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6) Co-existence of pedestrians and bicyclists on the designated bike routes/paths will be encouraged.

c. Skates (includes rollerblades/rollerskates/inline skates):

1) All zones indicated in yellow on the map constitute dismount areas for skates. Designated bike routes/paths are dismount areas for skates. Enforcement is suspended on Saturdays, Sundays and UNM holidays.

2) Users of skates as transportation to campus must remove skates at entrance to dismount areas.

3) Skates may not be worn in dismount areas nor in any building at UNM.

4) Skates are to be used on the ground only and may not be used on walls, benches, fountains, or other structures.

Enforcement

a. Enforcement will be the responsibility of UNM Campus Police and those designated by the UNM Police Chief. Person(s) stopped for violations must produce an ID upon request.

b. Sanctions:

1) All student and visitor violations will be referred to Dean of Students for review and action under:
   a) Student Code of Conduct
   b) Visitor Code of Conduct

2) All faculty and staff violations will be referred to Human Resources or appropriate academic unit.

c. Enforcement will be pursuant to official UNM Policy and/or rules.

5. In Summary

a. Skateboards are banned from campus.

b. Skates permitted on campus only on Saturday, Sunday, and UNM holidays.

c. Bikes permitted only on bike routes Monday through Friday; elsewhere on Saturday, Sunday, and UNM holidays.

Date 8/23/94

Richard E. Peck, President
The October 11, 1994 meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Bel Campbell at 3:40 p.m. in the Kiva.

Senators present: Steven Block (Music), James Boone (Anthropology), Jane Bruker (Gallup Branch), Beverly Burris (Sociology), Bel Campbell (Physics & Astronomy), Anthony Cardenas (Spanish & Portuguese), Joseph Changuet (Management), Monica Cyrino (Foreign Lang. & Lit.), Jeff Davis (Math & Stats.), Tom DeCoster (Orthopaedics), Ernest Dole (Pharmacy), John Finklestein (Management), Charles Fleddermann (Elec. & Comp. Engr.), John Gellisman (Earth & Planetary Sci.), Robert Glew (Biochemistry), Deborah Graham (Med. Sch. Lib.), Linda Hall (History), Blaine Hart (Radiology), Andrew Hai (Pediatrics), Roy Jonson (Civil Engineering), William Kane (Education), Astrid Kodric-Brown (Biology), Tom Kyner (Math & Sciences), Harry Lulii (General Library), Demetra Logothetis (Dental Hygiene), Richard Melzer (Valencia Branch), Kurt Woltz (Pathology), Peter Fabisch (Foreign Lang. & Lit.), Ed Reyes (Pharmacology), Joe Rothrock (Art and Art History), Richard Santos (Economics), Stephen Schreiber (Arch. & Planning), Howard Schreyer (Mech. Engr.), Jerome Shea (Univ. College), Maurice Wildin (Mech. Engr.), and Beulah Woodfin (Biochemistry).

Senators absent: Lynndianne Beene (English), Cheryl Learn (Nursing), Bill MacPherson (Law), Carolyn Mold (Microbiology), Paul Montner (Medicine), Elizabeth Nielsen (Special Education), Lynette Oshna (CIMTE), Alan Reed (Public Administration), Gloria Sarto (Obst. & Gyn.), Leonard Stitelman (Public Admin.), Henry Trehritt (Comm. & Journ.), Carolyn Voss (Medicine), Holly Waldon (Psychology), Scott Walker (Psychiatry) and Nancy Ziegler (Gallup Branch). Excused: Joan Bybee (Linguistics), Leroy Ortiz (Education) and Gerald Weiss (Physiology).

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

Minutes of September 13, 1994. The summarized minutes of September 13, 1994 were approved with the following changes:

-- Pp.2, last paragraph: A regent will "be involved with" rather than "chair" each committee participating in UNM 2000.

