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

The UNM Faculty Senate will meet on Tuesday, December 14, 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 November 9, 1993

3. Senate President's Report -- Professor Bel Campbell
   a. Memorial Minutes for Professor Emeritus Wilson Ivins and Professor Emerita Dorothy Cline

4. Committee Reports
   a. Teaching Enhancement Committee
   b. Admissions & Registration Committee
   c. Library Committee

5. Items from Student Affairs
   a. Proposed Revision of the Student Grievance Procedure (INFORMATION ONLY) -- Dean Karen Glaser
   b. Sanction Enhancement Policy -- Brian Polding, Assistant Dean of Students

6. Report from Provost - Mary Sue Coleman - deleted

7. Committee Appointments and Replacements

8. Approval of Degree Candidates for Semester I, 1993-94
The December 14, 1993 meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Bel Campbell at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

Senators present: Dave Baldwin (Zimmerman Library), Larry Barton (Biology), Jaynesanne Beene (English), Joan Bybee (Linguistics), Bel Campbell (Physics & Astronomy), Michele Diel (Valencia Branch), John Finkelstein (Management), Charles Fiedlermann (Elec & Comp Eng), Kenneth Gardner (Medicine), John Geissman (Earth & Planetary Sciences), Robert Glew (Biochemistry), Larry Gorbet (Anthropology), Deborah Graham (Med Centr Lib), Roy Johnson (Civil Engr), Kathleen Koehler (HPPEIP), Tam Kyner (Math & Stats), Cheryl Leanl (Nursing), Hany Lull (Centennial Library), John Matthews (Physics & Astronomy), Carolyn Hold (Microbiology), Kurt Nolte (Pathology), Peter Pabisch (Foreign Languages), Carolyn Mold (Microbiology), Berta Naves (Pathology), Howard Schreyer (Mech Engr), Jerome Shea (University College), Dianna Shomaker (Nursing), Robert Sickels (Political Science), Henry Tremblit (Journalism), Scott Walker (Psychiatry) and Gerald Weiss (Physiology).

Absent: Jane Bruker (Gallup Branch), Richard Coughlin (Sociology), Jeff Davis (Nurs & States), Eva Encinias (Theatre & Dance), Linda Hall (History), Ina Hart (Radiology), Demetra Lagohege (Dental Hygiene), William MacPherson (Law), Beth Miller (Gallup Branch), Paul Mrden (Medicine), Elizabeth Nielsen (Special Education), Leroy Ortiz (CIMIE), Lynette Oshima (CIMIE), Mario Rivera (Public Administration), Edward Reyes (Pharmacology), Gloria Sarto (Obstet & Gynecology), Russell Snyder (Neurology), Carolyn Voss (Medicine) and Helen Songolowicz (Gallup Branch).

Approval of the Agenda. The agenda was approved with the addition of the presentation of a resolution regarding the appointment of the dean of the College of Education following item 5(b).

Minutes of November 9, 1993. Senator Peter Pabisch noted that only the German Summer School, as mentioned on page 5 of the minutes, is held in Taos.

Senator Kathleen Koehler requested that additional detail be included in the section on the appointment of the dean of the College of Education. She told the Senate that she had already spoken with Barbara Thomas, Office of the University Secretary, who agreed to add more information on this important item.

A motion was made and approved that votes be recorded in the future when a division of the house is called.

The minutes of November 9, 1993 were approved with the above revisions.

Senate President’s Report. Senate President Bel Campbell urged all faculty members to respond to the UCIA-HERI Faculty Survey. She explained that there had
become some confusion regarding the local option questions and said that a clarification will be forthcoming.

President Campbell told the Senate that there had been continuing conversations regarding the appointment of the Dean of the College of Education. The main issues are at the core of the dispute: 1) the new Policy on the Appointment and Continuation in Office of Deans, approved by the Senate in April of 1992, was not submitted to the Regents for ratification and therefore might not be in effect. and 2) many faculty members maintain that policies and procedures should be followed regardless of all other issues. Additionally, some faculty have stated that they did not feel safe in providing a written response to the Provost’s inquiries regarding the appointment of Dean Blackwell.

Senator Kathleen Koehler stated that it was her understanding that the new policy was in effect following the vote of approval by the Senate in April 1992. The material approved at that meeting regarding department chairpersons was a revision of an existing policy with no action required by the Board of Regents. The section regarding deans, on the other hand, was entirely new and intended as a companion to the statement on chairs. It was her understanding that it was not intended to be made part of the Faculty Constitution. (PLEASE NOTE THAT THE MINUTES OF APRIL 1992 STATE THAT “IT WAS UNDERSTOOD THAT APPROPRIATE CHANGES WOULD BE MADE IN THE FACULTY CONSTITUTION” THIS ISSUE NEEDS TO BE CLARIFIED.)

Senator Koehler also said it was her belief that the issue of the format of the input from faculty in the College of Education was an issue. She stated that she respects the Provost’s action in asking for written comments from the faculty in Education. The request from the Provost was open-ended and responses ran the gamut of opinions regarding the restructuring in general, restructuring in particular, the process itself, the leadership of the Dean and the effectiveness of the Dean as an administrator as well as whether or not to conduct a search. She said it was her belief that the request for input was a good step but was incomplete.

President Campbell explained that the section on the Appointment and Continuation in Office of Deans, as approved by the Senate in April 1992, was in conflict with the existing statement which is part of the Faculty Constitution and also is a considerable expansion of the current statement. This issue now needs to be resolved.

President Campbell informed the Senate that:
- Richard Cady, Director of Planning and Policy Studies will soon retire. He will be missed.
- The Operations Committee will soon request nominations for the names for next year’s administrative reviews.
- A strong resolution is being considered by the Staff Council requesting an outside review of the performance of Carla Espinosa as the Director of Human Resources.
- The Budget Planning Guidelines for 1994-95 have been issued. Two primary changes are in place: a rolling three-year planning process and a comprehensive plan which includes capital, equipment and computing budget requests. The three units whose requests will be considered for 1994-95 are the College Fine Arts, the College of Engineering and the General Library. She acknowledged Professor Maurice Wildin and the Planning Council for their work on the Guidelines.
- Professor David Kaufman has been appointed to chair the Outcomes Assessment Committee upon the resignation of Susan Deese.
- She attended the November 19, 1993 meeting of the Gallup Branch faculty. She said they have serious concerns about salary, workloads and tenure and are now
working to develop a tenure and promotion policy which would be unique to that campus. President Campbell will attend future meetings when possible.

An additional committee member is needed on the Art In Public Places Committee. Anyone interested may contact Bel.

