alternative formats.

5. Students' responsibility: It is incumbent on students with disabilities to raise any special needs they have with their professors. They can and should be held to the same standards of performance as all other students.

Revised 11/8/93
The Americans with Disabilities Act
Key Provisions and Definitions

1. General Prohibition: No qualified individual with a disability shall on the basis of disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any public entity.

2. Key Principles: Persons with disabilities shall be provided with equal services, programs and benefits in as integrated a setting as possible. The determination of what is an equal and integrated service will be made on a case by case basis. What is appropriate for one person with a similar visual impairment may not be useful to another person with a visual impairment.

3. Key Definitions:

qualified individual with a disability means an individual with a disability who, with or without reasonable modifications to rules, policies or practices, the removal of architectural, communication, or transportation barriers, or the provision of auxiliary aids and services, meets the essential eligibility requirements for the receipt of services or participation in programs or activities provided by the public entity.

For example: a person with a disability who did not meet the University's admission requirements, would not be a qualified individual with a disability and the fact that the University would not admit this person would not be discrimination.

Individual with a disability is anyone who has, has a record of, or is treated as having, an impairment that substantially limits a major life activity.

For example: a person who walks with a limp would probably not meet the definition of an individual with a disability unless people treat him/her as if they were substantially limited in a major life activity. Similarly, if a cancer survivor was denied access to programs at UNM because of their history of cancer, they would be covered under the Act, though they do not presently have a disabling condition.

Reasonable Modifications: A public entity shall make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures when the modifications are necessary to avoid discrimination on the basis of a disability unless the public entity can demonstrate that making the modifications would fundamentally alter the nature of the services, program or activity.
For example: There is precedent that a University could bar a student with a hearing impairment from their nursing program because the student could not participate in the clinical requirements of the program without endangering patients. To have removed the clinical requirement in the curriculum to accommodate the student would have fundamentally altered the program and thus, the University was not required to do that. Please note that this is not a hard and fast rule. A case by case analysis must be conducted for each student with a disability within the context of the curriculum in question before a student could be barred as described above.
STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES, DISABLED STUDENT SERVICES, UPWARD BOUND PROGRAMS

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: JUAN J. CANDELARIA

The Student Support Services and Upward Bound Programs are federally funded by grants from the U.S. Department of Education. The fiscal year of those grants are September 1 through August 31. The Disabled Student Services Program is funded with UNM resources. The fiscal year for this program is July 1 through June 30.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING SOURCES:</th>
<th>SSS Services</th>
<th>UB Services</th>
<th>FEDERAL FUNDING</th>
<th>DSS Services</th>
<th>TOTAL FUNDING:</th>
<th>FEDERAL PERCENTAGE OF FUNDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992-1993</td>
<td>$2,433,798.00</td>
<td>$311,942.00</td>
<td>$555,210.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$3,499,940.00</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-1994</td>
<td>$2,503,368.00</td>
<td>$311,942.00</td>
<td>$652,300.00</td>
<td>$44,701.00</td>
<td>$3,499,940.00</td>
<td>22.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Finally, please be advised that it is illegal to refuse access to University programs and facilities to persons with disabilities because of expenses associated with providing such accommodations. If you have any questions, or require any guidance in the acquisition of auxiliary aids and equipment, please contact EOP at 277-2621.
STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES, DISABLED STUDENT SERVICES AND UPWARD BOUND PROGRAMS

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: JUAN J. CANDELARIA

SERVICE AGENTS:

Twenty percent of all resources are utilized to pay wages of service agents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB TITLE</th>
<th>NO. OF EMPLOYEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreters t/l Deaf</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Proctors</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readers t/l Blind &amp; L.D.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note-takers t/l Deaf &amp; Orthopedic</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Aides for Disabled Lab</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EMPLOYEE DATA FOR FALL 1993
DISABLED STUDENT SERVICES, STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

WHEN YOU COMPARE THE NUMBER OF EXAMS GIVEN IN 1992-93 WITH THE NUMBER GIVEN IN 1986-87, THE INCREASE IS 1,326 EXAMS, 330.67%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FISCAL YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EXAMS GIVEN</th>
<th>ANNUAL % INCREASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>58.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>48.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>35.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>12.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>12.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES REQUESTED</td>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>Reading Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income/First Generation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually Disabled</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory Disabled</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedically Disabled</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disabled</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological or Other Disabilities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The University of New Mexico

To: Faculty Senate
From: Operations Committee
Subject: Committee Replacements

The following are submitted for Senate approval:

COMMUNITY EDUCATION COMMITTEE
Ranjit Bose, Management, 1995 for faculty vacancy, 1995

GENERAL FOMAR CtNCIL
Robert Glog, Biochemistry, 1996 for faculty vacancy, 1996
David M. Johnson, English, 1996 for faculty vacancy, 1996
Martin Kuntrowitz, FCAM, 1994 for faculty vacancy, 1994
Richard Nordhaus, Arch & Plng, 1995 for Denise Schulz, Th & Dance, 1995

RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE
John Ondahl, Biochemistry, 1994 for William Sienhida, Arch & Plng, 1994
Nancy Uscher, Music, 1996 for faculty vacancy in Fine Arts, 1996

The following are also submitted for Senate approval (not over from the October meeting):

ATHLETIC COUNCIL
Gregory Bowes, Bd Admin, 1995 for faculty vacancy, 1995

EXERCISE COMMITTEE
David Herkel, Jr., Arch & Plng, 1996 for vacancy in Architecture, 1996
Peter Winkgrald, Law, 1995 for vacancy in Law, 1995

(cover)
COMMUNITY EDUCATION COMMITTEE
Community Representatives:
Joan Marsh
Demarise Wright

FACULTY RECRUITMENT & ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Hermin Atterbom, HPFELP, 1994 for faculty vacancy, 1994

RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE

TEACHING ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE
Charles Beckel, Phys & Astr., SEM I ONLY for Cheryl Fresch, English, SEM I

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
John Finkelstein, Management, 1994 for faculty vacancy in Hist, 1994

BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR THE FACULTY SENATE - 9 NOVEMBER 1993

1) The development of a formal Dispute Resolution Policy, including both staff and faculty disputes, is getting the strong attention of both faculty and staff. Primary concerns have been the responsibilities and accountability of a proposed Dispute Resolution Co-ordinator, and the extremely short interval given for reporting disputes and grievances; we are very close to real accommodation on both issues. Areas still to be tackled in detail include sexual harassment complaint procedures and the impacts on faculty with regard to academic freedom and tenure. If you have questions or would like to have input into these intense negotiations, please contact Prof. Diana Robin, FL&L (x73713, fax73599) or Bel Campbell.

2) At their October meeting, the UNM Board of Regents approved the 1994-95 Operating Budget funding requirements. These include: a 7% increase in employee compensation, to include merit and promotion adjustments as well as to address market and compaction structures; a 4% inflationary increase in non-personnel operating costs; and a $3.9 million peer adjustment for instruction, primarily addressing faculty compensation. The Finance Committee of the Commission on Higher Education, however, has recommended against a peer adjustment this year. They have also recommended against changing the rolling 3-year SCH average basis on 'T' funding to a most recent single year basis; this change would benefit those institutions experiencing enrollment growth. A final decision by the full CHE should be coming mid-November.

New Mexico's fiscal position is excellent. The revised (October) forecast for the current fiscal year is for total recurring revenues of $2.50 billion, or 10.4% over the 1993 fiscal year, and projected June 30, 1994, cash balances of about $300 million. Conservative estimates of recurring revenue growth for FY '95 range from 5 to 8 percent. The Legislature could therefore increase recurring appropriations by approximately $250 million over the current fiscal year. There are reports, however, that Governor King wishes to keep such increases within a conservative 5%. This may mean more dollars available for capital projects. The CHE Facilities Committee has listed its prioritized Capital Outlay Project Recommendations as follows:

- ADA - Health and Safety Requirements, Phase I $10,000,000 (statewide)
- Equipment Renewal and Replacement $10,000,000 (statewide)
- UNM - Valencia: Learning Resource Ctr., Phase II $10,000,000 (Rank: #1)
- NMFU: Library Addition and Remodel $850,000 (Rank: #2)
- UNM - Main Campus: Gen'l Classroom Bldg. $8,150,000 (Rank: #3)
- UNM - Gallup: Computer Classroom & Lecture Hall $1,353,750 (Rank: #5)
- UNM - Los Alamos: Student Services Bldg. $1,250,000 (Rank: #7)
- UNM - Main Campus: Chemistry Bldg. Renovation $2,000,000 (Rank: #14)

3) The Provost, in concert with the Vice President for Business & Finance, the Deans, the University Planning Council, and the President's Council, is revising a set of Preliminary Budget Planning Guidelines for 1994-95. (These guidelines are intended for Main Campus organizations only.) Some key features of these guidelines:

- Three broad priorities, in ranked order: [1] maintenance of current quality of programs and services; [2] improvement in the competitive level of faculty and staff compensation; and [3] investments that improve the quality of existing programs and services and support new programs and services. The sense is that priority [1] will be fulfilled before considering [2], and that a specified amount in [2] would be fulfilled before considering [3] (this may vary from college to college, however).

(over = > > > )
rolling, three-year budget planning, with four academic units' input each year; off years will accept revisions to previously entered three-year plans;

-- submission of capital, equipment, and computing budget requests at the same time as operating budget requests.

(4) Faculty who are interested over the next three to four months in contacting their state legislators with a highly focused message about UNM and Higher Education needs, please get in touch with Bel Campbell. This will be a vigorous, pro-active, constituent-based effort as opposed to direct lobbying in Santa Fe.

One reason for UNM's lack of consistent success in the Legislature is the highly disparate agendas of the metropolitan Albuquerque legislators. Our aim is to target as many of those legislators as possible with a clear, positive message from their constituents (faculty and others). We hope to reach faculty for this effort both through you, the Faculty Senators, and through department chairs.

