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

The UNM Faculty Senate will meet on Tuesday, February 8, 1994 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 December 14, 1993
3. Senate President’s Report -- Professor Bel Campbell
4. Comments from Provost Mary Sue Coleman
5. Committee Reports
   a. Faculty & Staff Benefits Committee -- Kari Ward Karr
   b. Long Range Planning Committee -- Professor Bud Wildin
   c. Computer Use Committee -- Professor Edward Angel
6. Senate Recommendations for Administrative Reviews in 1994 -- Professor Bel Campbell
7. Consideration of Changes to Faculty Constitution regarding Administrative Appointments -- Professor Bel Campbell
8. Items from the Curricula Committee -- Professor Bel Campbell
    a. Revision of Major and Minor in Computer Science
9. Approval of Honorary Degree Recipient for May 1994 -- Professor Allen Parkman
10. Committee Appointments and Replacements -- Professor William MacPherson
The February 8, 1994 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), Lynn Baume (English), Jane Brooker (College Branch), Joan Rybee (Linguistics), Bel Campbell (Physics & Astronomy), Jeff Davis (Math & Statistics), Michele Diel (Valencia Branch), Eva Enchinas (Theatre & Dance), Charles Fleckmann (Math & Comp Engr), John Geissman (Earth & Planetary Sciences), Larry Gorbet (Anthropology), Deborah Graham (Med Centlib), Blaine Hart (Radiology), Roy Johnson (Civil Engr), Kathleen Koehler (HPELP), Tam Kyner (Math & Stats), Harry Lull (Centennial Library), Karen Machercac (Law), John Matthews (Physics & Astronomy), Deborah McFarlane (Public Admin), Carolyn Mold (Microbiology), Elizabeth Nielsen (Special Education), Kurt Noetzel (Theatre & Dance), Leslie Ortiz (CIMI'E), Heber Rehisch (Foreign Lang & Lit), Shane Proctor (Political Science), Walter Rutman (Foreign Lang & Lita), Lynn Raymond (Pharmacy), Alan Reed (Public Admin), Edward Reyes (Pharmacology), Russ Remens for Beth Miller (Gallup Branch), Joe Rothrock (Art & Art History), Richard Santoss (Komensko), Stephen Schrauder (Architecture & Ping), Howard Schreyer (Mech Eng), Robert Sickles (Political Science), Beth Tigges (Nursing), Henry TreWhitt (Journalism), Carolyn Vois (Medicine), Scott Walker (Psychiatry) and Gerald Weiss (Physiology).

Absent: Richard Coughlin (Sociology), John Finkelstein (Management), Kenneth Garber (Medicine), Robert Glass (Medicine), Cheryl Leann (Nursing), Gertrude Metzger (Dental Hygiene), Paul Martzer (Medicine), Diane Osbourn (CIMI'E), Gloria Sarto (Obstet & Gynecology), Joanne Shea (Univ College), Russel Snyder (Neurology) and Helen Zosovolos (Gallup Branch).

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

Minutes of December 14, 1993: The summarized minutes of the meeting of December 14, 1993 were approved as presented.

Senate President's Report: Senate President Bel Campbell presented her report which included the following items:

- There are three administrative reviews from last year in various stages of completion. The review of University Counsel Nick Cristi will be completed very soon. The review of John Rinaldi, Dean of University College has been completed and is now being studied by the Provost's Office. The review of Robert Migneault, Dean of Library Services, has just begun.
- Regarding the analyses of salary differentials of full-time faculty on nine-month contracts, President Campbell said that UNM is below the NASULGC (National Association of Universities and Land Grant Colleges) average. She noted that these are not the official peer institutions as recognized by the Commission on Higher Education. These salaries, she explained, are worse for more senior faculty members, a situation known as compaction. Provost Mary Sue Coleman has proposed setting aside a larger amount of the funds appropriated by the legislature for salaries for the purpose of addressing these discrepancies.
The Regents' sub-committee meetings are now open for input within certain parameters. The "Regents' Vision for UNM" has been approved and represents a synthesis of UNM 2000 and various other documents. It has not been decided how the vision will be put into effect. The Vision statement is printed below.

UNM will build on its strengths in the following areas, thereby increasing the quality of education for students, UNM's national reputation and UNM's role within the state.

1. UNM will be the choice of superior students and faculty, attracting the "best and brightest" from New Mexico and elsewhere.

2. As the "flagship" university for the State of New Mexico, UNM will expand its role in improving the quality of life of the citizens of the state.

3. As a nationally recognized university, UNM will become a member of AAU and one of the top 25 public research universities.

4. UNM will emphasize "Steeples of Academic Excellence" which take advantage of cutting-edge research, interdisciplinary participation and proximity to the national laboratories.

5. UNM will expand its role and achieve hemispheric prominence as the University for the Americas.

6. UNM will demonstrate that diversity and excellence go hand-in-hand, and this will be a source of competitive advantage for UNM.

7. UNM will be a model of teaching excellence, using the most effective and advanced learning techniques.

President Campbell encouraged faculty members to attend the meetings of the University Planning Council where many important issues are discussed. Committees have been established for Research Strategic Planning and for investigating the future of Planning and Policy Studies.

The Staff Council has approved a resolution calling for an external review of the Human Resources Department. Additionally, the Legislature has ordered the University to conduct a review of hiring and promotion practices at UNM.

The Office of the Dean of Students is conducting workshops regarding the Student Standards and Grievance Policies and President Campbell urged Senators to participate in those workshops.

Comments from Provost Mary Sue Coleman. Provost Coleman reported on the Legislature's actions to date regarding the University of New Mexico. A 4.5% increase in compensation is proposed and a 3.3% increase in tuition is assumed. This means that it would take a 5% increase in tuition to give a 1% increase in compensation.

All universities in the State have urged that there be no increase in tuition and a 1% increase in compensation. The proposed 4.5% increase would mean a $5.5 million increase in the I&G budget and does not include special projects or capital requests.

Provost Coleman said the special projects were not included in House Bill 2 and that they will be addressed as separate issues. These include such projects as
Another program provides for outstanding students to leave New Mexico for graduate study and be assured of a teaching position at the University of New Mexico upon completion of study. Nominations are now being solicited and the Provost is guaranteeing these positions; the funding will not come out of the department budget. This program has the strong support of the State legislature.

Provost Coleman said that the evaluation of Human Resources will be a good opportunity to assess where UNM stands as a large institution. She said it is necessary to have fair procedures and that, in fact, those procedures are followed. To have good procedures and not follow them is, she said, no better than having bad procedures. An evaluation group accustomed to higher education personnel systems is being sought and it is hoped that a committee will be appointed in the next few weeks. A report must be made to the Legislature in October of 1994 so the evaluation must proceed rather quickly. Wide input will be sought for presentation to the reviewing group.

President Peck plans to appoint an ombudsperson for UNM in the near future. This person will not function as a mediator but will act to make problem solving proceed more smoothly for both faculty and staff. Provost Coleman said that there is a need for people to assure that their concerns are being addressed.