MEMORIAL MINUTES

President Campbell recognized the following deceased faculty members whose memorial minutes appear below: Professor Emerita Dorothy Cline (Political Science) and Professor Emeritus Wilson Ivins (Education).

MEMORIAL MINUTE FOR DOROTHY I. CLINE

Dorothy I. Cline, Professor Emerita of Political Science at the University of New Mexico, died at her home in Albuquerque on December 4, 1993, at the age of 89. She was born in Michigan, worked for Harry Hopkins during the New Deal, and earned a bachelor's degree at the University of Michigan and a master's degree in political science at the University of Chicago. She remained, accordingly, active in both civic and academic affairs throughout her long life.

In 1936, she served as training director in the Recreation Division of the Works Progress Administration and later as a community analyst for the Office of Civil Defense. In New Mexico, along with her teaching and writing, she was chair of the Bernalillo County Commission, organizer and chair of the New Mexico Commission on the Status of Women, vice president of the New Mexico Constitutional Convention, and director of health and recreation in the State Department of Education, and in 1967 she was appointed by President Johnson to the National Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. At the University, Professor Cline was director of the Division of Government Research. After her retirement, she received the New Mexico Distinguished Public Service Award.

In 1946, she became the first woman in the Department of Government, as it was then known, and helped change its name to Government and Citizenship. Later, certainly without her encouragement, it became more austerely the Department of Political Science. Among her later publications were an essay on "Constitutional Politics in New Mexico: 1910-1976" in New Mexico Government (1976), New Mexico's 1910 Constitution (1985), and Reorganization of the Executive Branch of State Government (1978). She retired in 1970 and remained active to the end. She will be remembered as a person of extraordinary drive, courage, and candor.

The memorial minute for Professor Wilson Ivins has not been submitted.

Committee Reports.

Professor Paul Kerkof, chairman of the Teaching Enhancement Committee, presented a report from the committee. He explained that there are five subcommittees and a task force. The Committee was established in 1996 to encourage and foster better teaching at UNM. Prior to the establishment of the Teaching Enhancement Committee, there were several teaching awards given at UNM. The responsibility for administering these awards has now been consolidated into an Awards & Grants sub-committee currently chaired by Professor Shino Komi. During the past year, Greg Candela of the Valencia Branch Campus received the Alumni Association Teaching Award of $1,000. The Teacher of the Year Awards were not offered this past year therefore, this year there will be three awarded in the
amount of $2,000 each as well as five teaching assistantship awards in the amount of $500 each.

Last year, the Burlington Resources Foundation Awards of $2,500 each were received by Fritz Allen (Chemistry), Noel Campbell (Physics & Astronomy), Kathleen Kohler (Nutrition) and George Lufer (Computer Science). This was the last year that the Burlington Awards will be given and a new sponsor is being sought.

This last year, the UNM Presidential Fellows Awards were initiated. These are the most prestigious awards at UNM. The first two recipients were Ed Angel (Computer Science) and Gordon Hodge (Psychology).

The Teaching Allocation sub-committee, chaired by Gregory Howell, administers and makes allocations from the faculty teaching fund. This sub-committee evaluates faculty generated proposals and makes grants of up to $2,500 from a total fund of $15,000. This is the third year for this program. Professor Kerkof explained that there has been a delay in the call for proposals this year but it is anticipated that the call will go out in the next few weeks.

The Teaching Resource Center Task Force, chaired by Rosalie Otero, was initiated last spring for the purpose of establishing a center where faculty can obtain assistance in enhancing their teaching abilities. The assistance of recipients of the awards mentioned above can be obtained at the Center. The Faculty Development Office has made space available to house the Teaching Resource Center and a proposal to establish the Center will be brought to the Senate for official action at the beginning of the spring semester.

A Media Services sub-committee, which was called for in the original charge to the Teaching Enhancement Committee, has been established to investigate the current operations of media services and to examine the condition of the audio-visual equipment. A report from this sub-committee, chaired by Jane Hood, is expected in the spring semester.

A Task Force on Salary Rewards for Teaching Excellence, chaired by Professor Erichus Chester Travelstead, was created in 1991. The recommendations of the Task Force have been approved and call for implementation of methods to increase the importance of teaching excellence by awarding annual salary increases and in tenure and promotion decisions. Chairpersons and deans are required to submit annually, in writing, to the Provost a description of methods of evaluation and formulas used in recommending salary increases based on quality of teaching within their units.

The Task Force also recommended that some form of fair evaluation of teaching performance be required for all faculty. To this end, a Teaching Evaluation sub-committee, chaired by Patrick McNamara, was established this semester to investigate methods of evaluating teaching performance at UNM as well as other universities and to make recommendations to the Teaching Enhancement Committee.

In November 1993, an ad-hoc sub-committee on implementation of the recommendations on rewards for teaching excellence was initiated. This sub-committee is chaired by Charles Beckell and is charged with determining the role, if any, that the Teaching Enhancement Committee should play in ensuring that the policies of the original Task Force on Salary Rewards for Teaching Excellence are correctly interpreted, implemented and adhered to.
Professor Ed Reyes for the Admissions & Registration Committee told the Senate that the Committee met eight times last year and acted on the following items:

-It examined the ITV document to ascertain if the Admissions & Registration Committee needed to involve itself in ITV activities and found that it was not necessary.
-It discussed the Core Curriculum and the Committee believes that the commonly accepted core of general education requirements is desirable but the issue is still unresolved.
-It prepared a proposal for increasing freshman admission standards which was discussed at two Faculty Senate meetings and those new standards were approved at the January 1993 Faculty Senate meeting.
-It examined the process regarding use of orange cards for a variety of "non-normal" course changes. A new pink card system was approved and implemented at the beginning of the second semester.
-It prepared a proposal for the evaluation of technical credits. This issue has become much more complex due to the types of programs offered at the UNM branch campuses. The issue remains unresolved and discussion is continuing.
-A questionnaire was prepared regarding the policy for determining if faculty are interested in changing to a less liberal policy for the drop date for courses.

Items pending are a policy which would add to student transcripts, where appropriate, the words "with distinction": use of forms A, B and C for curricula changes and classroom usage.

Professor Richard Williams presented a report from the Library Committee. He told the Senate that almost all of the Committee's time has been focused upon adequate funding for the libraries. The effects of the current inadequate funding are that journal subscription orders have to be prioritized due to increasing costs and book acquisitions are restrained. Some salary monies have been converted to acquisitions resulting in loss of expected service. The Library Committee has supported the Library in these difficult decisions.