-- Pp.3, 3rd to last paragraph: "...A letter be written to President Peck..." rather than "of" him.
pp.3, last paragraph: Professor Bill Kane (Education) replaces Kathy Koehler as Faculty Senator.

pp.4, 3rd to last paragraph: the program changes mentioned in this paragraph are "proposed."

pp.6, 4th paragraph from the top: Professor Maurice Wildin said that, even though Professor Paul Davis stated that the core curriculum proposal was voted down by the faculty, it was his recollection that the proposal was returned to the Senate for reconsideration.

Review of Senate minutes for October 13, 1992 shows that this was the case; however, the Faculty Senate declined to reconsider.

Comments from Senate President Bel Campbell. President Bel Campbell informed the Senate that:

1. Preliminary information on faculty compensation suggests that 1993-94 salaries at UNM increased at an equal or slightly higher rate than did salaries nationally and regionally. It appears we also held our own with regard to the official peer institutions. Sketchy data suggest that the increase in compensation (salary and benefits) at UNM for 1994-95 will give us at least a 2-3 percentage point gain on our peers.

2. Undergraduate enrollments are down all over the state this fall, not only at UNM -- though our decreases in headcount and SCHs are especially large (3.91% and 4.62% respectively). Possible reasons are a drop in the local unemployment rate; lower than predicted high school graduates in state; more rigorous enforcement of academic standards in University College; slightly improved graduation rates; and tuition increases at most 4-year campuses, including UNM. (Note: tuition at T-VI = $28.50/CH; at UNM = $68.50/CH)

3. A Forum for Gubernatorial Candidates will be held at UNM on Thursday, 3 November, 6:30-8:30 PM, in Woodward Hall. All three candidates are expected to attend.

4. A progress report on UNM's fiber optics network: all 128 buildings on campus have been connected; 9 intra-building networks have been completed (with a total of 1900 connection plates); 13 intra-building networks should be added during 1994-95 (1665 plates), with an additional 41 added in 1995-96 (2581 plates).
5. Students concerned with the "racist, sexist, and pro-science murals in the west wing of Zimmerman Library have proposed to the Regents that several steps be taken: (1) a "deconstructionist" plaque in front of the current murals; (2) a book there for viewers' comments; (3) a new mural adjacent to the older ones that addresses the "historical inaccuracies" and other concerns raised by them.

6. In a brief update on the new faculty hires arising out of the Incentive Retirement Plan, Provost Mary Sue Coleman stated that several new minority faculty have opted not to self-identify as minorities, stating their preference to be hired on merit alone.

7. The Mercer Report on Human Services will be presented to the Legislative Finance Committee in Santa Fe this coming Friday. President Peck said that it is the LFC's decision whether the report can be released to the University Community. The Regents are planning a meeting (open?) in November to consider the recommendations of the Report prior to a formal presentation to the Legislature in early December by President Peck and Arthur Melendres, President of the Board of Regents.

8. Campus Police substations are being established in three locations: the SUB, Centennial Science and Engineering Library, and the Basic Medical Sciences building on north campus. In addition, two officers are based in Zimmerman Library. In order to address officer vacancies, AU&AL Security has been contracted to provide security personnel to south, main, and north campuses.

She also called special attention to item #4, document #4, pp. 23, "Assessment and Accreditation," from her information packet, as a reference for further discussion concerning articulation for the core curriculum in general. She said that assessment was a large part of the articulation discussion and should seriously be considered. The issue for the North Central Association (NCA), UWM's accrediting body, could be competency based articulation rather than course based articulation.

Comments from Provost Mary Sue Coleman. Provost Mary Sue Coleman began by commending the Senate for its discussion of the core curriculum. She said core curriculum is an issue of tremendous importance in the State right now and she feels the wisdom of Faculty Senate analysis is beneficial to all. She encourages continued discourse.

She mentioned her attendance, along with President Peck's, at a recent AAUP meeting on campus, where she clearly heard that communication was an issue of campus-wide concern. She wants to
work very hard on improving communication. She's meeting regularly now with the Senate Operations Committee. She's also in contact with Senate Vice President Harry Llull and commends him (and the Senate) for starting an electronic format through which to rapidly send information. She has asked Sally Meyer, the new director of Faculty Contracts and Faculty Services, to establish a faculty e-mail list.

