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March 2, 1994

TO: Members of the UNM Faculty Senate

FROM: Barbara Thomas, Office of the University Secretary

SUBJECT: March Meeting

The UNM Faculty Senate will meet on Tuesday, March 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 February 8, 1994
3. Senate President's Report -- Professor Bel Campbell
4. Report from Provost Mary Sue Coleman
5. Reports regarding Legislative Outcome, Compensation and Tuition -- Professors Bel Campbell and Maurice Wildin
6. Administrative Reviews -- Professor William MacPherson
7. Proposed Revision of the Student Grievance Procedure -- Karen Glaser, Dean of Students
8. Recommendation from the Teaching Enhancement Committee -- Professor Paul Kerkof
9. Report on Parking -- Leon Ward, Director of Parking Services
10. Items from the Curricula Committee -- Professor Bel Campbell
The March 8, 1994 meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Bel Campell at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

Senators present: Dave Baldwin (Zimmerman Library), Lyndsianne Boone (English), Joan Bybee (Linguistics), Bel Campbell (Physics & Astronomy), Jeff Davis (Math & Statistics), Michele Dial (Valencia Branch), John Finkelstein (Management), Charles Fleckemann (Eloc & Comp Expr), Kenneth Gardner (Medicine), John Geissman (Earth & Planetary Sciences), Larry Garbet (Anthropology), Deborah Graham (Med Centr Lib), Blaine Hart (Radiology), Roy Johnson (Civil Engr), Kathleen Koehler (HPPEIP), Tan Kyner (Math & Stats), Oleiy Larson (Nursing), Harry Lull (Contemporary Lib), Estrella Lopetheis (Dental Hygiene), William MacPherson (Journalism) and Gerald Weiss (Physiology).

Absent: Irv Barton (Biology), Jane Bruker (Gallup Branch), Richard Coughlin (Sociology), Eva Encinias (Theatre & Dance), Robert Glew (Medicine), Carolyn Hild (Microbiology), Paul Montner (Medicine), Elizabeth Nielsen (Special Ed), Carolyn Voxx (Medicine), Scott Walker (Psychiatry) and Helen Zorgolowicz (Gallup Branch).

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

Minutes of February 8, 1994. The summarized minutes of the meeting of February 8, 1994 were not available to be included in the agenda and were distributed at the meeting. Approval will be sought at the April meeting of the Senate after the Senators have had an opportunity to read them with care.

Senate President's Report. Senate President Bel Campbell reported on the status of administrative reviews. The review of John Rinaldi, Dean of University College, has been completed and Dean Rinaldi has resigned from that position. Associate Provost Jan Roebuck has assumed the position on a temporary basis. The review of Nick Estes, University Counsel, is in its final stage and has been forwarded to President Peck and the review of Robert Migneault, Dean of Library Services, has just begun.

President Campbell noted that the review procedure as approved by the Faculty Senate on March 8, 1988 states that "the office and individual performance of every UNM administrator ... should be evaluated every five years. The person being evaluated should have been in office a minimum of three years."
She announced forthcoming meetings of the University Planning Council (3/9/94) at which budget and tuition issues will be discussed, a special meeting of the UNM faculty (3/29/94) to discuss UNM's participation in intercollegiate athletics and the meetings of the Board of Regents.

Additionally, the UNM chapter of the American Association of University Professors and the Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee are sponsoring "Governance Days" on March 24 and 25, 1994. Professor Jack Schuster of the Claremont Graduate Schools will be a guest of UNM on those two days and will be available to speak with faculty.

The ad hoc committee on the future of the UNM Office of Planning and Policy Studies has submitted a proposal for the reorganization of that office and a search will begin in the near future for a replacement for Director Richard Cady who is retiring.

President Campbell announced the death of Professor Emeritus Stuart Northrop whose memorial minute appears below.

MEMORIAL MINUTE FOR STUART A. NORTHROP

Emeritus Professor Stuart A. Northrop died on Friday, January 21, 1994, at the age of 89. Stu's association with the University of New Mexico spanned almost two-thirds of a century. He was born on March 14, 1904, in Danbury, Connecticut, attended Robert College in Istanbul, Turkey (1921-23), and received his bachelor's (1925) and doctoral (1929) degrees from Yale University. Stu arrived at UNM in 1928 as Assistant Professor and Acting Chair, and became Chair the following year, a position he held for the next 32 years. He served as Acting Dean of the Graduate School in 1961-62, and as Research Professor in the Department of Geology until his retirement in 1969. Even after retirement he was an active Emeritus Professor, conducting research and publishing into the mid-1980's.

During his long tenure as Chair, he laid many of the foundations of the present Department, including the creation of the masters and doctoral programs, the construction of the geology building (1953) that now bears his name, and the addition of several young faculty who served their entire subsequent academic careers at UNM and who are themselves Emeritus Professors (Wongdi, Fitzsimmons, Anderson, Eleton). Stu established the Geology Museum, and taught thousands of students in his historical geology, stratigraphy and paleontology classes. Fourteen graduate students obtained masters degrees under his guidance.

Stu's scholarly interests ranged widely, from paleontology to mineralogy to New Mexico's earthquake history. Among his major contributions may be mentioned a 300-page study of the paleontology and mineralogy of the Guadalupe Mountains, New Mexico, published by the Geological Society of America in 1939; the classic and still much-used book, "Minerals of New Mexico" (1959); and his study (with V.C. Kelley) of the geology of the Sandia Mountains and vicinity, published as a memoir by the New Mexico Bureau of Mines and Mineral Resources in 1975. His strong interest in history led him to write "University of New Mexico Contributions in Geology, 1899-1964", and "History of the New Mexico Geologic Society, 1947-1968". Altogether, he produced about 100 publications, from 1928 to 1986. In recognition of his scholarly contributions, many persons have served as editors and publishers of his works.
achievements, Stu was chosen to present the 8th Annual UNM Research Lecture (April 1961, on the topic "New Mexico's Fossil Record"), the first member of the Geology Department so honored. He was an editor without peer, serving in that capacity for several professional society publications, and was selected an honorary member of the New Mexico Geological Society in 1962.