Another project underway is the development of a network priority for interbuilding wiring on the UNM campus. The project has been approved by the Computer Use Committee. There is also pressure to examine the policy for providing gateways to Internet. The service cannot be provided at no cost and the Provost said it is an issue for which she will be seeking assistance.

Provost Coleman told the Senate that the Board of Regents have requested more information concerning academic programs and issues and she asked for input regarding how to provide such information to the Regents.

The Provost said that careful oversight is needed regarding the use of overhead funds. These funds should be utilized for stimulating new research and are among the only flexible funds available to the University.

Regarding faculty hiring at the University of New Mexico, the Provost reported that UNM is doing well. Thirty-one per cent of new hires were female as compared to 27% nationally; 15% minorities were hired as compared to 10% nationally. These figures are the same as last year but represent an eight to nine times higher figure than national averages in minority hiring.

Provost Coleman offered to answer questions from the Senators.

Senator Tom Kyner expressed concern about quality control of the students who are allowed to go away for graduate study and return to a tenure-track teaching appointment at UNM. He said that although there is support for the idea, there are reservations about predicting the success of the students as competitive.
candidates for teaching positions. Provost Coleman said that while she understands the concern, she wants to try. There will be controls and also noted was the fact that these individuals will not be competing, their position in a tenure-track appointment is guaranteed and does not come from a department budget.

Senator William MacPherson asked about the status of the Office of the University Secretary.

Provost Coleman responded by saying that negotiations are not completed and the proposal is that the University Secretary will be an emeritus faculty member with a half-time appointment fully supported by a complete staff.

MacPherson commented that the Faculty Senate committees do not currently have the support required and Coleman said that the Secretary's Office reports to her and that it is her responsibility to make sure the Senate has the support it needs.

When asked how many staff members will be in the Office of the University Secretary's Office, Provost Coleman answered that the plan is for there to be three people, not all full-time. She said that she is committed to making the office function for the Senate and for the Staff Council.

Senator Peter Pabisch asked for the rationale for having an emeritus faculty member as University Secretary. Coleman answered that a very careful analysis had been conducted and that it was felt that it would be most efficient for the staff position to be an Assistant to the University Secretary and that the office would benefit from a "faculty presence" to assure the efficient functioning of the office. She further stated that it was felt that an emeritus faculty member would have the time to devote to it as well as the wisdom and that it would tie emeritus professors to the institution. She said that the Senate would have a part in selecting the individual.

President Campbell commented that the institutional history in the office is missed.

Professor Maurice Wildin expressed his concern that the link between faculty and the Regents has been broken and that it needs to be put back together. Someone is needed, he said, who knows what the Regents are doing as well as what the Faculty Senate is doing, someone to provide continuity and communication.

Provost Coleman replied that there is a philosophical difference and that one of the ways to bridge the gap will be by involving the Senate President in the subcommittees of the Board of Regents. She said that the decision has been made.

Senator MacPherson asked when the Office would be fully staffed. Provost Coleman answered that mediation is still underway and that a temporary person is in the Office now.

Senator Joan Bybee pointed out that the faculty had never been told what was wrong with the system as it was and thought it was working fine. She asked Provost Coleman what was being fixed.

Coleman answered that it was her understanding that President Peck and the Senate had a philosophical difference about how the office should function and that it had been reorganized. She said that she has never had a conversation with President Peck concerning the Office of the University Secretary. She said that the University Secretary's office had been constructed around an individual who had been in the job for a very long time rather than around a structure and that
she understood that when that person left, the structure no longer worked and that she really didn’t wish to get into these details any further. She stated that she did not wish to get into a debate and that the decision has been made.

Senator MacEnhorn stated that the problem is that Provost Coleman never had a conversation with the President about the philosophical change. And that the President has never had a conversation with the Senate about that philosophical change. He said that while he respected Provost Coleman’s philosophy about how the University should be run, he finds it disturbing that the President’s Office seems to be saying “My philosophy is superior to yours because I have an office in Schles Hall.” He said that he believes President Peck should be told that he made a mistake in doing what he did unilaterally with the Secretary’s Office and that he has upset the Senate. Further, MacEnhorn said that he finds it difficult to “put it behind us” when there has never been any conversation on the University Secretary position other that after the fact we’re told what is going to be done. He said that it’s not which philosophy wins in the end but are the faculty going to have communication over what they view as a very important position.

Senator Larry Gorbet said it was his belief that there were many instances when the former University Secretary pointed out to individuals in the administration that what they had done or were proposing to do was a violation of some policy or binding decision, that perhaps some people in the central administration felt the Secretary was putting roadblocks up and the best thing they could do would be to weaken the Office by making it a secretarial office. He stated that he did not believe that President Peck had heard the repeated statements of the Operations Committee that the office of the University Secretary is to serve the faculty and not just the faculty and the Staff Council, but the entire University community. The reason for the office being called the “University secretary” was the title is appropriate for an office which provides valid, unbiased information to the University community and the community outside of the University as well. Professor Gorbet said that the loss of that function is a serious loss for the University.

Provost Coleman stated again that there was a philosophical difference and that by putting an emeritus faculty member in the position, some of the institutional memory would be preserved.

Committee Reports. Karl Ward Karr, chairperson of the Faculty & Staff Benefits Committee presented the report from that committee. She said that a proposal has been presented to David Mc Kinney, Vice President for Business & Finance regarding an increase in benefits. A number of constituencies have been involved in the discussions. The major complaint about benefits at the University of New Mexico is that the premiums are too high, therefore, it has been proposed that the University increase the employer contribution to health insurance. Ward Karr noted, however, that such an increase requires a change in the law. The five items presented to Vice President Mc Kinney are as follows.

1. Support of any legislation this year to increase the employer contribution to health insurance
2. Establishment of a higher education lobbying force to institute the required changes in the law which would allow for higher employer contribution
3. Adoption of the employer/employee percentages rate structure of the current health insurance for dental and vision plan. Currently UNM contributes only 5%. Ward Karr pointed out that money paid into benefits actually costs us less in terms of taxes than money into compensation.
4. Improvement in Health Plan mental health and substance abuse benefit to make them comparable to the Lovelace Plan
5. Inclusion of Ritalin for adults in non-formulary drugs under Health Plus

It was asked whether the incentive retirement would be continued and expanded and Ward Kerr replied that the committee does plan to address the issue but the issue of health benefits required more immediate attention.

Professor Maurice Wildin, chairperson of the Long Range Planning Committee presented the report of the committee. He reviewed the membership and charge of the committee as outlined in the Faculty Handbook and pointed out that the committee serves in some of an advisory and review capacity rather than in a line approval capacity. Professor Wildin presented some of the major activities of the committee for the year 1992-93 which are as follows.

1. Recommended to the Faculty Senate adoption of revised procedures for approval of new academic programs or units, or revisions in existing programs or units requiring submission of estimates of cost and sources of other needed resources for the first three to five years of operation of the new or revised program or unit prior to approval of proposals. This recommendation was adopted by the Senate in the fall of 1992 and implemented by the Senate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Committee.