Provost Coleman encouraged Senate members to get to know Sally Meyer, who comes from Washington State University and is very experienced in faculty issues, human resources and women's services. She thinks Sally is attuned to issues on the UNM campus and will do an excellent job for UNM.

A number of campus searches are open. New deans for Engineering and Continuing Education are being sought. Associate Provost Ellen Goldberg and Dean Richard Eribes, respectively, are the chairpersons of these search committees. Faculty are urged to contribute their ideas. In addition, searches for the heads of the Valencia and Gallup campuses will ensue. Reynaldo Saenz, Associate Dean of Pharmacy, is chairing the Valencia search and Elijio Padillo, Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, is chairing the Gallup search. Again, anyone with any ideas should contact the search committees. She hopes to have Spring appointments for these positions.

Of note: The September 19, 1994 issue of Business Week includes an article about supercomputing for the masses (with a picture of Professor Frank Gilfeather), about UNM's Maui High Performance Computing Center.

Provost Coleman is a member of Albuquerque’s United Way campaign cabinet. She reported that this year’s drive would be in full swing in a week or so. She said that University contributions started dropping off about 3 years ago, at about the same time a National Appropriation of Funds scandal occurred. Now that the national campaign is back in order, even winning a business efficiency award, she projects a 3% gain in donations. Donations can be made to one of the 37 listed organizations or personally designated. United Way still gets a percentage of the city's total donations. She added that UNM staff typically donate more than UNM faculty. She encouraged faculty to contribute more.

Provost Coleman introduced the issue of a campaign for the UNM libraries. She said this was a special interest of hers and she hopes to bring the UNM libraries into the top 50 of the Association of Research Libraries nationwide (UNM is now ranked 61st out of 108). Money is specifically needed for the library collections. Both she and Robert Migneault, Dean of Library Services, feel that if UNM realizes how important this is, and starts its own annual campaign (beginning in November), the State might help the University help itself. To launch the campaign, the Board of
Regents has agreed to match dollar for dollar every amount of money raised. The goal set is $50,000 -- with the Regents' match the sum is $100,000.

The campaign committee wants to raise the money from three groups. The first is from alumni who have not contributed to the University in any other way. This phase of the campaign has been completed and $20,000 was raised. The second group is faculty and staff. Provost Coleman, President Peck, Bel Campbell and Don Burge will be issuing a fund raising support letter at the end of the first week in November. The third group consists of the parents of current UNM freshman through junior year students. A total of fifty-thousand people will be asked to contribute to the libraries. Donations can be made through payroll deductions; there will be campaign gifts at every level of giving; and President Peck has agreed to host, as the D.J., a sock-hop in February asking for donations at the door. Provost Coleman stated that faculty support is critical. She and her husband will be donating $5,000 to the campaign.

On a different subject, Provost Coleman stressed the importance of the upcoming vote on G.O. Bond Issue B, which supports the classroom building, the renovation for the chemistry wing, library collections, computing equipment, and the UNM branches.

**Report from Dr. Kari Karr Regarding Changes in Faculty Health Insurance.** Dr. Kari Karr, Chair of the Faculty Senate Benefits Committee, listed the inclusion of Qual Med as a new change in faculty health insurance. The other two health insurance carrier choices are Health Plus and Lovelace. Changes can be made during the open enrollment period from October 24, 1994 - November 18, 1994. Packets will be mailed to people’s homes on October 19, 1994. Other changes include: coupon incentives for wellness behaviors, the available trade in benefits for mental health and substance abuse, an increase in Lovelace’s mental health and substance abuse co-payment from $12.00 to $20.00, and the January 1, 1995 starting date for domestic partners insurance to go into effect.

President Campbell offered to send the latest insurance bid numbers out to Senate members when she had them.

Another positive change during open enrollment will be an automatic pre-tax payment situation where insurance is paid with pre-tax dollars. This would be a financial advantage. However, a person can elect out of this option during open enrollment.