Stuart Northrop will be remembered as a gracious and generous scholar, whose presence at UNM positively influenced the lives of many students and colleagues, and made this a better institution. He is survived by Iyah, his wife of 63 years, his daughter June and her family, three grandchildren, six great-grandchildren, and a nephew, David Northrop and their families.

I ask that these words be inscribed in the official records of the Faculty Senate, and that a copy of this memorial minute be sent to his family.

Presented by Barry S. Rue
Professor and Chair
Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences

Report from Provost Mary Sue Coleman. Provost Coleman reported that one of the issues which has taken up a great deal of time in the past months is the budgeting plans for academic units. She explained that this year, rather than requesting each dean to submit a full and comprehensive budget proposal, a new three-year cycle has been put into place whereby one quarter of the colleges and schools present an in-depth budget plan every three years. The other deans, on their off-years, do a shorter budget presentation. Each dean who has completed the in-depth, three-year budget proposal then presents the plan to a small group which includes the Senate president and the chairman of the Senate Long Range Planning Committee. For these in-depth plans, the deans are asked to include every possible budget request including salaries and compensation, operating expenses, major and minor capital expenses, and equipment requests. The expectation is that this procedure will reduce the complications of requests which come up after budgets have been approved by creating longer term plans.

An evaluation of this process will be requested by Provost Coleman.

This year all of the capital budget requests were put on a general obligation bond issue. This method was not the wish of UNM; however, the capital budget requests of all New Mexico institutions were done this way and a strategy will not have to be developed in order for the bond issues to be passed. The top priority of UNM is a classroom building. The second priority is a renovation for the Chemistry Building for which there is a $1.6 million matching funds grant from the National Science Foundation. Other UMN requests include planning monies for a science and technology building and an equipment request of $900,000.

In response to a question from the February Senate meeting, Provost Coleman said that she is willing to report to the Faculty Senate regarding the results of administrative reviews.

She reported that during meetings with the Senate Long Range Planning Committee, a suggestion had been made for UMN to better align itself with the national laboratories, foundations and corporations in order to generate new resources for UMN, particularly in the areas of research and graduate education. Provost Coleman intends to submit a proposal for such action in the future. This effort
would be funded, she said, by indirect cost returns to the institution and, if unsuccessful, the program would be discontinued.

Provost Coleman concluded her report by saying that the issue of indirect cost is being closely examined and a renegotiation of the percentage of indirect costs is now underway. Funding for graduate education is a serious concern and perhaps indirect costs can be used to address the problem.

President Bel Campbell urged Senators to consider the issue of who might wish to serve as president, vice president and on the Senate Operations Committee for next year.

Report regarding Legislative Outcome, Compensation and Tuition. President Campbell reviewed the Budget Planning Guidelines for this year. The first-priority is to keep UNM even with inflation and with mandated costs and to maintain the current quality of programs and services, including our ability to respond to increased demand for instructional services. Any monies left from priority one would then go toward the second priority which is to address peer inequities, salary compaction in the academic ranks and to bring the minimum staff wage to $6 per hour. She said there is sufficient money this year to begin addressing priority two.

The third priority is to address improvements in existing programs and services, new programs and services and other special needs.

Regarding tuition, Campbell explained that the Legislature has not set a cap on tuition increase; however, a credit was taken for a 3.34 tuition increase. The Legislature has provided for a 4.1% compensation increase for higher education and public education employees for the forthcoming year. Both ASNM and GSA have proposed a 4% increase in tuition and fees for 1994-95.

The UNM administration proposes an increase of 10% in tuition and fees for nonresident undergraduates, all graduate students and law students. The proposal from the Board of Regents via the University Planning Council includes increases in the HEPI, UNM per capita income and state 165 appropriation per student amounting to 4.73% increase and an increase of no more than one percentage point in student share of the cost of education amounting to a 4.4% increase. The tuition increase recommended by faculty members on the University Planning Council was 9.1%.

President Campbell went on to explain that implicit in the recommendation regarding faculty compensation was equal compensation for staff and that it will be an explicit recommendation from the faculty to the University Planning Council that there be parity between faculty and staff in the compensation increase. In five of the past six years, faculty have received a greater increase in compensation than staff. She said that it was the argument and recommendation of the Senate Budget Committee that the low student share of instruction cost strongly impacts the fact that UNM is approximately 94 behind its peer institutions in compensation.

The final decision regarding increases in both compensation and tuition will be made by the Board of Regents at its meeting on March 22.

Professor Maurice Wildin, chairman of the Senate Long Range Planning Committee and one of the faculty members on the University Planning Council, expressed his thanks to President Campbell for her hard work during the budget planning.
Senator Peter Fabich asked if the salaries of teaching assistants is being addressed. It was explained that any such increases will have to come from the operating budgets of departments.