Professor Williams said also that many books are deteriorating and there are losses due to damage and theft.

Dean Migneault has spoken with the Committee regarding funding for the next year and it is anticipated that funding will be better than in past years and Provost Coleman has said that she will work in Santa Fe with the Legislature for an improved formula for library funding which would be consistent with the vision for UNM as a great research institution.

The Committee has had to confront the issue of access vs acquisition which has been going on in many other institutions as well. This discussion involves availability by electronic media and Professor Williams said it should be very closely examined and discussed here at UNM.

A question was asked regarding library resources for the branches and centers of UNM outside Albuquerque and Professor Williams said that the Committee had not addressed this particular issue.

Senator Alan Reed, Director of UNM North Graduate Centers, said there is a library task force working now which has met with library administrators. They plan to systematically assess library services in the northern New Mexico locations. They also are making contact with the State Library, Los Alamos National Library and the Museum of New Mexico Library System. He said the report which will come from these meetings will be forwarded to the Senate Library Committee.
Item from Student Affairs. Brian Foulding, Assistant Dean of Students, presented the following resolution regarding the Sanction Enhancement Policy, which would be used in conjunction with the Student Code of Conduct and the Visitor Code of Conduct.

WHEREAS, there have been recent acts of vandalism on campus which appear to have been targeted at particular groups because of the group's race, gender, or ethnicity; and

WHEREAS, UNM supports equal opportunity for all, regardless of race, color, religion, national origin, physical or mental handicap, age, sex, sexual preference, ancestry, or medical condition; and

WHEREAS, Violations of University rules and regulations, where the harm is targeted at a group or individual because of such characteristics, produces special harm not only to the targeted individual, but also to other members of that protected group, members of other protected groups, and to the campus community at large;

NOW THEREFORE,

The Student Code of Conduct, Section 4 (Sanctions) is amended by adding the following new subsection:

4.3 The sanction imposed shall be set based upon numerous factors, including the severity of the offense, the amount of harm created, the student's record, and sanctions imposed in recent years for similar offenses. In considering the harm created, there shall be taken into account whether any harm or injury was targeted against a person or group because of that person or group's race, color, religion, national origin, physical or mental handicap, age, sex, sexual preference, ancestry, or medical condition.

The Visitor Code of Conduct, Section 4 (Sanctions) is amended by adding the following new subsection:

4.4 The sanction imposed shall be set based upon numerous factors, including the severity of the offense, the amount of harm created, the visitor's record, and sanctions imposed in recent years for similar offenses. In considering the harm created, there shall be taken into account whether any harm or injury was targeted against a person or group because of that person or group's race, color, religion, national origin, physical or mental handicap, age, sex, sexual preference, ancestry, or medical condition.

The proposed policy is intended to address the issue of motivation in sanctioning or criminal penalty in offenses involving bias on the part of perpetrators of acts of vandalism. The policy is not a hate speech policy but could be viewed as a hate offense policy, Foulding explained. He also said that Robert Bienstock, UNM Legal Counsel, was present to answer questions.

The resolution was approved by the Senate as presented.
A proposed revision of the Student Grievance Procedure was presented for information only. Karen Glaser, Dean of Students, explained that the reasons for the proposed revision are the need for a policy that would be much less cumbersome to administer, the need for greater clarity within the policy, the need to include items that are now mandated by federal law and the need for a policy that is less time consuming for everyone concerned.

The summary of the most significant changes proposed follows.

-The nomenclature of the Procedure and the Committee have been changed. The Student Standards & Grievance Procedure has become the Student Grievance Procedure, and the Student Standards & Grievance Committee has become the Student Conduct Committee.

-The role of the Committee and its place in the administrative hierarchy has been changed. The Committee would serve under the Dean of Students, and serve as an alternative to the Student Discipline Officer to decide discipline cases. Currently the Committee is an independent body that reviews decisions of the Dean of Students Office on appeal. This revision allows the student to make a choice between the Discipline Officer (Assistant Dean) and the Committee rather than running the appeal first through the Discipline Officer, then the Committee and then the Vice President who usually assigns the case to an Associate Vice President. This procedure is the one most often used by public research institutions (as well as others) in other states throughout the country.

-The Dean of Students would assume an appellate role, reviewing decisions of the Committee and the Student Discipline Officer.

-The Procedure explicitly provides for enforcement of the Visitor Code of Conduct.

-The Procedure formalizes the practice of the Student Discipline Officer (SDO) providing accused students a choice of procedures to use. The SDO can offer students a menu of choices including formal or informal hearings before the SDO, mediation, or a formal hearing before the Committee.

-It eliminates the right of appeal for minor disciplinary sanctions. Appeal would be permissible only for sanctions of probation, suspension, expulsion and banishment from campus.

-It permits the consolidation of evidence on cases in which a number of individuals were involved in the same wrongful act.

-In cases in which criminal proceedings are occurring concurrently, it would give the SDO greater discretion to decide whether or not to proceed, and require interim probation or suspension pending the outcome of the outside civil or criminal proceedings.

-It makes explicit provisions for emergency banishment from campus.

-It includes specific rights of the accused, and of the victim, with special provisions for sexual and physical assault victims.

-It gives the Dean of Students veto authority over other campus bodies creating appeals to the Student Conduct Committee. This will not affect those organizations currently using this process.

-It provides greater flexibility for selecting Committee panels by increasing the pool, and giving the Administrator authority to select panel members for each case.

President Campbell asked if there was any plan for mediation in the proposed new procedure. Assistant Dean Bolding answered that mediation is currently one avenue for resolving grievances, particularly between students and the Dean of Students’ office. If the proposed Mediation Center, which would be administered by the Department of Communication and Journalism, is approved, it will be used.
Assistant Dean Folding said that further input will be requested before the proposed policy is presented to the Senate for approval.

Resolution Regarding the Appointment of the Dean of the College of Education. Associate Provost Janet Keenback spoke on behalf of Provost Coleman and said the issue had been discussed at the November Faculty Senate meeting and everyone had been informed that it was to be an item on the November agenda. She pointed out that the issue was thoroughly discussed at that meeting and the Senate had rendered its decision. She further said that the Provost was not able to attend this meeting and that it would be inappropriate to repeat the discussion.

Senator Sickels read the following motion.

Because a dean of the College of Education has been chosen by administrative action alone, and because we believe that full faculty participation in the selection of deans, as of other principal academic administrators, is essential at a good university, we call upon the Provost to reconsider her decision, for the benefit of the College of Education and the morale of the University.