2. Encouraged formalization of the efforts originally undertaken voluntarily in connection with the North Central Association "focused visit" in May 1992 to assess student achievements. The Faculty Senate approved a proposal to form an ad hoc Student Outcomes Assessment Committee in December of 1992. The committee members were appointed and the committee initiated its work last spring.

3. Recommended to the Provost Search Committee that the following criteria be adopted and applied in evaluating semifinal candidates.

   a. The ... candidates shall provide evidence of an ability to coordinate a university-wide process for developing and continuously improving plans for the future of our institution, particularly as these affect its academic programs.

   b. The ... candidates shall exhibit an ability to organize and execute a broadly accepted process for allocating and reallocating funds consistent with the institution's plans.

4. Encouraged the Academic Vice President to develop a policy and procedure that would ensure full consideration of the fiscal and academic aspects of proposals to create new units on campus, or new branches or education centers of UNM. This issue arose out of concern regarding the way approval was sought for the Taos Education Center.

5. Considered ways in which to improve interactions between UNM and the National Laboratories in New Mexico.

Professor Wildin went on to present the issues currently being addressed by the Long Range Planning Committee. Those include:

1. Developing a policy and procedure for approval of new or revised units, centers, or institutes on the main campus, or branches or education centers off-campus.

2. Continuing discussion of university/national laboratory relationships and consideration of a proposal to form a university/laboratory programs office. This would include constituent areas such as human services, education, fine arts, health, and science and technology.

3. Recently initiated an effort to assess how to improve communications and interactions between the branches and the main campus.
4. Continuing to follow the work of the Student Outcomes Assessment Committee.

5. Overseeing of the administration and analysis of the HERI survey of faculty and administrators.

6. Following up previous recommendation that a planning office be created and a planning officer be appointed to support planning in units across the campus as well as planning for the university as a whole.

7. Continuing to encourage planning efforts by academic units and by the university as a whole. This includes efforts by the University Planning Council to revise and implement a rational budget planning process and by encouraging the Provost and other senior administrators to undertake broad discussions with the faculty, staff and students to develop a shared vision of the University and to encourage faculty to participate in such discussions.

Professor Wildin ended his report by saying that the climate for higher education in New Mexico appears to favorable at the present time and urged faculty to take advantage of this opportunity by developing a positive working relationship with senior administrators.

The chairperson of the Computer Use Committee was not in attendance and therefore, no report from that committee was heard.

Senate Recommendations for Administrative Reviews in 1994. President Campbell reported that recommendations are needed for administrative reviews to be conducted in the next year. She suggested that Carla Espinosa, Director of Human Resources, might be considered as one of the individuals. She pointed out that information concerning administrative reviews is contained in the Brief Announcements which were distributed to Senators at the door and urged the Senators to examine this information.

Senator William MacPherson observed that the pattern in the past has been that although the Senate approved the names of those persons to be reviewed, the results of the review process never were reported back to the Faculty Senate. President Campbell pointed out that in the summary of the review process, it is stated that once action is taken, the responsible administrator will forward a summary of the action to the President of the Faculty Senate. She said that President Peck has agreed that a summary of the findings, but not including confidential personnel information, will be made available to the faculty.

Senator MacPherson stated that he is not interested in making a recommendation regarding review unless the information resulting from the review is brought back to the Senate. If that involves a special closed meeting to discuss personnel matters, then perhaps that is what should be done. Otherwise, he said, let it be an administrative review by the administration and leave the Senate out of the process. He also pointed out that he does not believe the Senate has ever received any substantive reports resulting from past reviews.

Senator Larry Corbet said it was unclear to him what the Senate might do once it did receive the results of an administrative review and compared such participation to the Senate participating in the tenure and promotion process of a faculty member.

MacPherson said that since it is middle management personnel who make decisions which affect him as a teacher, he believes it is appropriate for the Faculty Senate to have the opportunity to comment on the administrators. He then made a notion that the chair of the reviewing committee, in addition to sending a copy
of the final report to the Provost, submit a copy of the report to the Faculty Senate Operations for review. Any information deemed appropriate by the operations Committee would then be placed on the Senate agenda. President Campbell pointed out that the reports do not always go to the Provost but to some other vice president. MacPherson agreed to amend that point.

At this point, Provost Coleman asked that before the Senate votes on the issue, she be allowed to meet in executive session with the Operations Committee and she requested that action be tabled until the March Senate meeting. Senator MacPherson withdrew his motion.

Senator Joan Bybee asked why the reviews are initiated by the Senate rather than having automatic five-year reviews and President Campbell answered that it was because it is not specified anywhere that it be done except in the case of the appointment and continuation in office of deans and chairs.

A motion was made by Senator Kathleen Koehler that the Operations Committee bring to the Senate next month, along with its report on the issue, a list of all those who would be due for evaluation. The motion was seconded and passed.

Approval of Honorary Degree Recipient for May 1994. Upon recommendation of Professor Alan Parkman for the Honorary Degree Committee, the Senate approved granting an honorary degree of Doctor of Letters to author Henry Roth.

Items from the Curricula Committee. Upon recommendation of Professor Bel Campbell for the Curricula Committee, the Senate approved a revision of the existing minor in Computer Science and a revision of the existing major in Computer Science. The revisions are being made in light of recommendations from the Computer Science Accreditation Board and the Association for Computing Machinery. No major changes have been made in ten years and these revisions are made in response to rapid changes in the field.

Committee Appointments and Replacements. Senator William MacPherson first introduced a new Senator, Beth Tigges of Nursing, who replaces Diane Shoemaker. Upon recommendation of Senator MacPherson for the Operations Committee, the Senate approved the following committee appointments: Diane Furno (Communication & Journalism) on the KUNM Radio Board and Jane Slaughter (History) for Rhonda Hill (ECE) on the Athletic Council.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Thomas, Secretary
FORM C  
MAJOR AND MINOR CURRICULAR CHANGES

Date: 10/4/93

Henry Shapiro
(Name of individual initiating curricular change form)

Assoc. Prof.
(Title, position)

Computer Science
(Dept., Div., Prog.)

This form is for Computer Science
Name of New or Existing Program

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

I. Major Change-Mark appropriate catagory

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

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

Minor Change-

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

New Name of Program

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

See attachment.

Reasons for Request: (attach statement)

Effective Date of Proposed Change: Summer 1994

Budgetary and Faculty Load Implications: (attach statements)

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

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

Signature: ________________________

Department Chair

Approvals:

Dean of Library Services
CIRT
College Curricula Committee
(If necessary)
College of School Faculty
College of School Dean
FS Undergraduate Ac. Affairs
FS Graduate Committee
Office of Graduate Studies
FS Curricula Committee
Assoc. VP of Academic Affairs
Faculty Senate
For CS Minor:

II. Minor Change

Minor Program Revision (3-5) hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change computer science graduation requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 151L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 201L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 251L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 257L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EECE 238L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 341L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 351L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason for Request:
See the reasons on the Form C for changes in the undergraduate computer science major.