Administrative Reviews. Senator William MacPherson reminded the Senate that a discussion had taken place at the February Senate meeting regarding the administrative review process. At that time, Senator MacPherson expressed the belief that a copy of the final report of the review committee should be presented to the Senate and there was discussion of the issue of confidentiality. He spoke strongly in favor of a more open style of governance while at the same time maintaining confidence as necessary. It is his opinion, however, that the entire document should not be confidential since the administrative reviews are driven by the Faculty Senate and should be more accessible to faculty. He pointed that in the past, administrative reviews seem to have simply disappeared. He further said that he does not agree that greater confidentiality guarantees greater truth.

There was considerable discussion regarding what a committee might do to change the policy as approved by the Senate in March 1988 as well as the issue of confidentiality and the suggestion that there be separate reviews of departments and the administrators in charge of them.

Senator Kathleen Koehler observed that perhaps there should be two separate review processes, one for academic administrators and units which report to the present and one for the non-academic units. Senator Howard Schreyer noted the difficulty in the process since sometimes the individual does define the office regardless of what the official job description might be. The time frame for the new document to be presented to the Senate was also discussed and it was agreed that the document would probably not be ready by May 1994. After a considerable discussion, the Senate approved the following resolution by acclamation:

The Faculty Senate of the University of New Mexico recognizes that it is important that all administrative offices at the University of New Mexico be reviewed on a regular basis by the Faculty of the University of New Mexico:

And, that the Faculty of the University of New Mexico should have the opportunity to provide meaningful input into the evaluation of individuals holding administrative offices at the University of New Mexico in an efficient and fair manner:

And, recognizing that the present Administrative Review Process was enacted on March 8, 1988:

And, that the present Administrative Review Process does not appear to meet the goals of reviewing the administrative offices and the individuals acting as administrators at the University of New Mexico in an efficient and fair manner:

And, experience with the existing Administrative Review Process indicates there are problems with the process and views these problems with concern:

AND THE FACULTY SENATE HAVING DISCUSSED THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW PROCESS AND CONCLUDED THAT THE ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW PROCESS SHOULD BE REVIEWED AND EVALUATED, REQUESTS THAT:
1. The President of the Faculty Senate appoint an ad hoc committee to review and evaluate the Administrative Review Process enacted March 8, 1988; and

2. Said committee shall after reviewing and evaluating the present Administrative Review Process make such deletions, revisions, corrections, or additions to the process that it deems appropriate to improve and update the Faculty Senate administrative review process at the University of New Mexico; and

3. Said committee shall submit a new or revised Faculty Senate Administrative Review Process and report to the Faculty Senate by no later than the May 1994 Faculty Senate meeting.

Proposed Revision of the Student Grievance Procedure. President Campbell explained that workshops had been held recently to discuss the proposed revisions of the Student Grievance Procedure and then introduced Karen Glaser, Dean of Students and Brian Polding, Assistant Dean of Students.

Mr. Polding explained that the major changes were indicated in the Executive Summary included in the Senate agenda. He said that very little had been changed and that the main changes were in Articles IV and V and those are explained in the Executive Summary.

Senator William MacPherson asked why the entire Grievance Procedure was not included in the agenda and President Campbell responded that the omission was due to the length of the Policy. MacPherson said he would not vote on the Policy without seeing the entire document and having the chance to debate the issues. He said he believes there are free speech issues and well as due process issues in question. He further stated that he finds the language parental, whereas the role of the University is to allow young people to grow up by being able to participate in making decisions regarding how they live and function at the University. He said he does not wish to see someone else’s summary but would prefer to draw his own conclusions.

Of particular concern to Senator MacPherson was the item regarding a situation in which criminal proceedings are occurring concurrently with disciplinary action at the University of New Mexico and which would allow UNM to put the student in such circumstances on probation or actually suspend the student pending the outcome of the civil proceedings.

Senator Jeff Davis said he had attended one of the small workshops presented regarding the revisions of the Student Grievance Procedure and that although the material was well presented, he is not in the position to judge the document. However, after listening to the discussion, he now believes that perhaps further discussion is required.

Senator MacPherson moved to table action on the Student Grievance Procedure until the April Faculty Senate meeting and the motion passed.

Report on Parking. Leon Nard, Director of Parking Services, told the Senate that the parking situation was actually going to get worse before it is solved. He noted that when he arrived at the University two and one-half years ago, parking violations were rampant. In addition, Parking Services was operating in the red. He received complaints about the employees at Parking Services and there was no plan for parking.
He told the Senate that many actions have been taken toward creating a pedestrian campus and that this involves a change in thinking. Although the rules are still being disregarded, the situation is improving. Personnel are now better trained and the lines at Parking Services are getting shorter.

Other improvements, he explained, are that permit requests will be mailed out in April, the north "G" lot will be paved, an additional 2000 spaces on the south campus will be made available and ten new buses will be purchased to move people back and forth. The University is working with Sun-Trans to improve bus service to UNM and in the future we will have trolleys on Central Ruanes. Special events parking continues to be a problem, but it is planned for those attending special events to park off campus and have buses to take them to the main campus. He said there is no incentive parking for car-poolers.

In the future, there will be a small increase in fees, the zones will change somewhat and the process of issuing parking permits will be streamlined.

In response to a question about cars being towed at night, Mr. Ward said that people cannot park wherever they wish at night. The rules were in place prior to his arrival at UNM, but were not being enforced. Also, in the future, handicapped permits for UNM campus will be issued by the University and purchased just as regular permits are.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Thomas, Secretary
OVERVIEW OF LEGISLATIVE ACTION
1994-95 OPERATING BUDGET APPROPRIATIONS

The following is a summary of State General Fund appropriations for the various line item programs at UNM. Briefly, the appropriations include:

1. An overall increase in appropriation for UNM of 9.3%.
2. Appropriation for an average increase in employee compensation of 4.5%.
3. The MAIN CAMPUS Instruction and General (I&G) appropriation includes:
   - Full funding for workload increases.
   - An increase or "credit" for tuition revenue of 3.3% (translates into approximately 2.5% of tuition and fees).
   - No increase in funding for other operating costs or utilities.
   - An increase of 9.8% for library acquisitions.
   - Funding of new library formula at about 50% of full funding amount.
   - No funding for peer adjustment.
   - No formula funding for equipment replacement. (There is some one-time equipment acquisition funding in the capital budget.)
   - No increase in the building renewal and replacement formula.