The attached maps show the coverage of the various Bernalillo County legislative districts; also attached is a listing of the legislators for those districts. If the detail on these maps is insufficient to show you which house and senate districts are yours, you can contact the University Secretary's office or Bel Campbell to view a much more detailed map. You may also call the Bernalillo County Clerk's office at 768-4085 for this information.

Bel Campbell
Physics & Astronomy
x75148, fax71520
bel@triton or bel@unmb
Since time did not permit at our regular meeting, I have decided to put down several important matters for your information related to RPC activities for 1993-94. Some of these will be addressed by the subcommittees beginning immediately. Others are more in the nature of food for thought. It is essential, however, that the entire Committee have an overview of plans for this year from the outset and the opportunity to contribute to these or other issues.

1. UNM Technology Development Corporation (TDC). UNMTDC is a non-profit corporation formed by the Regents for the purpose of benefiting UNM by commercialization of inventions of the UNM faculty. The Regents have entered into an agreement with TDC in which UNM intellectual property will be assigned to TDC for development. The agreement necessitates clarification and modifications in both policies found in the Faculty Handbook and in administrative procedures related to ownership, disclosures, and disposal of technologies and inventions. Furthermore, the distribution of financial proceeds is to change from the present arrangement of 50% to the inventor and 50% to UNM to a new distribution of 40% to the inventor, 40% to TDC and 20% to the inventor's department. The Intellectual Property Subcommittee must begin work on these issues promptly.

2. ITV Policy. Last year we completed work on a policy on ownership and control of material developed by faculty for use on ITV. The Regents returned it because of a few questions. This, coupled with the establishment of a Distance Learning Center, and some unresolved issues with the ITV Policy Committee reporting to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, left the policy in limbo. I have met with Diane Shoemaker of the ITV Policy Committee and come to an understanding that RPC is responsible as a faculty committee for developing policy and that the ITV Policy committee is in fact responsible for operations of the Distance Learning Center. I am meeting with her and Dr. Bill Bramble, director of the Distance Learning Center, on Sept. 22 to chart the course for getting one policy in place to which we all agree.

3. Misconduct. Please review the UNM misconduct policy and procedures, Faculty handbook pp. D-12 through D-16 in light of the enclosed article from Science. Our policy and procedures have been tested only once up through the Inquiry Committee stage. It seems to have worked well in this one experience. Do we need to rethink our procedures? Even if we do not, it is important to develop an educational activity directed to the faculty on misconduct. How should that be done?
4. Interdisciplinary Research.

RPC is charged with oversight of the establishment, continuance, and review of research institutes, centers, bureaus, etc. We face a number of issues in this regard:

a). How do we understand these words: institute, center, bureau, etc?

b). We have received, or soon will, proposals for the establishment of several new research institutes (Assistive and Training Technologies, Biotechnology, Maui High Performance Computer Center,...). The Interdisciplinary Research Subcommittee will conduct a preliminary review of them for RPC recommendation to the Senate.

c). A broader, more long range issue is how and which we encourage. Ought we be involved in this question in any way?

d). It is timely to conduct reviews of several institutes. Initial steps have been taken with respect to the Center for Global Environmental Technologies (CGET). Two additional institutes are the Center for Micro-Engineered Ceramics (CMEC) and the Center for High Technology Materials (CHTM). The Interdisciplinary Research Subcommittee will coordinate these reviews.

e). We may find it necessary to consider the question of how to handle an educational function of research institutes. Please think about that a bit.

f). Indirect costs. See Item 5.

5. Indirect Cost IDC Distribution.

Ann Powell and Ellen Goldberg collected the information in the enclosed tables on how some of our sister institutions deal with research parks and overhead (IDC) distributions. Please UNM rather desperately needs a policy statement regarding use of IDC returns, especially as it pertains to centers and institutes, and also with respect to broader use of those discretionary resources. The Indirect Cost Subcommittee will develop a policy statement for RPC to consider.

6. Annual Research Recognition Award

The first announcement for nominations for the Annual Research Recognition Award has been made. We again look forward to participating in this most important and enjoyable experience.

7. Strategic Planning

Let me make a personal statement. We faculty of UNM must become more acutely aware that we are UNM. We come here as a diversity of backgrounds. Yet we do have certain features in common; most significantly a passion for understanding our world and for sharing what we learn with our students. Nevertheless, it is a great disappointment to me that I have so little opportunity to share with my faculty colleagues what I have come to know about the world from the perspective of a remote corner in the basement of the Chemistry Building and to learn from them what they know. I cannot believe that I am alone in this sentiment. What steps can we take in the direction of university? I have a few thoughts and ideas, but I invite yours. UNM could profit from serious discussion on this topic.


I expect to have a few concrete examples of progress on the federal laboratories-UNM front to give you at our October meeting.

Edward A. Walters
Chair

EAW/dg