Budgetary and Faculty Load Implications: These are discussed in the Form C for changes to the undergraduate computer science major. There are no additional faculty load implications.

Might this change impinge in any significant way on student or departmental programs? No
# Major and Minor Curricular Changes

**Date:** 10/4/93  
**CIP Code:** 11.0101

## Form C

**Name:** Henry Shapiro  
**Title/Position:** Assoc. Prof.  
**Department/Program:** Computer Science

### Routing (All four copies)

1. Dean of Library Services  
2. CIRT (Comp & Inform Res & Tech), if necessary  
3. College Curriculum Comm. if necessary  
4. College or School Faculty  
5. College or School Dean  
6. FS Undergraduate Academic Affairs Comm. and/or FS Graduate Comm.  
7. Office of Graduate Studies (For grad. level changes)  
8. FS Curricula Committee  
9. VP of Academic Affairs  
10. Faculty Senate

This form is for **Computer Science**  
Name of New or Existing Program  
This program is or would be located in current catalog page 241-245

## Major Change

Mark appropriate category

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

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

### Minor Change

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

New Name of Program

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

See attachment.

### Reasons for Request

(attach statement)

**Effective Date of Proposed Change:** Summer, 1994

**Budgetary and Faculty Load Implications:**

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

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

**Signature:**  
Department Chair

### Approvals

- Dean of Library Services  
  *Signature:*  
  *Date:* 10/3/93

- CIRT  
  *Signature:*  
  *Date:* 10/3/93  
  *Date:* 10/19/93

- College Curricula Committee  
  *Signature:*  
  *Date:* 10/20/93

- College of School Faculty  
  *Signature:*  
  *Date:* 12/10/93

- College or School Dean  
  *Signature:*  
  *Date:* 12/10/93

- FS Undergraduate Ac. Affairs  
  *Signature:*  
  *Date:* 12/10/93

- FS Graduate Committee  
  *Signature:*  
  *Date:* 12/10/93

- Office of Graduate Studies  
  *Signature:*  
  *Date:* 12/10/93

- FS Curricula Committee  
  *Signature:*  
  *Date:* 12/10/93

- Assoc. VP of Academic Affairs  
  *Signature:*  
  *Date:* 12/10/93

- Faculty Senate  
  *Signature:*  
  *Date:* 12/10/93

The University of New Mexico (Norman & Rill)
II. Minor Change

Minor Program Revision (3–5) hours

Change computer science graduation requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS 151L</td>
<td>CS 155L</td>
<td>Drops from 4 to 3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 201</td>
<td>CS 154</td>
<td>Renumbered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 251L</td>
<td>CS 253L</td>
<td>Drops from 4 to 3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 257L</td>
<td></td>
<td>New course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EECE 238L</td>
<td>EECE 238L</td>
<td>Renumbered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 341L</td>
<td>CS 255L</td>
<td>Drops from 4 to 3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 351L</td>
<td>CS 352L</td>
<td>Renumbered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 451</td>
<td>CS 355</td>
<td>Renumbered/Drops from 4 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 461</td>
<td>CS 363L</td>
<td>credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 481</td>
<td>CS 387</td>
<td>Renumbered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 460</td>
<td>CS 460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 CS electives</td>
<td>2 CS electives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks: Drops from 4 to 3 credits

Complete undergraduate brochure entry attached.

Reason for Request:
By way of introduction, the undergraduate curriculum committee of the Department of Computer Science has spent the last year thoroughly reviewing our current curriculum in the light of CSAB (Computer Science Accreditation Board -- our accrediting agency) and ACM (Association for Computing Machinery -- our professional organization) recommendations. We have also investigated the curriculums of other schools with strong curricula and similar undergraduate emphasis. Computer science is a rapidly changing field and we have not had a major overhaul of our curriculum in 10 years. While there are many changes, all of them are small, and they fall into three categories:

1. Course renumberings: five of our courses (154, 255L, 355, 363, and 387) were judged to be at the wrong level.
2. New courses: There is one new course. The rising importance of nonimperative programming paradigms and the low cost of graphical workstations are changing how programming is done and how it is taught. While these topics are addressed in our curriculum, taught. While these topics are addressed in our curriculum, taught. While these topics are addressed in our curriculum, taught. While these topics are addressed in our curriculum, taught. While these topics are addressed in our curriculum. To rectify this situation, we are introducing a new lower division (257L) class that deals with introducing a new lower division (257L) class that deals with introducing a new lower division (257L) class that deals with introducing a new lower division (257L) class that deals with introducing a new lower division (257L) class that deals with these topics. This course will also be taken by computer science engineering students -- during their recent reaccreditation their accreditation organization (ABET) stated that it was important for computer engineering students to see nonimperative programming paradigms. To compensate for the extra hours, four courses are being reduced from 4 to 3 credit hours.
3. We are switching from Pascal and C to C++ (which supports object-oriented design) in our mainline programming sequence.

Budgetary and Faculty Load Implications: Despite the addition of a new course in the undergraduate curriculum, the total number of credits in the program is decreasing by 1. The net effect should be no change in overall faculty workload.
Might this change impinge in any significant way on student or departmental programs? Yes

The changes will affect Computer Engineering students, as they currently take their first two programming courses from our department. This will increase to three courses, but from only 8 to 9 credit hours. The EECE faculty has agreed to the change.

The changes will affect mathematics majors, who must take one programming course. The choice of language is irrelevant to most mathematics majors; math education students will be the most affected, since Pascal is widely used in the public schools.
COMPUTER SCIENCE

The program of this department is intended to provide students with a well rounded general education and a broad set of skills and knowledge in the basic areas of computer programming and computer science. The program is accredited by the Computer Science Accreditation Board. The core requirements in mathematics, computer science and electrical engineering cover the basic principles and methodologies of discrete mathematics, problem analysis and algorithmic development, assembly language, high level programming languages, language design and implementation, operating systems, analysis of algorithms, computer architecture, and software engineering.

1 Admission

Students wishing to enroll in the bachelor's program in computer science must apply for admission or transfer to the Department of Computer Science, College of Engineering. The admission request is initiated through the Office of Admissions and Records for students wishing to transfer to UNM from other institutions. Students transferring to the computer science program from another program at UNM should initiate the paperwork in their current college office. Students denied entrance to the department due to lack of sufficient credits or specific courses may enroll in computer science classes and reapply at a later time when they meet the entrance requirements. The criteria for admission to the department are:

1. A minimum of 30 hours of credit acceptable toward the degree with a grade of C- or better in all courses counted in the 30 hours and an overall academic average for all courses taken at UNM of not less than 2.2.

2. 24 hours taken from among the communications skills, computer science, mathematics, and laboratory science graduation requirements, with an academic average of not less than 2.5 in the 24 hours. Engl 101, Engl 102, CS 151L, CS 201, and Math 162 must be included in the 24 hours.

Students wishing to enter the Computer Science program and having university level credit for course work completed at another institution will have their transfer credits evaluated on an individual basis. Grades earned in equivalent courses at other institutions will be used in determining eligibility for admission to the department.