The following legislatively mandated programs are included in the Main Campus I&G appropriation for FY 1994-95:

- Spanish Resource Center: $100,000
- Distance Education for Nurse Practitioners: $295,100
- Director of Physician Assistant Training Program: $75,000
- Addition of Students for Nurse Practitioner Program: $202,400

4. The following programs which were a legislatively mandated part of Main Campus I&G in FY 1993-94 have been removed from I&G and added as new special project line items for FY 1994-95:

- New Mexico Historical Review: $102,600
- Youth Recreation Program: $151,900
- Geographic Alliance: $50,000
- Ibero-American Eden Consortium: $205,900
5. The School of Medicine Instruction and General (I&G) appropriation includes:
   - An increase or "credit" for tuition revenue of 10%.
   - New funding for the following:
     - Pediatric Nephrologist $110,700
     - Expansion of Occupational Therapy Program $61,800
     - Master's in Public Health Degree Program $226,400
     - Center for Disaster Medicine $100,000
     - AIDS Education $15,000
     - Expansion of Physical Therapy Program $150,000

6. The following programs which were a part of Medical School I&G in FY 1993-94 have been removed from I&G and added as new special project line items for FY 1994-95:
   - Locum Tenens Program $200,000
   - Area Health Education Centers $216,300

7. The following new line-item appropriations have been added:
   - Advanced Materials Research $75,000
   - Manufacturing Engineering Program $200,000
   - Hispanic Student Center $225,000
   - Indian Resource Materials for Libraries $80,000
   - Native American Resource Materials $20,000
   - Graduate Student Computers $200,000
   - Law School Library Books $50,000
   - Multi-cultural Gender Equity Library Resources $25,000
   - Graduate Student Research $200,000
   - Sci and Engineering Women's Career Development $15,000
   - Center for Wildlife Law Education $60,000
   - Recruitment and Retention of Native American Students $220,000
   - Office of International Technical Assistance $50,000
   - NM Judicial Education $199,500
   - Institutional Discretionary Funds $600,000
   - (100,000 for Main Campus and $100,000 for each Branch Campus)

8. The appropriation to Athletics includes $209,000 to address gender equity issues.

9. Various appropriations made to other state agencies for UNM programs (see Attachment 1).

Capital appropriations of $20,484,650 have been identified for UNM from various sources: General Fund Surplus, Severance Tax and General Obligation Bonds (See Attachment 2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY</th>
<th>SB 372 (HB-2 Jr) GF Surplus</th>
<th>Other GF Surplus HB-19</th>
<th>Sovereign Tax Bonds HB-19</th>
<th>General Obl Bonds HB 680</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course Well</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Golf Course Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Golf Course Improvements</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Room</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tow Diehm Athletic Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Athletic Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Training Facilities</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof/Equipment (Child Psych, Carrie Tingley)</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry Bldg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Education Center/Planning</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Education Center Computers</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Shuttle Busses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Student Svcs Ctr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Tech Complex Planning</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Ctr Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallup Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallup Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos Stdnt Svc Bldg Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Learning Res Ctr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Acquisitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Main Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Gallup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Los Alamos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Valencia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Equipment Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallup Equipment Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos Equipment Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Equipment Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,947,000</td>
<td>625,000</td>
<td>5,807,000</td>
<td>12,105,650</td>
<td>20,484,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FY 1994–95 Appropriations for UNM
Made to Other State Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Agencies</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Health</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>PIE (Preschool &amp; Infant Evaluation) Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Health</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Maternity &amp; Infant Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Policy Commission</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>Population Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Health</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>Casa Esperanza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFA</td>
<td>176,000</td>
<td>Fetal Alcohol/DWI Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Public Edcn</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>For family development training programs coordinated by the University of NM to increase participation of low-income parents in the education of their children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Higher Ed</td>
<td>606,300</td>
<td>MESA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Dept</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>Highway to Science Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statewide Appropriations for Higher Education
Made to Commission on Higher Education (UNM will receive a share of these)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHE</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>Instructional Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
<td>Programs including: Educational Options info, Small Business Development Centers System Development Fund, Women/Minority Business Assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appropriations for Financial Aid (UNM will receive a share of these)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Mexico Educational Assistance Foundation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17,104,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TUITION POLICY APPROVED BY REGENTS (VIA PLANNING COUNCIL) SPRING, 1993

The policy includes two factors, which are summed together to yield the tuition increase:

1. Average of the increases in HEPI, NM Per Capita Income, and state I&G appropriation per student.
   
   (a) Higher Education Price Index is exclusive of inflation, reflects real increases in costs of delivering higher education
   
   92-93 increase: +3.4%

   (b) New Mexico Per Capita Income from U.S. Dept. of Commerce
   
   91-92 increase: +4.8%
   
   (figures for 92-93 not yet available; estimated increase = 5-6%; total NM personal income growth 92-93 = 7.7% vs. 7.4% for 91-92)