Because, also, we are well aware that the Provost has lately rejected pleas to reconsider, we urge her at least to reduce the new appointee’s term from three years to one. A one-year term would allow time for the college to concentrate on restructuring before a new search for dean—a prime concern of the Provost in her recent statement to the Senate—and it would be a welcome symbol of good faith and mutual accommodation.

The motion was seconded and Professor Keith Auger of the College of Education was recognized. Professor Auger said that four different rationales have been offered for the selection of the current Dean of the College of Education: 1) that the College of Education is in the process of restructuring, 2) that women are an underutilized group, 3) that the appointee has done a good job and 4) that the College of Education had already experienced two failed searches. Professor Auger explained that the official and approved Affirmative Action document contains no exceptions to a due process search and, further, it constitutes a contract between faculty and staff and the administration. He said that the Affirmative Action Document provides for addressing the issue of underutilization of all groups in the context of a due process search only. It does not leave room for discretionary decisions. The fact that the appointee has done a good job, he said, is irrelevant. The issue is due process.

Professor Auger said the Administration must accept some responsibility for the failed searches. The first failed search resulted when the candidate reported back to the faculty that there was no sense of support from the central administration. The second failed search failed for the same reason. When the second choice candidate was offered the position, he was told it would be a one-year appointment and he rejected the offer.

The issue, he stated, is not only the problem of the College of Education but of all University faculty and any other unit which will undertake restructuring in the future. If the Senate permits this to be the precedent, then all of our rights will be diminished. A climate of fear and intimidation exists in the College of Education, Professor Auger said, and it will not be turned around by the College alone. None of this situation exists because of personalities, but because of the absence of external norms which permit faculty to operate as faculty. What is in operation now is internal criteria, idiosyncratic criteria
determined by the Administration, and the Senate can help turn the situation around. Even if the Provost does not respond to the motion on the floor, it is the responsibility of the Senate to record its sentiment. He asked that the Senate consider their actions as a due process issue and not as one of support for the Provost or the Provost’s appointees and said this is not a legal issue but a good faith issue between Provost Coleman and the faculty.

Senator Howard Shreyer said he had not been comfortable about the way the issue was handled at the November Senate meeting and he spoke in favor of the motion before the Senate as a protest vote. He commended Senator Kathleen Koehler for bringing the issue before the Faculty Senate in November, however, he expressed concern that the issue was not brought to the Senate in the first place.

Senator Schreyer suggested that a Senate oversight committee be established and asked why the motion at the November Senate meeting was not presented by the Operations Committee with a recommendation. He said it appeared to him that at the November meeting, the opponents of the motion presented at that time had their argument ready and that debate had been cut off prematurely. He also said it was his belief that even though Dean Blackwell is competent, a full search should have been conducted.

President Campbell explained that the Operations Committee could not agree on a recommendation with which to bring the motion to the Senate, therefore it was presented without one.

Senator Richard Santos said he feels the matter is important and moved to table the discussion. Senator Alan Reed seconded the motion and said he had not been part of an organized effort at the November meeting to defeat the motion as suggested by Senator Schreyer and that he, in fact, did not know prior to the meeting that the issue would be discussed. He said the Senate had expressed its wishes and it was his belief that everyone had been given the opportunity to speak in November.

Senator Sickels said the large amount of time for discussion of this issue is warranted in light of its importance and Senator Larry Gorbet spoke against the motion to table. Gorbet said it was his understanding that there is a "cataclysmic decline in morale" in the College of Education.

Professor Auger was recognized and confirmed Senator Gorbet’s opinion about morale. He explained that during the past summer, while most faculty were absent, two associate deans were appointed without any consultation with the faculty. He urged the Senate to not table the motion, but to take action now as a due process issue.

Senator Tom Kyner said the issue should be dealt with directly and requested that the Operations Committee provide the Senate with information about any restructuring abuses as well as the general situation in the College of Education. President Campbell responded that the Operations Committee would not want to deal with restructuring but would wish to keep the two issues separate. She said the College of Education senators have been asked for more information about restructuring.

The vote to table the motion indefinitely was 14 in favor and 16 against and therefore the motion failed.

The Senate then voted on the main motion which also failed by a vote of 10 in favor and 19 opposed.
President Campbell asked that any further information regarding these issues in the College of Education be brought to the attention of the Senate Operations Committee.

Professor Auger thanked the Senate for its reconsideration.

Committee Replacements. Upon recommendation of the Senate Operations Committee, the Senate approved the following committee replacements: Jim Porter (Management) for Bandshal V. Ravinder (Management) on the Curricula Committee and Richard Reid (Management) for John Finkelstein (Management) on the Undergraduate Committee.

Approval of Degree Candidates for Semester I, 1993-94. Upon recommendation of the various schools and colleges, the Senate approved degree candidates for Semester I, 1993-94.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Thomas
Barbara Thomas, Secretary
The Teaching Enhancement Committee, one of the University Faculty Standing Committees, has been in existence for three years. The Committee was established in 1990 to promote, support, enhance, and reward teaching throughout the University of New Mexico system. The subcommittees and task forces of the TEC recommend new policies and programs and oversee approved procedures for teaching enhancement, recognition and reward. There are currently five subcommittees and one task force responsible to the Teaching Enhancement Committee. The overall function of these units is outlined below.

Awards and Fellowships Subcommittee (TECAF)
A number of awards for teaching excellence are available to faculty at UNM. This subcommittee administers these award programs.
1. Alumni Association Teaching Award - one @ $1000.
2. Teacher of the Year Awards - two @ $2000.
3. Burlington Resource Foundation Faculty Achievement Awards - four @ $2500.
4. UNM Presidential Teaching Fellows Awards - two @ $2500/yr for two years plus $1000/yr for two years added to base salary.

Teaching Allocations Subcommittee (TAS)
Administers and makes allocations from the Faculty Teaching Fund. This subcommittee calls for and evaluates proposals from faculty directed to the development of more effective methods of communicating information, of teaching critical and analytical thinking, and of formulating ideas and exploring methods of inquiry. Grants of up to $2500 are available from a total yearly fund of $35,000.

Teaching Evaluation Subcommittee (TES)
This is a newly-created subcommittee in the fall semester of 1993. The main charge of this subcommittee is to investigate various methods of evaluating teaching performance by faculty at this University. This is an extension of an earlier Teaching Quality and Effectiveness Subcommittee (TQ&E). The procedures proposed by this subcommittee, if approved and implemented, will be used as part of the formula in determinations of annual salary increases, promotion and tenure decisions, and teaching awards.