2 Advanced Placement and Transfer Credit

The department subscribes to the general policy of the College of Engineering with regard to advanced placement credit earned by examination.
Students with university level course work from other institutions will have their academic records evaluated by an undergraduate advisor from the department on an individual basis. The student should be aware that the department has the final say about which transfer credits can be applied toward the graduation requirements listed below. Because computer science programs vary greatly, students transferring from other institutions should not assume that computer science courses they have taken elsewhere can be applied toward the 40 hour computer science course work graduation requirement. Courses not accepted toward the 40 hours may be applied toward the 130 semester hour graduation requirement as general electives at the discretion of the undergraduate advisor.

3 Graduation Requirements

To receive the degree of Bachelor of Science in Computer Science a student must satisfy all general UNM regulations concerning baccalaureate programs and the student must have completed all work defined by the following groups. Only courses with a grade of C– or better may be used to satisfy any of the requirements defined herein. The following courses cannot be used to satisfy any of the requirements listed below: Reserve Officers Training Corp (ROTC), recreational physical education (PE-NP), Business Education (BUS ED), courses offered by University College, basic skills courses (e.g., Engl 100), and mathematics courses prior to Math 121. If in doubt about the applicability of a course contact an undergraduate advisor in the Department of Computer Science.

1. Completion of 130 semester hours.
2. Completion of at least 42 hours in courses numbered 300 or above.
3. Completion of 40 hours in Computer Science with a GPA of not less than 2.0 in the 40 hours presented. The 40 hours must include the following courses, which total 34 hours:

   - CS 151L Introduction to Computer Science
   - CS 201 Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science
   - EECE 228L Computer Logic Design
   - CS 251L Introduction to Data Structures
   - CS 257L Nonimperative Programming
   - CS 341L Introduction to Computing Systems
   - CS 351L Design of Large Programs
   - CS 451 Programming Paradigms
   - CS 460 Software Engineering
   - CS 461 Algorithms and Data Structures
   - CS 481 Operating Systems Principles
The remaining six hours are technical electives of the student's choosing to be taken from among the Department of Computer Science offerings. The following courses in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering are also acceptable as technical electives:

EECE 344L Microprocessors
EECE 438 Design of Computers

CS 259L may be substituted for CS 151L and CS 251L. Only five hours credit is awarded. The computer science hour requirement is reduced to 30, but the overall graduation requirement remains at 130.

The following additional rules apply:

(a) Departmental offerings below the 300 level cannot be used as technical electives. CS 390, 420, 421, 490, and 492 cannot be used as technical electives.

(b) At most 3 hours of CS 499 may be used toward satisfaction of this requirement.

(c) At least 15 credits at or above the 300 level used to satisfy this requirement must be taken from full-time University of New Mexico Department of Computer Science faculty.

4. Completion of the mathematics sequence:

Math 162 and Math 163 (Calculus I and II)
Math 317 (Elementary Combinatorics)
Math 345 (Statistics and Probability)
Math 375 (Introduction to Numerical Computing)

It is recommended that students minoring in mathematics or who wish to take additional mathematics as general electives take Math 314 (Linear Algebra with Applications) and Math 316 (Applied Ordinary Differential Equations), as these better prepare the student for Math 375.

5. Nine hours of communications skills: English 101, English 102, and one of English 219 (Technical Writing), English 220 (Expository Writing), English 290 (Introduction to Professional Writing), or Communication 130L (Public Speaking).

Part of this requirement may be satisfied by passing an authorized proficiency examination. English 101 will be waived if the student’s score on the ACT is 29 or higher or whose score on the verbal portion of the SAT is 570 or higher. While credit is not granted for English 101, the student’s total credit requirement is reduced to 128, the minimum allowed by the university.
6. 21 hours in humanities, social sciences and the fine arts. The student must develop both breadth and depth. In particular:

(a) At least three credits must be taken in each of humanities, social and behavioral science, and fine arts.

(b) At least six credits must be nonintroductory. Nonintroductory generally means either a 200-level course with a prerequisite or a 300 or above level course.

The following general areas are considered humanities: Literature and Creative Writing, Modern and Classical Languages, Philosophy, American Studies, History.

The following general areas are considered social and behavioral science: Anthropology, Communication, Geography, Economics, Political Science, Psychology, Linguistics, Sociology.

The following general areas are considered fine arts: Art, Music, Theater and Dance, Architecture.

Certain courses offered by departments of the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Fine Arts may not be used to satisfy this requirement, because they do not satisfy the spirit of the requirement, which is to broaden the perspectives of the student. In particular, Phil 156 (Introduction to Logic and Critical Thinking) and Phil 257 (Introduction to Symbolic Logic) may not be used to satisfy the humanities requirement, Psych 200 (Statistical Principles) and numerous technical courses in the Department of Geography may not be used to satisfy the social science requirement, and numerous technical courses in the School of Architecture and Planning may not be used to satisfy the fine arts requirement. Studio courses in the fine arts are allowed. Students who speak a foreign language fluently are encouraged to take literature courses taught in the foreign language, but the applicability of basic language and grammar courses toward the humanities requirement will be decided on an individual basis after consultation with the Department of Modern and Classical Languages. If there is any doubt regarding applicability of a course, an undergraduate advisor in the Department of Computer Science should be consulted.

7. At least 13 hours of laboratory science. One of the following sequences of laboratory science must be included in the 13 hours. The remaining hours can be more advanced courses in the discipline chosen for the sequence or they can be additional introductory laboratory science hours.

Astronomy 270, 272L–271, 273L
Biology 121L–122L
Chemistry 121L-122L
Earth and Planetary Sciences 101, 105L-102L
Physics 160-161, 163L

Physics is recommended.

8. Course work sufficient to satisfy requirements of a minor. Minors approved by the College of Arts and Science are generally acceptable for Computer Science majors. The University of New Mexico Catalog should be consulted for the requirements for completing a minor in various fields of study. An interdisciplinary minor of not less than 24 hours can be developed to suit the goals of individual students; such a minor must be approved by the undergraduate curriculum committee of the department.

The following concentrations of courses taken from the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering satisfies this requirement:

- Minor in Computer Engineering: EECE 203, EECE 206L, EECE 213, EECE 321, EECE 322, EECE 438, and one of EECE 325L, 434L, or 447L.

Mathematics minors may not use Department of Mathematics Courses for Teachers and Education Students in constructing the minor.

Students enrolling in the three-two M.B.A. program offered by the Anderson School of Management may satisfy this requirement with 18 hours of 500 level management courses, normally taken during their senior year. For more information contact the department or the Anderson School.

Courses taken to satisfy this requirement may also be used to satisfy the requirements of categories 1, 2, 5, 6, 7.