   (c) I&G Appropriation per FTE student
   
   increase of budgeted 93-94 over actual 92-93: +6.0%
   
   
   \[
   \frac{(3.4 + 4.8 + 6.0)}{3} = 4.73\% \\
   4.73 \times 0.75 = 3.55\% \\
   4.73 \times 1.25 = 5.92\%
   \]

2. No more than one percentage point increase in student share of cost of education

Note: Faculty Senate-approved (1992-93) policy is no less than a one percentage point increase in student share

A tuition and fees increase of approximately 4.4% yields a 1% increase in student share

one percentage point increase in share: 4.4%

Tuition increase recommended by faculty members of University Planning Council: +9.1%
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 would be 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** (students, faculty and staff)

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
TO: Bel Campbell, Faculty Senate President
FROM: Paul R. Kerkof, Chair, Teaching Enhancement Committee
SUBJECT: Teaching Resource Center Proposal
DATE: February 10, 1994

Enclosed is a proposal from the Teaching Resource Center Task Force of the Teaching Enhancement Committee for consideration by the Faculty Senate Operations Committee. The proposal has been unanimously approved by the Teaching Enhancement Committee. The only action requested of the Senate Operations Committee at this time is that the proposal be approved in principle. The Faculty Development Office has provided space to house the Teaching Resource Center. No request for funds is included in this proposal. We would like to initiate operation of the facility following approval by the Faculty Senate.

Thank you for your consideration of the proposal.
INTRODUCTION

For years the University, in its public pronouncements, in its Faculty Handbook, and in UNM 2000, has said that excellence in teaching is an important goal. The Teaching Enhancement Committee has made strides to that end with a variety of proposals to improve the quality of teaching at the University. One of them is that a Teaching Resource Center be established at UNM.

Faculty normally are not able to keep track of developments in teaching methodologies. Their time is limited, the resources are generally not easily available to them, and they do not all have the expertise to benefit from publications in education. In addition, faculty do not often have opportunities to discuss pedagogical aspects of their various disciplines. A Teaching Resource Center can augment the teacher education program by serving as an information source and by offering opportunities for practical experiences.

GOALS

- The TRC will house the Presidential Fellows, Burlington, Alumni, Toya, and other winners of teaching awards. These faculty can serve as mentors and share their teaching skills with other faculty.
- A TRC will monitor the educational publishing field and disseminate useful information to faculty. This information can be shared by offering symposia and workshops, by distributing a teaching newsletter, and by maintaining a library of recent publications which is organized and accessible to all faculty. The Center will thus be seen as a conduit by which new teaching ideas are brought to the university.
- A TRC will offer direct assistance for faculty who wish to improve their teaching. Assistance can be made available in a confidential manner, independent of departmental evaluations for tenure, promotion, and salary increases.
- A TRC will offer opportunities to hear about teaching and talk about teaching, both in gatherings of faculty or in a faculty consultation.
- The Center will serve as an information clearinghouse with current articles, an idea file, teaching technique information, test fabrication, sample syllabi, teaching portfolios, tests, videos of good teaching in action, classroom assessment, etc.
- The Center will cooperate with the Research Center offering a cumulative data base and experimental situations for research in teaching.
- The Director of the Center will assist with new faculty orientations and mentorships.
- The TRC will assist in finding and training mentors for the Regent Scholars.
1. Status of ongoing (1993) administrative reviews:

--- The review of John Rinaldi, Dean of University College, has been completed. As a result, the Dean has left that position. Jan Roebeck, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, has taken temporary leadership of the College. Other dramatic changes should show up soon.

--- The review of Nick Estes, University Counsel, has just been forwarded by Maureen Sanders (Law) to President Peck. (As of this morning, he had not yet received it.)

--- The review of Robert Migneault, General Library, is just getting underway.

2. Pool of administrators available for review (starting dates prior to 1/89):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Slavin</td>
<td>Dir. Int'l Programs &amp; Svcs.</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Sandoval</td>
<td>Dir. Career Couns. &amp; Placement</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Cooper</td>
<td>General Manager, KNME-TV</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Eaton</td>
<td>Dir. Student Health Center</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Phillips</td>
<td>Dir. UNM - Gallup Branch</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Hadas</td>
<td>Dir. UNM Press</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Holder</td>
<td>Assoc. Provost for Acad. Aff.</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignacio Cordova</td>
<td>Assoc. Provost for Acad. Aff.</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Lee Brown</td>
<td>Dir. School of Public Admin.</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Powell</td>
<td>Dir. Office of Research Admin.</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Abraham</td>
<td>Exec. Dir. Alumni Relations</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David McKinney</td>
<td>Vice President, Bus. &amp; Finance</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes Lockwood</td>
<td>Dir. UNM Childcare Center</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Candelaria</td>
<td>Dir. Disabled Student Services</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Glaser</td>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Zink</td>
<td>Assoc. VP Research/ Bus. &amp; Gov.</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Jones</td>
<td>Exec. Asst. to the President</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sobolewski</td>
<td>Assoc. VP Comp. &amp; IR Tech.</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Britton</td>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current administrative review procedure (approved by the Senate 3/8/88) reads:

The office and individual performance of every UNM administrator ... should be evaluated every five years. The person being evaluated should have been in office a minimum of three years.

3. Meeting of the University Planning Council, 330PM - 7, Roberts Room, Scholes Hall. The meeting will be held to discuss, among other things, tuition and salary policy. This is a public meeting.