Teaching Resource Center Task Force (TRC)
This task force was initiated in the spring semester of 1993. A proposal to establish a Teaching Resource Center was submitted to the Faculty Senate Operations Committee in August of 1993 for their consideration. The Center is envisioned as a place where recipients of teaching awards, etc. will be available to share teaching techniques and skills with other faculty. Assistance is anticipated to be confidential. The Center will house books, articles, videos, etc. on teaching methodology.

Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Implementation of the Recommendations on Salary Rewards for Teaching Excellence
This Ad Hoc Subcommittee is charged with determining what role, if any, the Teaching Enhancement Committee should play in ensuring that the policies of the original Task Force on Salary Rewards for Teaching Excellence are correctly interpreted, implemented, and adhered to.

Media Services Subcommittee (MSS)
This subcommittee is charged with assessing the present condition and operation of Media Services. The subcommittee will make recommendations for establishment of a more effective, up-to-date Audio Visual Facility.
The following subcommittees and task force have completed their original charges and are either no
longer in existence or have evolved into other subcommittees and task forces:

Programs for Teaching Development Subcommittee (PTD)
This subcommittee made recommendations for a number of teaching development
programs of a university-wide character. One of their recommendations was that new faculty be
advised during their orientation that good teaching is important to their advancement at UNM. The
subcommittee also recommended a mentoring program for new faculty, teaching workshops, etc.
The establishment of the Teaching Resource Center Task Force was a result, in part, of the activity
and recommendations of this subcommittee.

Teaching Quality and Effectiveness Subcommittee (TQ&E)
This subcommittee was charged with the responsibility of defining what constitutes quality
teaching. The subcommittee prepared an extensive bibliography of publications on teaching
methods, effectiveness, etc. They also ran an essay contest on teaching quality sponsored by the
Public Service Company of New Mexico and awarded three $500 prizes. The efforts and reports
of this subcommittee constitute a valuable resource for the new Teaching Evaluation
Subcommittee.

Task Force on Salary Rewards for Teaching Excellence (SRTE)
The recommendations of this task force have been approved and are now University
policy. The new policies include a commitment to teaching excellence and implementation of
procedures for effective and equitable evaluation of teaching performance leading to decisions on
salary increases, promotion, and tenure. Department Chairs and Deans of Colleges are required to
submit in writing what methods of evaluation and what formulas they use in decisions on annual
salary increases, tenure and promotion. The newly-created Teaching Evaluation Subcommittee and
the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Implementation of the Recommendations on Salary Rewards for
Teaching Excellence will aid in the final implementation and adherence to the new policies
formulated by this task force.
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The following subcommittees and task force have completed their original charges and are either no longer in existence or have evolved into other subcommittees and task forces:

**Programs for Teaching Development Subcommittee (PTD)**

This subcommittee made recommendations for a number of teaching development programs of a university-wide character. One of their recommendations was that new faculty be advised during their orientation that good teaching is important to their advancement at UNM. The subcommittee also recommended a mentoring program for new faculty, teaching workshops, etc. The establishment of the Teaching Resource Center Task Force was a result, in part, of the activity and recommendations of this subcommittee.

**Teaching Quality and Effectiveness Subcommittee (TQ&E)**

This subcommittee was charged with the responsibility of defining what constitutes quality teaching. The subcommittee prepared an extensive bibliography of publications on teaching methods, effectiveness, etc. They also ran an essay contest on teaching quality sponsored by the Public Service Company of New Mexico and awarded three $500 prizes. The efforts and reports of this subcommittee constitute a valuable resource for the new Teaching Evaluation Subcommittee.

**Task Force on Salary Rewards for Teaching Excellence (SRTE)**

The recommendations of this task force have been approved and are now University policy. The new policies include a commitment to teaching excellence and implementation of procedures for effective and equitable evaluation of teaching performance leading to decisions on salary increases, promotion, and tenure. Department Chairs and Deans of Colleges are required to submit in writing what methods of evaluation and what formulas they use in decisions on annual salary increases, tenure and promotion. The newly-created Teaching Evaluation Subcommittee and the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Implementation of the Recommendations on Salary Rewards for Teaching Excellence will aid in the final implementation and adherence to the new policies formulated by this task force.

**INTRODUCTORY REMARKS TO EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Over the past year, members of the Dean of Students Staff including the Student Discipline Officer and Robert Bienstock of the University Counsel’s Office have worked on revising the Student Standards and Grievance Policy.

There are a number of reasons why the policy needs revision:

Need a policy that was much less cumbersome to administer
Need for greater clarity within the policy
Items that are now mandated by federal law needed to be included
Need for a policy that was less time consuming for everyone

Approval or consensus is now sought from Faculty Senate, Student Government and President’s Council. Final approval rests with the Regents.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF STUDENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE**

This summary lists the most significant changes from the Student Standards & Grievance Procedure to the proposed Student Grievance Procedure.

- The nomenclature of the Procedure and the Committee have been changed. The Student Standards & Grievance Procedure has become the Student Grievance Procedure, and the Student Standards & Grievance Committee has become the Student Conduct Committee.

- The role of the Committee and its place in the administrative hierarchy has been changed. The Committee would serve under Dean of Students, and serve as an alternative to the Student Discipline Officer to decide discipline cases. Currently the Committee is an independent body that reviews decisions of the Dean of Students Office on appeal. This revision allows the student to make a choice between the Discipline Officer (Assistant Dean) and the Committee rather than running the appeal first through the Discipline Officer, then the Committee and then the Vice President who usually assigns the case to an Associate Vice President. This procedure is the one most often used by public research institutions (as well as others) in other states throughout the country.

- The Dean of Students would assume an appellate role, reviewing decisions of the Committee and the Student Discipline Officer.

- The Procedure explicitly provides for enforcement of the Visitor Code of Conduct.
The Procedure formalizes the practice of the Student Discipline Officer (SDO) providing accused students a choice of procedures to use. The SDO can offer students a menu of choices including formal or informal hearings before the SDO, mediation, or a formal hearing before the Committee.

- Eliminate the right of appeal for minor disciplinary sanctions. Appeal would be permissible only for sanctions of probation, suspension, expulsion and banishment from campus.

- Permit the consolidation of evidence on cases in which a number of individuals were involved in the same wrongful act.

- In cases in which criminal proceedings are occurring concurrently, give the SDO greater discretion to decide whether or not to proceed, and require interim probation or suspension pending the outcome of the outside civil or criminal proceedings.

- Make explicit provisions for emergency banishment from campus.

- Include specific rights of the accused, and of the victim, with special provisions for sexual and physical assault victims.