Dr. Karr also mentioned a vocal agreement with Vice President David Kinney that there will be an increase to 8 hours for academic and/or job related tuition waivers. A proposed policy will be given to the Faculty Senate for review when it is complete.
Senator Finklestein asked whether a tuition exchange program had been discussed yet. She had not heard of one, but said that she would relay the information to the committee if Professor Finklestein would send her a statement.

Dr. Karr clarified a question from Senator Richard Santos about the Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee by saying the Faculty and Staff Benefits committee was not considering the new health insurance bids. She stated that the Bid Specifications Task Force, chaired by Carla Espinosa and Sheryl Garrett, reviewed the bids. As chair of the Faculty Senate Benefits Committee, she was a representative and one of eleven on the task force. She said that the Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee members were invited to attend the interviews and invited to give their comments, and did so.

Dr. Karr stated that there was no representation by a Faculty Senator on the task force and Professor Santos asked where the Faculty Senate would have formal representation on the bidding process. President Campbell answered by saying one of the Operations Committee members could have been involved in the process. She also said that, like all Faculty Senate committees, they don't explicitly have faculty senators designated to be representatives. If the Senate wishes to have direct representation on certain committees, formal action should be recommended.

Vice President Llull suggested that an updated Faculty Senate Committee list including all of the chairs might help clarify matters.

1994-1995 Committee Assignment Update - Senate Vice President Harry Llull. Upon recommendation by Professor Harry Llull, the Senate approved the following changes in committee assignments: Athletic Council -- Drop Gregory Boxes (Education); BUS Faculty Advisory Committee -- Add Anne Taylor (Architecture and Planning) and Martin Bradshaw (Engineering); Campus Planning -- Dan Hancock replaces Rupert Holland (South Neighborhood Association) and Artimis Chekarian replaces Summers Kalishman (North Neighborhood Association); Curricula -- Drop Jennifer Predock-Linell and add Pat Teese (Gallup), Jim Wright (Library), and Sandra Schwanberg (Nursing); Faculty and Staff Benefits -- Drop Alexander Stone (Math & Statistics) and Holly Waldron (Psychology). Add Sally Meyer (Faculty Contracts Officer, ex-officio); Library -- Drop Anthony Cardenas (Spanish & Portuguese). Add Gary Scharnhorst (English) and Leonard Stittelman (Public Administration); Long Range Planning -- Drop Raymond Radosevich (Management) and Alan Read (Public Administration); Research Policy -- Add Teresa Kokoski (Education); Scholarships, Prizes and Loans -- Drop Ronald Devries (Electrical & Computer Engineering, add Javier Gallegos (ASUNN); Teaching Enhancement -- Drop Maryann Willie (Linguistics), add Gordon Hodge (Psychology); Undergraduate -- Drop Steve Rubio (Education), add Margaret Grady (Nursing); International Affairs -- Add Santa
Falcone (Public Administration) and Suleiman Kassicieh (Management) as advisors; KUNM Board -- Add Diane Furno (Communication & Journalism) and Bruce Thomson (Civil Engineering).

Report from David Stuart Regarding Summer School. David Stuart, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, began his report by saying that Summer School 1994 was quite successful. UNM offered a record number of courses, about 1,470 courses, to a record number of students, 9,227 students, with a record number of credit hours, nearly 45,000 credit hours. This was a significant achievement because the national trend was towards declining enrollments in summer school.

He thinks UNM did so well last summer because of the focus on required courses, the reduction of funds for administrative purposes, and more money in the pockets of faculty who taught summer school. He added that last year UNM eliminated the penalty on faculty pay for those who taught courses in a format shorter than eight weeks. More graduate classes were also offered last summer.

In answer to a question of senator Peter Pabisch's concerning cost per student credit hour monies, Professor Stuart said that summer school is treated as part of an annual cycle budget and that no funds are held back from summer operations.