4. By successful petition of the faculty to the President, a special meeting of the entire faculty will be held on Tuesday, March 29, at 330PM, in Anthropology 163 to consider this resolution: That the University of New Mexico should cease to participate in intercollegiate athletics.
5. Meetings of the Board of Regents:

Friday, March 11, 8AM(*)
Roberts Room, Scholes Hall
Finance and Facilities Committee

Monday, March 14, 1100AM
Roberts Room, Scholes Hall
Full Board: mandated meeting to elect officers and approve
annual resolutions and act on other matters presented in the agenda; some Regents
may participate via telephone conference

Monday, March 14, 115PM
Dean's Conf. Room, Basic Medical Sci. Bldg.
Health Sciences Committee

Tuesday, March 22, 10AM
Roberts Room, Scholes Hall
Full Board: tuition, salary policy, budget allocations, et al.

(*) Approx. first hour in executive session

Except as noted or when real estate or personnel matters are being discussed, all
meetings are public. Agendas are available through the Public Affairs Office at least 24
hours before each meeting. Individuals may be recognized and heard by the Board by
arranging with the President's office in advance, under the following guidelines:

-- public input will come at the beginning of each 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, sequence of speakers, et al.

6. The UNM Chapter of the AAUP and the UNM Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee
are jointly sponsoring Governance Days, Thursday-Friday, 24-25 March, 1994. Professor Jack H.
Schuster from the Claremont Graduate School will visit the University on those days and will be
available to speak with faculty, in addition to attending an open forum (faculty may contribute to
the agenda of the forum by contacting any member of AF&T). Further information to follow.

7. The Ad Hoc Committee on the future of the UNM Office of Planning and Policy Studies
has produced a proposal for the reorganization of that office and has submitted that proposal to
the President and the Provost. A search for a suitable replacement for Director Richard Cady
should begin shortly.
TUITION POLICY APPROVED BY REGENTS (VIA PLANNING COUNCIL) SPRING, 1993

The policy includes two factors, which are summed together to yield the tuition increase:

(1) Average of the increases in HEPI, NM Per Capita Income, and state I&G appropriation per student.

   (a) Higher Education Price Index reflects real and inflationary increases in costs of delivering higher education

      92-93 increase:  +3.4%

   (b) New Mexico Per Capita Income from U.S. Dept. of Commerce

      91-92 increase:  +4.8%

      (figures for 92-93 not yet available; estimated increase = 5-6%;
      total NM personal income growth 92-93 = 7.7% vs. 7.4% for 91-92)

   (c) I&G Appropriation per FTE student

      increase of budgeted 93-94 over actual 92-93:  +6.0%

      \[
      \frac{3.4 + 4.8 + 6.0}{3} = 4.73\%
      \]

      \[
      4.73 \times 0.75 = 3.55\% \\
      4.73 \times 1.25 = 5.92\%
      \]

(2) No more than one percentage point increase in student share of cost of education

   Note: Faculty Senate-approved (1992-93) policy is no less than a one percentage point increase in student share

   A tuition and fees increase of approximately 4.4% yields a 1% increase in student share

   one percentage point increase in share:  4.4%

Tuition increase recommended by faculty members of University Planning Council:  +9.1%
MAIN CAMPUS INSTRUCTION & GENERAL ALLOCATION OF NEW MONIES

Budget Planning Guidelines:

(1) First Priority
- maintain current quality of programs and services, including our ability to respond to growth in demand for instructional services
  - increase employee compensation to reflect higher cost of living, promotions, other adjustments: \( \approx 4\% \)
  - inflationary and other increases in non-personnel budgets, including utilities, benefit changes, \textit{et al.}: \( \approx 3\% \)
  - [legislatively mandated expenditures = $672,500]

(2) Second Priority
- address competitive compensation structure
  - peer inequities
  - salary compaction among academic ranks
  - [staff minimum to $6.00/hour]

(3) Third Priority
- address improvements in existing programs and services and investments in new programs and services, and other special needs

Tuition:
- No cap from the legislature, explicit or implicit, but tuition increases clearly a legislative concern
- Credit taken for 3.3% tuition increase (2.5% tuition + fees) in final state appropriation
- Other institutions:
  - NMIMT -- +3% resident tuition + fees
  - +5% non-resident tuition + fees
  - NMSU -- +5.8% tuition + fees
- ASUNM and GSA both propose +4% tuition + fees for 1994-95
- Current proposals from UNM administration include 10% increase in tuition + fees for non-resident undergraduate, all graduate, and law students
Compensation:

- Legislature provided for 4.5% compensation increase for higher ed and public ed employees, effective 1 July 1994.

- Legislature provided for nominal 6% compensation increase for all other state employees, split into +3% on 1 July 1994 and +3% on employee’s anniversary date, which averages out to +4.5% ... except for rise in CPI over that time interval, deflating the second +3% and making the actual total compensation increase < 4.5%

- UNM Faculty Senate-approved policy calls for a 1% minimum increase in student share per year until 30% share level is achieved [+1% share = +4.4% tuition + fees]

- University Planning Council- and Board of Regents-approved tuition policy calls for inflation-based rate plus a 1% maximum increase in student share, to maintain share in the range of 25%-30% of cost of education (defined as State I&G appropriation + mandatory student fees outside of I&G): policy dictates tuition + fees increase of 4.7% + ≤ 4.4%

- The two faculty members of the University Planning Council (Bud Wildin and Bel Campbell), acting in accordance with Faculty Senate, UPC, and Regent policy, have proposed a 9.1% increase in tuition + fees.