- Give Dean of Students veto authority over other campus bodies creating appeals to the Student Conduct Committee. This will not affect those organizations currently using this process.

- Provide greater flexibility for selecting Committee panels by increasing the pool, and giving the Administrator authority to select panel members for each case.

Revised: 11-16-1993
SANCTION ENHANCEMENT POLICY
December 1, 1993

WHEREAS, There have been recent acts of vandalism on campus which appear to have been targeted at particular groups because of the group's race, gender, or ethnicity; and

WHEREAS, UNM supports equal opportunity for all, regardless of race, color, religion, national origin, physical or mental handicap, age, sex, sexual preference, ancestry, or medical condition; and

WHEREAS, violations of University rules and regulations, where the harm is targeted at a group or individual because of such characteristics, produces special harm not only to the targeted individuals, but also to other members of that protected group, members of other protected groups, and to the campus community at large;

NOW, THEREFORE,

The Student Code of Conduct, Section 4 (Sanctions) is amended by adding the following new subsection:

4.3 The sanction imposed shall be set based upon numerous factors, including the severity of the offense, the amount of harm created, the student's record, and sanctions imposed in recent years for similar offenses. In considering the harm created, there shall be taken into account whether any harm or injury was targeted against a person or group because of that person or group's race, color, religion, national origin, physical or mental handicap, age, sex, sexual preference, ancestry, or medical condition.

The Visitor Code of Conduct, Section 4 (Sanctions) is amended by adding the following new subsection:

4.4 The sanction imposed shall be set based upon numerous factors, including the severity of the offense, the amount of harm created, the visitor's record, and sanctions imposed in recent years for similar offenses. In considering the harm created, there shall be taken into account whether any harm or injury was targeted against a person or group because of that person or group's race, color, religion, national origin, physical or mental handicap, age, sex, sexual preference, ancestry, or medical condition.
The University of New Mexico
To: Faculty Senate
From: Operations Committee
Subject: Committee Replacements

Date: December 6, 1993

The following are submitted for Senate approval:

CURRICULA COMMITTEE
Jim Porter, Management, 1994 for Handanbal V. Ravinder, Management, 1994

UNDERGRADUATE COMMITTEE
Richard Reid, Management, 1994 for John Finkelstein, Management, 1994
1. **There will be a Faculty Senate in January!** The meeting will be held at the usual time in the Kiva on Tuesday, 18 January, 1994.

2. The faculty are strongly urged to respond to the UCLA-HERI Faculty Survey which they should have just received in campus mail. All responses will be treated confidentially. Three separate populations (N = 1650) have received this survey: full-time tenure-track faculty, part-time faculty who are teaching in the current semester, and administrators with faculty status. Analysis of the survey responses will take place at UNM in the Planning and Policy Studies Office, with oversight by the Long Range Planning Committee. Please return your responses in the envelope provided to the University Secretary's Office, room 101, Scholes Hall.

Directions for answering the local option questions are ambiguous. The P&PS Office is sending out clarification via campus mail which should reach faculty in a few days.

3. The Senate President and two members of the Operations Committee have met with the Provost in further attempts to clarify faculty concerns with the method of reappointment of the Dean of the College of Education. There appear to be two main issues at the core of the dispute:

   (1) The Senate-approved (4/14/92) policy on the Appointment and Continuation in Office of Deans contains language significantly different from that contained in the Faculty Constitution [Article III, Sec. 3(a)], changes to which require ratification by the Board of Regents. As this policy was never submitted to the Regents for discussion or approval, it is arguably not in effect. The Provost says, however, that her written consultation with College of Education faculty nevertheless fulfilled the spirit of this policy, of which she was unaware at the time she made the reappointment.

   Faculty Constitution Article III, Sec. 3(a): "Deans of Colleges and Schools: The appointment of Deans of Colleges shall be recommended to the Regents by the President after appropriate consultation with all Department Heads of the College concerned, University Officers, and other interested persons."

   (2) Many faculty are adamant that adherence to policy and procedures should remain independent of all other issues (in this case, for example, College-wide restructuring), arguing that any departure from procedure, however worthwhile the reason, sets a precedent for ignoring the procedure in the event of arbitrary or less worthwhile circumstances. The Provost reiterates that she acted in good faith in polling the College of Education faculty, and that no official policy or procedure was ignored. Evidence that some College faculty did not feel safe in giving their responses in writing fail to dissuade her.

A joint AF&T-Faculty Senate has been established to develop a Confidentiality Policy of Faculty Records for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook. The chair of the committee is Bill MacPherson (Law), Senate Vice President and member of AF&T. The other members are: Lynn Beene (English, Senator and AF&T member), Harry Lull (CSEL, At-Large Senator), Lyn Osihama (College of Education, Senator), and Shane Phelan (Political Science, Senator).

A comparison of UNM's tuition and fees with those of its CHE peer institutions is attached.

Excerpts from the most recent report of the UNM Police Department are attached.
6. The membership of the just-established Task Force on Continuing Education is:
   Tom Dodson, Dean, College of Fine Arts (chair)
   Bill Bramble, Director, Distance Education Center
   Fred Chreist, Registrar
   Donna Dionne, Faculty Contracts
   Karen Hinton, Program Manager, UNM North
   Max Kerlin, Special Asst. to Provost
   Teresa Marquez, Zimmerman Library (Senate appointee)
   Richard Santos, Economics
   Jan Schuetz, Communication & Journalism
   Polly Turner, Assoc. Dean, College of Education
   Julie Weaks, Budget Director
   (additional member from T-VI to be appointed)

7. The on-line Faculty Information utility is still pending. Personnel at CIRT have been unresponsive to our requests for status and information.

8. Richard Cady, Director the Office on Planning and Policy Studies, has submitted his resignation effective May, 1994. Currently the Office reports to the President; preliminary indications are that they will begin reporting to the Provost at that time.

9. The Research Policy Committee has unanimously approved a resolution expressing appreciation to Dodd Bogart and the Budget Committee for their work on documenting the steady decline in faculty salaries over the past two decades.

10. The Staff Council is considering a strong resolution requesting an outside review of Carla Espinoza’s performance as Director of Human Resources. The text of that resolution may be available at today’s Senate meeting.

11. Earlier this fall, President Peck agreed to release to the Senate the results of administrative reviews requested by us. (The review of University Counsel Nick Estes has presumably been completed, as has University College Dean John Rinaldi’s. We have asked the President for copies of both reviews.) General Library Dean Robert Migneault’s review is just underway; the chair of that committee is Dean Bill Gordon from A&S.