All courses taken to satisfy these requirements are subject to final approval by an undergraduate advisor. At most 24 semester hours taken for CR/NC may be applied toward the baccalaureate degree. Courses taken for CR/NC may only be used to satisfy the requirement of 130 hours. Students may not take elementary courses in a department after progressing past a certain point in the course offerings of that department. Some examples are: taking CS 150 after having taken CS 251L, and taking Math 121 and/or Math 245 after having advanced mathematics courses. Courses taken out of sequence in this manner may not even be used as general elective credits to satisfy the requirement of 130 hours. Students may not go back and retake elementary computer science courses in order to raise their grade point average in computer science to 2.0.
Changes: Total number of hours remains the same.
Three courses go from four credits to three credits.
Course renumbering.
Number of credits at the 300-level goes from three to six.
Addition of new course.

No one course may be used to satisfy more than one requirement of categories 3, 4, and 8. Due to the cross listing of various courses within the university and the different requirements for the minor from department to department this has a number of implications. For example, mathematics minors cannot count the required sequence in mathematics toward the minor in mathematics and computer engineering minors cannot use EECE 438 as a technical elective in fulfilling requirement 3.

4 Minor in Computer Science

A minor in Computer Science is available for students in other departments. The requirements for a minor are completion of the following courses.

CS 151L, CS 201L, CS 251L, CS 257L, EECE 238L, CS 341L, and CS 351L.

(CS 259L may be taken in place of CS 151L and CS 251L.)

No course with a grade of less than C- may be counted toward the minor.

5 Advising

Students are required to see an undergraduate advisor within the department each semester prior to registering for classes. The student should check with an advisor about the admissibility of classes used to satisfy graduation requirement 6, as some courses do not meet the spirit of this requirement.

6 Graduate Study

The department offers a Master of Science and a Doctor of Philosophy in Computer Science. For master's degree curricula, see the Graduate Programs Bulletin. Contact the Department of Computer Science for more information on the Ph.D. program.

In order to encourage students with backgrounds other than computer science to enter the field, the department gives a series of immigration courses which cover the essential background material needed to begin work on an advanced degree. These courses are extremely intensive and should not be attempted by persons without a strong technical background in a related field.

7 Curriculum in Computer Science

The following schedule is intended as a model or guide for students when planning their course load for any particular semester. It should be noted that the
schedule must normally be adjusted to compensate for any deficiencies or advanced preparation on the part of the student prior to beginning the freshman year. All entering freshmen must take the mathematics placement examination, given free by the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, to aid the advisor in guiding the student into the appropriate entry level math course. Students must also have taken the ACT exam to aid in placement in math and English. Students should not begin any Computer Science courses until they have knowledge of mathematics equivalent to Math 150 (Advanced College Algebra).

General electives include courses in humanities, social and behavioral sciences, and the fine arts. It is not recommended that a student attempt more than 12 hours of technical material in one semester.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Semester</th>
<th>Second Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engl 101</strong></td>
<td><strong>Engl 102</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gen. Elect.</strong></td>
<td><strong>CS 151L</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 162</td>
<td><strong>Math 163</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Sci. I</td>
<td><strong>Lab Sci. II</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Semester</strong></td>
<td><strong>SECOND YEAR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CS 201</strong></td>
<td><strong>EECE 238L</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CS 251L</strong></td>
<td><strong>CS 257L</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Sci.</td>
<td><strong>Minor/Gen. Elect.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor/Gen. Elect.</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Semester</strong></td>
<td><strong>THIRD YEAR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CS 351L</strong></td>
<td><strong>CS 341L</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 345</td>
<td><strong>CS Elect.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 317</td>
<td><strong>Math 375</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor/Gen. Elect.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Minor/Gen. Elect.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Semester</strong></td>
<td><strong>FOURTH YEAR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CS 451</strong></td>
<td><strong>CS 460</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CS 481</strong></td>
<td><strong>CS 461</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Elect.</td>
<td><strong>Minor/Gen. Elect.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor/Gen. Elect.</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Changed to reflect new course [257L], course renumbering, and changes in prerequisites.
TO: Henry Shapiro, Computer Science
FROM: Alexander P. Stone, Chairman, Mathematics and Statistics
SUBJECT: Minor Course Change

The change you propose for CS 155L (change in credit hours and course title) will not negatively affect programs in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics.

APS:mmr
TO: Whom It May Concern
FROM: R. C. De Vries, Associate Chair for Computer Engineering, EECE Dept.
SUBJECT: Changes in CS courses and curriculum

The Computer Engineering faculty are pleased with the changes being made in the Computer Science courses and curriculum. Our faculty has for some time suggested that the CS Department use the C programming language as the vehicle for teaching the lower-level programming courses. The new courses, CS 151 and 251, will use C. We are also happy with the reduction of the number of hours from 4 hours to three hours for these courses. We also intend to have our students take CS 257, the programming languages course.

We feel that the CS changes will have a positive impact on the Computer Engineering curriculum. The CS and Computer Engineering faculty have coordinated curriculum revisions, and the EECE Department is in the process of preparing curriculum change forms to update its curriculum and courses to incorporate all changes, including those proposed by Computer Science. We very much would like to see the proposals for CS 151, 251, and 257 approved by the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee.
To: Faculty Senate
From: Operations Committee
Subject: Committee Replacements

The following committee replacement is submitted for Senate approval:

ATHLETIC COUNCIL:
Jane Slaughter (History) 1994 for Rhonda Hill (E&CE) 1994
BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR THE FACULTY SENATE - 8 FEBRUARY 1994

1. Status of ongoing (1993) administrative reviews:

   - The review of John Rinaldi, Dean of University College, has been completed. The results are being studied by the Provost's Office and recommendations for change, if any, should come shortly. [Chair: Reynaldo Saenz, Pharmacy]

   - The review of Nick Estes, University Counsel, has produced a draft final report and will very shortly be forwarded to President Peck. [Chair: Maureen Sanders, Law School]

   - The review of Robert Migneault, Dean, General Library, has just gotten underway. [Chair: Bill Gordon, Dean, Arts & Sciences]

2. The Deans have been provided by the Provost's office with comparative faculty salary analyses for and within the colleges. An obvious and pervasive problem is salary compaction where recent faculty hires come at rates very near those of tenured associate and full faculty. The table below provides the percentage differentials in faculty salary to NASULGC national averages.

   | PERCENTAGE FACULTY SALARY DIFFERENTIALS | UNM full-time 9-month averages compared to NASULGC national averages  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FALL 1992 (LAST YEAR AVAILABLE)</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIT</td>
<td>ASST P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS &amp; SCIENCES</td>
<td>-1.1% 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>-8.6% 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>0.6% 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINE ARTS</td>
<td>-10.2% 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIA</td>
<td>-6.6% 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE &amp; PLANNING</td>
<td>-4.8% 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>-9.5% 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>-9.6% 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHARMACY</td>
<td>0.4% 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>-13.1% 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTAL PROGRAMS</td>
<td>-14.0% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL/CITY COLLEGE</td>
<td>NA 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER UNITS</td>
<td>-8.0% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>-3.0% 187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To address this problem, the Provost has proposed putting a larger portion of faculty raises into the higher ranks. How this applies in detail within your own department may depend on the actual seniority and merit of individual faculty.