- Other institutions:  
  - NMIMT: +5% compensation
  - NMSU: +5% compensation

- Scenario | Tuition + Fees Increase (Res. UG & Grad) | Comp. Increase | % New Funds for Comp. Increases
- --- | --- | --- | ---
- 1 | 2.5% | 5.4% | 67%
- 2 | 4.5% | 6.0% | 69%
- 3 | 6.2% | 6.5% | 71%
- 4 | 8.0% | 7.0% | 73%

Note: a 9.1% increase in resident UG and Grad tuition yields ∼ 7.3% compensation increase

- The Planning and Budgeting Subcommittee of the UPC on 7 March 1994 recommended to the entire UPC the choice of Scenarios 2 and 4. The faculty proposed and the Subcommittee also passed a recommendation of parity between faculty and staff compensation increases.

Attachments:  
(1) Study of Faculty Compensation 1992-93: UNM and Comparison Group Institutions (Source: CHE from 1993 AAUP data; comparisons are "official" CHE peers)
(2) UNM Faculty Salary & Benefits Comparison, Fall 1993 (Source: AAUP data, preview of AY 93-94, UNM OPPS)
(3) Average Faculty/Staff Salary Allocations (Source: UNM Budget Office)
### Study of Faculty Compensation 1992–93

University of New Mexico and Comparison Group Institutions
Prepared by Commission on Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Avg Salary</td>
<td>Avg Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>55,500</td>
<td>65,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Arizona</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>59,600</td>
<td>72,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Arkansas</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>54,700</td>
<td>66,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Colorado</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>64,900</td>
<td>78,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Iowa</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>69,500</td>
<td>85,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Kansas</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>55,900</td>
<td>68,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Missouri</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>56,700</td>
<td>67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Nebraska</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>63,500</td>
<td>75,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Oklahoma</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>57,200</td>
<td>71,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Oregon</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>71,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Texas—Austin</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>70,300</td>
<td>85,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Utah</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>59,200</td>
<td>76,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Washington</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>66,700</td>
<td>81,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Kentucky</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>61,500</td>
<td>73,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of South Carolina</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>69,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Tennessee</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>55,300</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Virginia</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>71,600</td>
<td>87,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison Group Average: 485 | 61,288 | 75,006 | 311 | 44,525 | 55,525 | 254 | 38,713 | 48,306 | 50,043 | 92.2% | 61,824 | 89.0%

NOTE: All institutional averages are weighted by the UNM distribution of faculty across ranks.

**THREE–YEAR COMPARISON OF FACULTY COMPENSATION STUDIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO</th>
<th>Average Faculty Salary</th>
<th>Average Faculty Comp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989–90 Study</td>
<td>40,016</td>
<td>44,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990–91 Study</td>
<td>42,824</td>
<td>46,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991–92 Study</td>
<td>44,984</td>
<td>48,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992–93 Study</td>
<td>46,161</td>
<td>50,043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Change (3 years): 15.4% | 13.1% | 15.6% | 14.0%

MEMORANDUM
March 3, 1994

TO: Distribution
FROM: Richard H. Cady, Director, Planning and Policy Studies
SUBJECT: UNM Faculty Salary and Benefits Comparison Fall 1993

Attached are tables which show comparisons of faculty salaries, compensation and benefits, Fall 1993. The comparison institutions are the 17-member "peer comparison" group. These are the data reported to the U.S. Department of Education and the AAUP. Details are available in Room 306 Scholes Hall. As soon as the NASULGC data are available Tom Field will report his analysis of salaries by rank and discipline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNM Salaries as a percent of peer group average</th>
<th>UNM Compensation as a percent of peer group average</th>
<th>UNM Fringe Benefits as a percent of peer group average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1990 90.2%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1991 93.0%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1992 92.4%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1993 92%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RHC: Distribution:
President's Council
University Planning Council
Council of Deans
Budget Officer
President, Faculty Senate
President, AAUP at UNM
Chair, FSLRP
Chair, FSBC
Faculty Contracts Officer
Special Assistant to the Provost
for Fiscal Affairs
## Comparing Faculty Salaries, Compensation and Benefits: UNM vs 16 Peer Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>$52.4</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado (B)</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas (A)</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average w/o UNM</td>
<td>51.95</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM as a percent of Average</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM’s Rank Order in 17 Institutions</td>
<td>15th</td>
<td>17th</td>
<td>17th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Full-time, 9 month, w/o library faculty, w/o School of Medicine; top 3 ranks only; All institutions adjusted to UNM faculty rank distribution; AAUP data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Legislative Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.2% on salaries:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1.2% on FB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2.83% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.18% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>7-8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) In addition to a 2.83% salary increase is a separate fringe benefit increase of 6.23% for 1990-91. The Legislative increase for all prior years applies to salaries and fringe benefits combined.

(2) Although the Legislature provided for 10% salary and fringe benefit increases, there were numerous factors adversely affecting total I&G funding, most significant of which was the Legislature taking credit for $4.8 million of land and permanent fund revenue against the I&G appropriation, thus reducing the amount of funds available for use in I&G including those for salaries.

(3) Beginning in FY 1988-89, the Legislative salary and fringe benefits increases are supplemented by increases in tuition as established by the Regents.
RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT OF THE FACULTY SENATE TO APPOINT AN AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW PROCESS ENACTED ON MARCH 8, 1988, BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO.