Senator Steven Block asked about remedying a situation where course credit hours are not close to the contact hours, for instance when a four credit hour class actually runs 6 hours. Professor Stuart replied that the measurement formula in those cases is an antique which doesn't reflect the present situation. He said that the wisest thing a department could do is regularly review its contact hours and the kinds and natures of its courses. He added that summer school is not the time to be generous with contact hours. He suggested the Faculty Senate Curricula Committee as a venue for change.

Action Item: New Units Policy Report by Deborah Graham from Long Range Planning. Professor Deborah Graham stated that the Long Range Planning Committee brought this item forward in order to prevent confusion and redundancy of effort on the campus and to improve the communication issues so that new programs were not identical to other programs already being offered. She said the policy would lead to better planning campus-wide. The policy requires detailed consideration of planning, very similar to the planning involved in starting new courses. The intent of the policy is to prevent interdisciplinary redundancies. The proposed policy was created to prevent two or more colleges from initiating the same program. Programs created within a college would not be affected.

President Campbell moved to accept the new policy.
Senator William Kane said he thought the faculty handbook covered this issue. President Campbell responded by saying that there is not an existing policy that requires a new program to even come to the Provost for review. He then asked whether it specifically addressed academic programs resulting in degrees. Senator Graham answered by saying that the policy also addresses service programs. She said that she sees service programs often duplicated, crossing disciplinary lines, and the program duplication is not recognized until well after the fact.

In answer to a question from Senator Richard Santos concerning legislative funding, Provost Coleman remarked that the policy is meant to enforce discipline within the University, to set its priorities, rather than having programs, of which the administration is unaware, going to the legislature. It is meant to give everybody a chance to say what should be done, to encourage a prioritization process through the institution. It's meant to address new programs that have an impact outside of a college. She said it is clearly meant to try to help bring internal discipline and priority setting and the faculty have a big say in this.

Professor David Colton expressed worry about the policy interfering in departmental business too much. He said the policy was originally discussed to address only college branches.

Professor Brian Hansen responded by saying that the policy is no more than a set of guidelines, created to give those persons who would like to establish a new unit some guidelines as how to go about doing so.

Professor Campbell then mentioned that her motion to accept the new policy had not been seconded. It was seconded.

Senator Kane asked whether the activities of the College of Education a year ago would have been subject to Faculty Senate vote if the New Units Policy had been in effect. Senator Maurice Wildin replied that the policy would only impact changes outside the college.

Senator Kane then asked how the policy "squared" with the faculty constitution, article 2, sections 1, 2 and 3a. He said that these sections were targeted toward departmental and college organization and that he believed the policy was in conflict there.

Professor Graham answered by saying that the New Units Policy was designed only for those things that impact other colleges and other programs, and it was designed to prevent that kind of redundancy. The autonomy of the colleges should be intact.

President Campbell asked the Senate to take a vote on the motion.
Professor Kane then asked to have the policy returned to the Long Range Planning Committee for clarification. President Campbell suggested voting on it and then sending it back to the committee for clarification. Professor Kane was opposed to this. President Campbell stated that the question had been called and the Senate must vote.

The Senate then voted affirmatively to vote for the New Units Policy.

Thereupon the Senate voted to accept the New Units Policy. Twenty-three were in favor of accepting the policy, six were opposed and there were two abstentions. The New Units Policy carried.

Core Curriculum: Articulation within the State. Information, Discussion and Possible Action. Senator Pabisch protested the fact that the very important issue of the core curriculum had again come up for debate at 5:00 p.m. and that he had to leave soon. He said that during the September 13, 1994 meeting, he had requested that the core curriculum issue be put first on the agenda because of its importance. President Campbell said that his request had been discussed during the Operations committee meeting, but she had not foreseen the length of the discussion on the New Units Policy and, in fact, the other issues on the agenda. She assured him that his protest had been recognized.

President Campbell called attention to some documents concerning articulation assessment. The first was a document from TVI on the articulation of courses from TVI to UNM. The second was item 4, "Assessment and Accreditation," from her information packet, and the third was a memo written by Associate Provost for Academic Affairs Janet Roebuck (in the agenda).