You may wish to ask your chair for a copy of this information.

3. On July 1, 1994, President Peck begins his fifth year at UNM and the final year of his original five-year contract. On or before that date, he will notify the Board of Regents whether he would like to be considered for an additional term as President.
4. At its January meeting, the UNM Board of Regents decided to begin offering an opportunity for public input into meetings of both the full board and its committees (Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Finance and Facilities, Health Sciences). Among the guidelines proposed:

- public input would come at the beginning of the meeting
- topics for which public input would be taken will be limited to current agenda items
- the committee chair or Board President will determine the total length of time for public input, the length of time any individual may speak, and the sequence of speakers.

In addition, it appears that the Faculty Senate will now be represented at meetings of the Regents Academic Affairs Committee, except in the case of confidential and/or personnel matters.

5. Also at their January meeting, the Regents published their seven-item Vision for UNM (copy attached). Regent Hecker emphasized that this document was not "written in stone" and was more a basis for beginning a discussion with all the "stakeholders", including faculty, staff, and students.

6. The next meeting of the University Planning Council is set for Wednesday, 16 February, 3:30 PM in the Roberts Room. This meeting is open to all.

7. Provost Coleman and Associate Provost for Research Goldberg have established a committee on Research Strategic Planning [members: Assoc. Provost Goldberg, Provost Coleman, VP McKinney, RPC Chair Walters, Dean Gordon, Dean Dodson, Prof. Larry Sklar, Designated Representative Pathology, Prof. John Wood - Mech. Eng., Prof. Campbell - Faculty Senate]. Within the charge of this committee is an overview of current research funding including overhead allocations and expenditures, the roles of Centers in the institution, the role of the Research Allocation Committee, and review/development of an institutional research plan.

8. Associate Provost Richard Holder is chairing a committee to address the role of the Office of Planning and Policy Studies, and to develop a job description for an anticipated national committee on Research Strategic Planning [members: Assoc. Provost Holder, VP-SA Zuniga-Forbes, Richard Cady - OPPS, Max Kerlm - Spec. Asst. to Provost, LRP Chair Wildin, Prof. Campbell - Faculty Senate].

9. The UNM Staff Council has approved a resolution to request a public opinion poll about UNM's role in the community. A copy of that resolution is attached. The New Mexico Legislature, as a result of the survey, will almost certainly pass a directive to the University administration for a similar external review of hiring and promotion practices.

10. If you have not already completed and sent in the UCLA-HERI survey to the office of the University Secretary, please do so as soon as possible. Fewer than 500 forms had been received by several UNM staff members, almost certainly pass a directive to the University administration for a similar external review of hiring and promotion practices.

11. As you may be aware, Professor Hugh Witemeyer (English) is asking for a petition of five intercollegiate athletics programs at UNM. Signatures are being requested on a form mailed to the academic deans who should be returned to the office of the University Secretary.

12. The Athletic Council is sponsoring a reception for all UNM faculty, coaches, and members of the athletic department on February 24 at 6:00 PM, prior to the UNM vs. Air Force basketball game. The reception will take place at the McDavid lounge at the Pit prior to the game. Faculty will also receive a special ticket rate for the game.

REGENTS' VISION FOR UNM

UNM will build on its strengths in the following areas, thereby increasing the quality of education for students, UNM's national reputation and UNM's role within the state.

1. UNM will be the choice of superior students and faculty, attracting the "best and brightest" from New Mexico and elsewhere.

2. As the "flagship" university for the State of New Mexico, UNM will expand its role in improving the quality of life of the citizens of the state.

3. As a nationally recognized university, UNM will become a member of AAU and one of the top 25 public research universities.

4. UNM will emphasize "Steeples of Academic Excellence" which take advantage of cutting-edge research, interdisciplinary participation and proximity to the national laboratories.

5. UNM will expand its role and achieve hemispheric prominence as the University for the Americas.

6. UNM will demonstrate that diversity and excellence go hand-in-hand, and this will be a source of competitive advantage for UNM.

7. UNM will be a model of teaching excellence, using the most effective and advanced learning techniques.
University of New Mexico
Staff Council
Resolution 1994 - 1

WHEREAS the University of New Mexico Staff Council recognizes the difficulties in a service department satisfying all the needs and questions of all interested parties,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That in order to assist Human Resources in responding to those needs and questions, the Staff Council requests that Vice President for Business and Finance David Mc Kinney authorize funds to conduct an external review/audit of the Human Resources Department to determine what changes, if any, are needed to ensure that Human Resources operates to the maximum benefit of both the University proper and individual employees;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the review should also include an overall review of all policies and procedures that affect Human Resources' ability to perform its jobs effectively, such as those promulgated by the Equal Opportunity Programs Office and the Payroll Department; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That such review shall be completed as quickly as possible but by no later than May 1, 1994, and that the final report of the review shall be made public except where it would violate the University's policies with regard to protecting confidentiality of personnel information.

Adopted: January 11, 1994

cc: Members of the Board of Regents
    President Richard E. Peck
    Provost Mary Sue Coleman
    Vice President Orcilia Zuniga Forbes
    HRD Director Carla Espinoza
    Deans and Directors
    Faculty Senate President Bel Campbell
    UNM Staff Employees

SUMMARY OF CURRENT ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW PROCESS
(Senate approved 8 Mar 1988)

1. The office and individual performance of every listed UNM administrator (with a minimum of three years in office) should be evaluated at least every five years: President, VPs, Academic and other Deans, Directors, and Associate VPs reporting to them.

2. The purpose of the evaluation should be to:
   (a) determine the effectiveness of the administrator and the office administered
   (b) make recommendations for strengthening the effectiveness of the administrator and the office

3. The evaluation is initiated and co-ordinated by the person to whom that administrator reports. During a pre-evaluation period, before the evaluating committee is constituted, the administrator will submit a position description and a self-evaluation.

4. All information and assessments collected and used by the evaluating committee and its deliberations will be strictly confidential.

5. Decisions made or action taken as a result of these evaluations are done only by the person or group to whom the administrator reports, but they should include consultation with the committee, with others affected, and full discussion with the administrator. Once action is taken, the responsible administrator will forward a summary of the action to the President of the Faculty Senate. (*) A follow-up report in specific performance areas may be required.

6. The evaluation process should be designed and carried out in a manner appropriate to the position being evaluated. This flexibility should extend to written evaluating instruments, the range of affected persons interviewed, and the style of those questions. Moreover:
   (a) the administrator and office being evaluated will be informed in advance of the review, its purposes, and how the review will be used;
   (b) the evaluating committee should include administrators and faculty and, where appropriate, staff, students, alumni, and community members. In the case of Deans, the college's faculty should choose faculty members for the committee, with the Faculty Senate choosing two faculty from outside the college. The faculty members to be designated by the Senate will be determined by voting from a list of qualified and interested faculty. At a minimum, one-third of the committee members should be faculty;
   (c) the committee will also consider the performance of the units reporting to the administrator and will receive input from individuals and constituent groups (faculty/staff/student) most directly affected. (**) Evaluations should be scheduled well in advance and carried out at times not directly connected with an emergency or crisis facing the persons and offices being evaluated.