12. At the January Senate meeting, the Operations Committee will be requesting nominations for objects of next year’s administrative reviews.

13. Please note attached selected tables from the report, "Fall 1993 UNM Main Campus Full Time Faculty Salaries and Other Selected Indicators," prepared by the Office of Planning and Policy Studies. Excluded from the report are: medical school faculty, librarians with faculty rank, branch faculty, and administrators above the level of department chair with faculty appointments.

14. The Long Range Planning Committee is devising a proposed Policy and Procedures for New and Revised Centers, Institutes, and Academics Units at UNM or Governed by UNM. The purpose of this policy is to have a coherent means of dealing with hybrid (e.g., cross-college, research + academic) organizations. There are two such proposed hybrids already in line: an Institute on Broadcasting and Media Studies, and an organization to administer the Maui Supercomputing project.

15. The Budget Planning Guidelines for 1994-95 have been issued. Two primary changes are in place: a rolling, 3-year budget planning process; and a comprehensive plan which includes capital, equipment, and computing budget requests. The three units for 1994-95 are: Fine Arts, Engineering, and the General Library.
### COMPARISON OF UNM TO NMCHE-APPROVED PEER GROUP

**TUITION AND FEE RATES**

**FULL-TIME, UNDERGRADUATE**

**1993-94**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. of Arizona</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>1,778</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>6,934</td>
<td>7,284</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Arkansas, Fayetteville</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>4,718</td>
<td>4,970</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Colorado, Boulder</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>11,352</td>
<td>12,080</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Iowa</td>
<td>2,228</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>7,191</td>
<td>7,740</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Kansas</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>5,970</td>
<td>6,538</td>
<td>9.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Kentucky</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>5,358</td>
<td>6,198</td>
<td>15.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Missouri, Columbia</td>
<td>2,812</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>7,672</td>
<td>8,564</td>
<td>11.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Nebraska, Lincoln</td>
<td>2,187</td>
<td>2,187</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5,367</td>
<td>5,628</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Oklahoma, Norman</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>4,941</td>
<td>5,348</td>
<td>8.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Oregon</td>
<td>2,721</td>
<td>2,916</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>7,851</td>
<td>9,285</td>
<td>18.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of South Carolina</td>
<td>2,818</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>7,046</td>
<td>7,808</td>
<td>10.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Tennessee, Knoxville</td>
<td>1,898</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>5,498</td>
<td>5,762</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Texas, Austin</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>5,512</td>
<td>5,771</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Utah</td>
<td>2,105</td>
<td>2,298</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>6,075</td>
<td>6,795</td>
<td>11.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Virginia</td>
<td>3,890</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>10,826</td>
<td>12,254</td>
<td>13.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Washington</td>
<td>2,253</td>
<td>2,532</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>6,345</td>
<td>7,134</td>
<td>12.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peer Average**

| w/o UNM | 2,235 | 2,433 | 8.86 |

| UNM as a Percent of Peer Average | 74% | 73% | 86.6% | 86.8% |

**SOURCE:** NASULGC and AASCU, STUDENT CHARGES AT PUBLIC, FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS, FALL, 1993
During October, 1993 security in the parking structure area continued to be problematic for the University community. While no sexual assaults were reported, vandalism of vehicles did occur and more seriously, one hospital security guard was shot at shortly after observing signs of vehicles having been burglarized in the structure. The seriousness of this situation caused UNM Police, Hospital Security, Facility Planning and Parking Services to embark on a serious proactive security effort for the safety of persons in the parking structure. Armed police personnel were assigned to patrol the parking structure twenty-four hours a day with a person stationed at the entrance to monitor vehicular activity.

The number of reported larceny incidents rose significantly this month as did the number of motor vehicle thefts. However, no violent crime was reported other than the aforementioned shooting.
December 1, 1993
To: Orelia Zuniga Forbes
From: Bill Tryens, Staff Electrical Engineer 7-1141

Re: Exterior Lighting Projects

As you requested, I have prepared a list of Campus lighting projects completed since the 1989 Lighting Study:

Yale Pedestrian Mall - Created an excellent north-south pathway from Central Ave. to the Duck Pond.

Medical School Mall - Upgraded all the lighting on the Medical Campus Mall east of Basic Medical Sciences.

Northeast of the Psychology Building - Lighting at existing sidewalk to complete a pathway from Terrace Street Mall to Redondo Drive, east of Psychology.

South of Woodward Hall - New lighting for a very dark path between Woodward Hall and the Art Building. Made a east-west pathway from Yale Mall to Cornell Mall.

Walkway around the Kiva - Added new lights in a heavily traveled area.

Mesa Vista Hall - New lighting for two courtyards and the walkways from the Women's Center.

University House - Lighting improvements for the driveway and east patio lighting.

Onate Hall - New area lighting around the building and for the new accessible pathways.

Student Residence Center - New lighting to create a "mall" type pathway from the Commons Building to the southwest corner of Hokona Hall.

Zimmerman Library - Upgraded lighting on both the north and south entrances to the library.

North Lot - Added three light poles in the far north parking lot.

xc: Gil Berry, Facility Planning
### Fall 1993

**UNM Main Campus**

**Full Time Faculty**

**Salaries and Other Selected Indicators**

**9 Month Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Prof</th>
<th>Asso Prof</th>
<th>Assistant Professors</th>
<th>Inst</th>
<th>Lect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary</td>
<td>59,472</td>
<td>40,153</td>
<td>35,707</td>
<td>39,985</td>
<td>39,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Salary</td>
<td>58,085</td>
<td>41,756</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>36,800</td>
<td>36,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Salary</td>
<td>37,350</td>
<td>28,224</td>
<td>22,864</td>
<td>24,860</td>
<td>20,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Salary</td>
<td>97,065</td>
<td>72,365</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>64,003</td>
<td>64,003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number Returning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Returning</th>
<th>269</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Percent Returning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Returning</th>
<th>90.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Average Salary Increase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Salary Increase</th>
<th>2,649</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Median Percentage Increase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Percentage Increase</th>
<th>4.67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**With PhD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>86.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**With Master's Degree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**With Bachelor's Degree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>0.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Percent Male**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Male</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Number Returning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Returning</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Total Instructional FTE**

| Total Instructional FTE | 248.69 |

---

Data source is Faculty Contracts and Data Office.

"New" assistant professors are those hired June and later of the report year.

"Continuing" assistant professors are all others.

"Returning" faculty are those who were at UNM the prior year in a full time capacity.