President Campbell then introduced Provost Mary Sue Coleman to give a brief introduction to the proposal to remove the issue of articulation from the issue of core curriculum. She said that the interaction of two year and four year institutions in the state and how transferrable their courses are may be separable from the issue of what they transfer. UNM may give them an automatic "in" on basic courses and then specify core curriculum or core competencies later.

Provost Coleman said the University had looked very hard at courses that would constitute a first year for almost any baccalaureate program. Thirty-one hours that would transfer in as a "first year" were agreed upon. Transferrable courses constituting a "second year" are more difficult. She introduced Cynthia Stuart, Director of Admissions, to elaborate.
Ms. Stuart stated that adding a second year of transferrable courses for UNM in concert with the two year institutions was a challenge. She said that there were approximately five or six disciplines requiring their own version of a "second year."

President Campbell asked how prescribing a set of articulatable courses would later affect core competencies. Ms. Stuart said she didn't think it would be a problem, that changes could be made later if they were required. President Campbell asked about control over the quality of the curriculum from other institutions and Ms. Stuart said that the Commission on Higher Education (CHE) had already facilitated state-wide discipline groups in the areas of mathematics and English. She said the outcome would be more effective if UNM faculty worked with other faculty, letting them know their expectations directly. She said that she often receives requests from two-year institutions, asking how well their transfer students are doing.

Senator Beulah Woodfin asked about the level of interaction with other institutions regarding a foreign language. Ms. Stuart replied that she had never heard foreign language discussed. She added that this might be of faculty interest in the future.

Due to the lateness of the hour, President Campbell suggested having a special Faculty Senate session to discuss articulation and core curriculum issues because the agenda for November's meeting would be too full. The Special Faculty Senate Session (including all faculty) to discuss issues around the core curriculum was set for Tuesday, 25 October, 1994, from 3:30-5:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anne J. Brown, Secretary
Background:

The proposed Policy and Procedures for New Units and Interdisciplinary Reorganization of Academic and Research Units at the University of New Mexico is intended to fill a void in our current policies and procedures, as described in the Introduction below. It does this by means of:

1. A policy to provide guidance to those planning to form new units, or to make major changes in existing units. This policy requires approval of at least the Faculty Senate and the Provost's Office. It provides for prior consultation with the stakeholders of organizations undertaking experimental changes. Definitions are provided for "major changes" and "units."

2. A procedure, which requires submission of basic information for changes of all types covered by the policy and extensive information on proposed new units. This information includes the effects of the proposed changes on other units of the university, and the implications of these changes for staffing, funds, and space during the first to five years of operation.

Policy and Procedures for New Units and Interdisciplinary Reorganization of Academic and Research Units at the University of New Mexico

Introduction

From time to time it is necessary for the University to consider proposals for the creation of new units, or for major restructuring of existing units, especially units involving both research and teaching functions and those crossing disciplinary lines. Occasionally the proposed unit would become a branch of the University.

While there are well-established procedures for approving the creation of new courses, new programs, and both minor and major changes in existing courses, there exists no formal system of review by both the faculty and administration of proposals for creation of new units. This policy and the associated procedures attempt to lay out guidelines for such major changes and additions.

In general, a proposal for such major changes should follow the guidelines below. However, the specific procedures for consideration and approval will be established through discussions between the proposers of any changes and representatives of the Provost's Office and the Faculty Senate Operations Committee.

Policy

If it is proposed to create a new unit located on or off the UNM Albuquerque campus, including new branches or education centers, or Policy and Procedures for New Units
to make major changes in an existing unit, approval of at least the UNM Faculty Senate and the Provost is required. Approval of the proposed action must be sought and obtained prior to initiating operation of a new unit, or making major changes in existing units. In no case is this to be construed as prohibiting an existing unit from experimenting with major changes prior to seeking approval of these on a continuing basis. However, it is expected that even in the case of experimental changes, stakeholders, such as affected faculty, staff, and students will be informed in advance and their input sought and considered by the appropriate dean, director, or other administrator proposing the changes, prior to initiation of the experiment.