Preamble:

The Faculty Senate of the University of New Mexico recognizes that it is important that all administrative offices at the University of New Mexico be reviewed on a regular basis by the Faculty of the University of New Mexico;

And, that the Faculty of the University of New Mexico should have the opportunity to provide meaningful input into the evaluation of individuals holding Administrative Offices at the University of New Mexico;

And, recognizing that the present Administrative Review Process was enacted on March 8, 1988;

And, that the present Administrative Review Process does not appear to meet the goals of reviewing the administrative offices and the individuals acting as administrators at the University of New Mexico in an efficient and fair manner;

And, experience with the existing Administrative Review Process indicates there are problems with the process and views these problems with concern;

AND THE FACULTY SENATE HAVING DISCUSSED THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW PROCESS AND CONCLUDED THAT THE ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW PROCESS SHOULD BE REVIEWED AND EVALUATED, REQUESTS THAT:

1. The President of the Faculty Senate appoint an ad hoc committee to review and evaluate the Administrative Review Process enacted March 8, 1988; and

2. Said committee shall after reviewing and evaluating the present Administrative Review Process make such deletions, revisions, corrections, or additions to the process that it deems appropriate to improve and update the Faculty Senate administrative review process at the University of New Mexico; and

3. Said committee shall submitted a new or revised Faculty Senate Administrative Review Process and report to the Faculty Senate by no later than the May, 1994, Faculty Senate Meeting.
By a vote of ______ for and ______ against with ______ abstentions this ______ day of ______, 1994, this resolution was ______ and forwarded to the President of the Faculty Senate for ______ appropriate action.

Signed:

Secretary to the Faculty Senate.
1. The office and individual performance of every UNM administrator listed immediately below should be evaluated every five years. The person being evaluated should have been in office a minimum of three years. Every person should be evaluated at least once every five years:
   President, vice presidents, academic deans and all other deans, directors and associate vice presidents who report directly to any one of these administrators (see university organizational chart).

2. The evaluation procedures recommended should be based upon the assumption that an on-going process of evaluation in the form of annual reviews exists at the University of New Mexico. If, indeed, annual reviews have been conducted, a substantial amount of data should be available to complement a five-year summulative evaluation. The purpose of the five-year evaluation should be:
   a. To determine the effectiveness of the administrator and the office for which he/she is responsible; and
   b. To make recommendations for strengthening the effectiveness of the administrator and the office.

3. Every evaluation will be initiated and coordinated by the person to whom the administrator being evaluated reports. (For example, the President of the University reports to the Regents, the vice presidents report to the president, etc.) Each administrator being evaluated will submit a position description and self-evaluation of the position he/she occupies. This pre-evaluation process will occur during the period that the committee is being constituted and given its evaluation charge by the evaluation coordinator.

4. All specific information and assessments collected and used in connection with these evaluations and all committee deliberations will be handled on a strictly confidential basis and not discussed outside committee meetings. The evaluation committee will assume a degree of commitment that assures the highest degree of confidentiality.

5. Any decision made or action taken as a result of these evaluations should be done only by the person or group to whom the administrator being evaluated reports. Such decisions should be made, however, only after appropriate consultation with others affected, including the members of the evaluating committee, and after full discussion with the administrator whose individual performance and office have been evaluated. (For example, only the president is authorized to make such decisions about the vice presidents and only the vice presidents may make decisions and take action about persons reporting to them.) Once administrative action has been taken on a committee report, the responsible administrator will forward a summary of his actions to the President of the Faculty Senate. Depending upon the final action...
taken by the appropriate supervisor to whom the person being evaluated reports, a follow-up report in certain areas of performance may be required.

6. Each evaluation should be designed and carried out in a manner most appropriate for the particular position being evaluated. Since the various positions and persons holding them are so different, they should not all be subjected to a single evaluation instrument.

For this reason, no specific evaluation instrument is recommended. However, a questionnaire or similar instrument, which requires a written response, is recommended. In some cases, detailed checklists related to the duties and responsibilities of the office and person being evaluated might be used; in others, those responsible for planning and carrying out a particular evaluation may feel that open-ended questions would best suit the purpose. In many situations, interviews or use of outside consultants may be considered. In spite of the need for flexibility, all evaluations of UNH administrators should be guided by a few basic principles, some of the more important of which are listed below:

a. The person (and office) being evaluated should be made aware in advance that the evaluation will take place, what the purposes are, and what use will be made of its results;

b. The person (or group in the case of the Regents evaluating the President) initiating and coordinating the evaluation should, in consultation with the President of the Faculty Senate, assemble a committee made up of administrators and faculty members to assist with the evaluation. Where appropriate, staff, students, alumni, and community members should be included in the committee. Faculty members on evaluation committees should be chosen by college faculties where the administrator in question is the college dean, with the Senate choosing two faculty from outside the college. The faculty members to be designated by the Faculty Senate will be determined by voting from a list of qualified and interested faculty. Suggestions for nominations should be solicited from relevant Senate Committees. Representation should be balanced in view of the position being evaluated, with a minimum faculty representation of one-third. The administrators should be selected by the person or group responsible for setting up and carrying out the evaluation. This person should also select the committee’s chairperson, who could be either an administrator or a faculty member. The size of such a committee should be chosen for greatest efficiency (6-8 members) and its composition will vary, according to the position being evaluated.

c. The committee will 1) collect relevant information, 2) consider the general performance of the units reporting to the administrator being evaluated and 3) receive input from selected individuals and constituent groups (faculty/staff/student) most directly affected (see university organizational chart). All this information, along with the committee’s recommendations, will be transmitted to the evaluation coordinator for subsequent action.
d. The question to which persons are asked to respond in connection with an evaluation should be related as closely as possible to the job functions and responsibilities of the particular administrative position under review.

e. The written report prepared by the chairperson should include a summary of the individual’s performance and specific recommendations for improvement, as well as a summary of the effectiveness of the office.

f. A five-year schedule for administrative reviews will be constructed and annually updated by the Senate Operations Committee in consultation with the Faculty Senate and President of the University. The University Secretary will expedite the scheduling and implementation of the completed evaluations.

g. Evaluations of UNM administrators 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.