---

### Fall 1993

**UNM Main Campus**

**Full Time Faculty**

**Salaries and Other Selected Indicators**

**(12 Month Converted to 9 Month Basis)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Prof</th>
<th>Asso Prof</th>
<th>Assistant Professors</th>
<th>Inst</th>
<th>Lect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary</td>
<td>57,948</td>
<td>43,074</td>
<td>36,803</td>
<td>38,465</td>
<td>37,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Salary</td>
<td>56,225</td>
<td>40,500</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>34,781</td>
<td>34,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Salary</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>28,256</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>20,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Salary</td>
<td>97,065</td>
<td>72,345</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>64,003</td>
<td>64,003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number Returning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Returning</th>
<th>311</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Percent Returning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Returning</th>
<th>99.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Average Salary Increase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Salary Increase</th>
<th>2,657</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Median Percentage Increase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Percentage Increase</th>
<th>4.62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**With PhD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>84.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**With Master's Degree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>3.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**With Bachelor's Degree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Percent Male**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Male</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Number Returning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Returning</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Total Instructional FTE**

| Total Instructional FTE | 399.70 |

---

Data source is Faculty Contracts and Data Office.

"New" assistant professors are those hired June and later of the report year.

"Continuing" assistant professors are all others.

"Returning" faculty are those who were at UNM the prior year in a full time capacity.
### Fall 1993
#### UNM Main Campus
#### Full Time Faculty

#### Salaries and Other Selected Indicators

#### 9 Month Returning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Prof</th>
<th>Asso Prof</th>
<th>Assistant Professors</th>
<th>Inst</th>
<th>Lect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary</td>
<td>57,940</td>
<td>43,017</td>
<td>38,497</td>
<td>38,497</td>
<td>31,255</td>
<td>47,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Salary</td>
<td>56,666</td>
<td>40,505</td>
<td>34,711</td>
<td>34,711</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>44,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Salary</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>28,254</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Salary</td>
<td>97,065</td>
<td>72,345</td>
<td>64,003</td>
<td>64,003</td>
<td>60,458</td>
<td>97,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Returning</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Returning</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary Increase</td>
<td>2,666</td>
<td>2,041</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>2,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Percentage Increase</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With PhD</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Prof Doctorate</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Other Terminal Degree</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Masters</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Bachelors</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Male</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Minority</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Tenured</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Instructional FTE</td>
<td>299.70</td>
<td>239.71</td>
<td>156.50</td>
<td>156.50</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>734.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source is Faculty Contracts and Data Office.

"New" assistant professors are those hired June and later of the report year.

"Continuing" assistant professors are all others.

"Returning" faculty are those who were at UNM the prior year in a full time capacity.

---

### Fall 1993
#### UNM Main Campus
#### Full Time Faculty

#### Salaries and Other Selected Indicators

#### 9 Month Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Prof</th>
<th>Asso Prof</th>
<th>Assistant Professors</th>
<th>Inst</th>
<th>Lect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary</td>
<td>51,609</td>
<td>39,943</td>
<td>36,634</td>
<td>36,634</td>
<td>34,265</td>
<td>39,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Salary</td>
<td>49,041</td>
<td>39,363</td>
<td>35,864</td>
<td>35,864</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>37,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Salary</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>30,888</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Salary</td>
<td>76,078</td>
<td>61,255</td>
<td>62,475</td>
<td>62,475</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>62,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Returning</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Returning</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary Increase</td>
<td>2,739</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>1,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Percentage Increase</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With PhD</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Prof Doctorate</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Other Terminal Degree</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Masters</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Bachelors</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Male</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Minority</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Tenured</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Instructional FTE</td>
<td>54.01</td>
<td>70.02</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>94.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source is Faculty Contracts and Data Office.

"New" assistant professors are those hired June and later of the report year.

"Continuing" assistant professors are all others.

"Returning" faculty are those who were at UNM the prior year in a full time capacity.
### Fall 1993

#### UNM Main Campus

**Full Time Faculty Salaries and Other Selected Indicators**

#### 9 Month Ret. Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Prof</th>
<th>Asso Prof</th>
<th>Assistant Professors</th>
<th>New Contin.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Inst</th>
<th>Lect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary</td>
<td>51,649</td>
<td>39,916</td>
<td>36,829</td>
<td>36,829</td>
<td>30,512</td>
<td>40,788</td>
<td>35,892</td>
<td>38,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Salary</td>
<td>49,061</td>
<td>39,262</td>
<td>33,963</td>
<td>33,963</td>
<td>30,892</td>
<td>38,528</td>
<td>35,050</td>
<td>38,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Salary</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>30,888</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Salary</td>
<td>76,078</td>
<td>61,255</td>
<td>62,475</td>
<td>62,475</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>76,078</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>76,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Returning</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Returning</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary Increase</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percentage Increase</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Percentage Increase</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With PhD</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Prof Doctorate</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Other Terminal Degree</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Masters</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Bachelors</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Male</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Minority</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Tenured</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Instructional FTE</td>
<td>54.01</td>
<td>76.02</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>227.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source is Faculty Contracts and Data Office.
"New" assistant professors are those hired June and later of the report year.
"Continuing" assistant professors are all others.
"Returning" faculty are those who were at UNM the prior year in a full time capacity.

---

### Fall 1993

#### UNM Main Campus

**Full Time Faculty Salaries and Other Selected Indicators**

#### 9 Month Ret. Male

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Prof</th>
<th>Asso Prof</th>
<th>Assistant Professors</th>
<th>New Contin.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Inst</th>
<th>Lect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary</td>
<td>51,649</td>
<td>39,916</td>
<td>36,829</td>
<td>36,829</td>
<td>30,512</td>
<td>40,788</td>
<td>35,892</td>
<td>38,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Salary</td>
<td>49,061</td>
<td>39,262</td>
<td>33,963</td>
<td>33,963</td>
<td>30,892</td>
<td>38,528</td>
<td>35,050</td>
<td>38,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Salary</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>30,888</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Salary</td>
<td>76,078</td>
<td>61,255</td>
<td>62,475</td>
<td>62,475</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>76,078</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>76,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Returning</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Returning</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary Increase</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percentage Increase</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Percentage Increase</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With PhD</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Prof Doctorate</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Other Terminal Degree</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Masters</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Bachelors</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Male</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Minority</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Tenured</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Instructional FTE</td>
<td>54.01</td>
<td>76.02</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>227.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source is Faculty Contracts and Data Office.
"New" assistant professors are those hired June and later of the report year.
"Continuing" assistant professors are all others.
"Returning" faculty are those who were at UNM the prior year in a full time capacity.