(*) Should this report forwarded to the Faculty Senate also include a summary of the findings of the evaluation, in addition to the actions based on those findings?
(**) Should the Faculty Senate be allowed formally to submit a list of recommended persons or groups to be interviewed as part of the evaluation process?
POSSIBLE REVISIONS TO THE POLICY ON APPOINTMENT AND CONTINUATION IN OFFICE OF DEANS

(originally approved by the Senate on 14 April 1993)

Current wording:

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 consultation with college faculty and chairs shall include the taking of a vote by secret ballot on any potential appointment. (*) A 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 Provost and that a Dean's appointment and continuing appointment occurs with the advice and consent of the faculty and chairs of the college....

(*) -- May this secret ballot include the academic rank of the faculty member voting? Does this still preserve anonymity? Does the term 'ballot' exclude additional input from the voting faculty? Would inclusion of such input as part of the faculty vote allow for too much discretion weighting of the vote on the part of the Provost interpreting that input?

Proposed additional wording: This secret ballot may, at the discretion of the Provost, include the faculty members' academic ranks and may also include input in addition to the simple yea/nay vote.

NOTE FOR SENATORS FROM JAN ROEBUCK:

We are developing training modules for faculty to help them learn some of the more sophisticated options on Internet & would like to give Senators the opportunity to work on this. These modules will cover training with a more sophisticated communications package (PINE), which a variety of ways to locate a colleague on Internet; how to use the UNM Gopher to find information on the system.

This is not for novice users. Participants will need basic E-mail skills -- able to log on, send & receive messages.

These tools work from a UNIX platform, so participants will need to have an account already set up on one of our UNIX machines (people who still use VMS mail & Bootees will need to contact Corrine about setting up a new account ahead of time).

The workshops will be offered in the Journalism computer pod on 3 Friday afternoons, March 4, 11 & 25 from 1-4 pm. We already have many potential eager volunteers for this, so we ask people to sign up only if they are seriously planning to participate.

Senate gets first opportunity on this -- please call the Faculty Development Office at X-7898 or Email CORRINNE@CARINA by end of day Thursday to sign up -- we'll take people on a first come first served basis. After Thursday, we'll open it up to other faculty. I think Corrine is planning to be at the Senate meeting so she can help you with questions or whatever.

Jan
Report of the Faculty Senate Long Range Planning Committee to the Faculty Senate, February 8, 1994

Committee Structure:
Fourteen faculty members appointed by the Faculty Senate from at least 7 colleges, plus three voting representatives appointed by the administration from each of three areas:
1) academic affairs (Richard Holder), 2) administration and planning (Richard Cady), 3) business and finance (Julie Weaks). Current faculty representatives (and numbers) are from the following academic units: Anderson School (1), Architecture and Planning (1), Arts and Sciences (3), Centennial Library (1), Education (2), Fine Arts (2), Gallup Branch (1), Medical Center Library (1), and Nursing (1).

Committee Charge:
"The Faculty Senate Long Range Planning Committee is an integral part of the University’s planning process. Its primary function is to work with the administration and the faculty on the formulation and implementation of University policies and organization for effective long range planning. The faculty point of view shall be considered in all University planning. The Committee shall evaluate the effectiveness of policies and offices that are established for the purpose of planning. The Committee may also participate in monitoring program reviews. At its discretion the Committee shall conduct periodic surveys of faculty opinion and/or preference regarding proposed policies, overall University operations and other relevant matters. Reports of the results of such monitoring and surveys are to be made to the Faculty Senate as often as necessary, and in the Committee’s annual report each April. The Committee shall meet with the Budget Committee for coordination purposes as often as necessary, but at least once each semester."

1. Recommended to Faculty Senate that it adopt revised procedures for approval of new academic programs or units, or revisions in existing programs or units, namely, that it require submission of..."estimates of cost and sources of other needed resources for the first three to five years of operation of the new or revised program or unit..." prior to approving proposals for new or revised programs or units. Approved by the Faculty Senate during the fall of 1992 (virtually unchanged, I believe) and implemented by the Faculty Senate Curricula and Graduate Committees.

2. Encouraged formalization of the efforts originally undertaken voluntarily in connection with the North Central Association "Focused Visit" in May 1992 to assess student achievements.
The Faculty Senate approved a proposal (not developed by LRPC) to form an ad hoc Student Outcomes Assessment Committee in December, 1992. The committee members were appointed and the committee initiated its work last spring.

3. Recommended to the Provost Search Committee that the following criteria be adopted and applied in evaluating semifinal candidates:
   1) The ... candidates shall provide evidence of an ability to coordinate a university-wide process for developing and continuously improving plans for the future of our institution, particularly as these affect its academic programs.
   2) The ... candidates shall exhibit an ability to organize and execute a broadly accepted process for allocating and reallocation funds consistent with the institution's plans.

These were accepted by the search committee and, to our knowledge, they were used.

4. Encouraged the Academic Vice President (Chris Garcia) to develop a policy and procedure that would ensure full consideration of the fiscal and academic aspects of proposals to create new units on campus, or new branches or education centers of UNM. This arose out of concern about the way approval was sought for the Taos Education Center.

5. Considered ways in which to improve interactions between UNM and the National Laboratories in New Mexico. The discussion initially arose in connection with the suggestion that UNM submit a proposal to manage Sandia National Laboratories.

1993-94 Activities

1. Developing a policy and procedure for approval of new or revised units, centers, or institutes on the main campus, or branches or education centers off-campus. Hope to submit a proposal on this to the Faculty Senate later this semester.

2. Continuing to discuss university-national laboratory relationships. Considering a proposal to form a university-laboratory programs office. Our discussion appears to be evolving into one of how to improve relations with an array of external constituent areas including human services and education, fine arts, health, and science and technology.

3. Recently initiated an effort to assess how to improve communications and interactions between the branches and the main campus.
4. Continuing to follow with interest the work of the Student Outcomes Assessment Committee.

5. The chair is a member of an ad hoc committee chaired by Richard Holder to develop a concept paper regarding the future of the Planning and Policy Studies Office. Motivated by Richard Cady's announcement of his retirement in May, LRPC is following up on our previous recommendation that a planning office be created and a planning officer be appointed to support planning in units across the campus, as well as planning for the university as a whole.

6. Overseeing the administration and analysis of the HERI survey of faculty and administrators.

7. Continuing to encourage planning efforts by academic units, and by the university as a whole.
   1) UPC efforts to revise and implement a rational budget planning process.
   2) Encourage the Provost and other senior administrators to undertake broad discussions with the faculty, staff, and students to develop a shared vision of the university. Encourage faculty to participate in such discussions.

Personal comment: The current climate for higher education in New Mexico appears to be relatively quite favorable. Also, there appears to be an opportunity to develop a positive working relationship with some senior UNM administrators. The faculty should consider taking advantage of this opportunity.

[Signature and date]