1. "Major changes" is defined for purposes of this document as merger of two or more units, or division or dissolution of a unit. This policy is not meant to apply to organizational changes within an integral unit with no implications outside that unit.

2. "Unit" is used in this document to designate a department, division, center, institute, branch, program*, school, or college.

Procedure

Those proposing new or revised units other than interdisciplinary research centers or institutes (see below for procedures for these units) must prepare a proposal according to the attached guidelines, and submit it for approval by: 1) the Faculty Senate, acting on the advice of appropriate faculty committees, as determined by the President of the Faculty Senate, and 2) appropriate administrative officers, as determined by the President or Provost of UNM. If approval of the proposal by the Board of Regents is required, all actions of the Faculty Senate and the administrative officers relative to the proposal shall be transmitted to the Board of Regents. If clarification of the guidelines is desired, it should be sought from the Provost's office.

Those proposing creation of interdisciplinary research centers or institutes should prepare a proposal according to guidelines prepared by the Research Policy Committee. Copies of these guidelines may be obtained from the chair of that committee, or from the Associate Provost for Research.

Guidelines

The following is an outline of guidelines for preparing proposals for creating or making major changes in units, either on the UNM campus or entire branches or education centers at remote locations. It is recognized that a situation may arise for which these guidelines are not complete. In such a case, the proposer should

* In this context, the structural program is of interest.
Policy and Procedures for New Units ...

seek advice from the Provost's Office and the President of the Faculty Senate.

I. For all proposals, provide the following basic information

A. Identify the proposed changes, including all aspects such as instruction, research, and service.

B. Summarize your reasons why the proposed changes are desirable, or necessary. For example, are they responsive to state or national needs, existing or anticipated opportunities, or requirements of regulatory bodies such as accreditation agencies?

C. What are the advantages to the University of New Mexico if the proposal is approved and implemented?

1. What advantage does the proposal offer to current or future students, faculty, and staff at UNM?

D. Does the proposed new or revised unit pose any actual or potential conflicts with the programs or services of existing units at UNM, branches of UNM, or other institutions or organizations within the State of New Mexico? On the other hand, does it offer potential enhancement of, or cooperation with, the programs or services of other units or organizations?

E. Provide an overall summary of the anticipated costs or changes in costs, and the human and physical resources, including space and equipment needed during the first three to five years of operation of the proposed new or revised unit.

II. In the case of proposals for new units on or off-campus, or major revisions of existing units, provide the following detailed information

A. Describe the existing organizational structure related to your proposal, and the anticipated structure when the revision or new unit has evolved to its anticipated form. Include a description of:

1. Administrative structure, including the line of responsibility within the organization and the path(s) through which the unit will report.
2. Faculty positions, including rank and responsibilities.
3. Staff positions, including grades and responsibilities.

B. Describe the instructional programs the unit will offer, if any.

1. What degree programs will the unit offer, or support, at the undergraduate or graduate levels?
Policy and Procedures for New Units

2. What courses at the lower division, upper division, and graduate levels will the unit offer in support of either its own or other degree programs?
   a. Identify both existing and new courses. Briefly explain the need for the new courses.
   b. If any of these courses overlap or are intended to replace existing course offerings in the university, explain how potential duplication and conflict with the units offering those courses would be resolved.

3. What other courses, such as training or continuing education, might be offered by the unit.

C. Describe the unit's proposed research programs.
   1. What research programs will be conducted by the unit alone or in cooperation with other units?
      a. In case(s) of cooperative programs, what other units will be involved, what will be their role, and what will be the relationship between these units and yours?
   2. What degree programs will these research programs support, and in what manner will they be supported?
   3. What non-state funding sources are anticipated for the research programs?
   4. What funding from the University or State of New Mexico will be required?

D. Describe the unit's service activities.
   1. What services will the unit provide to other units in or associated with the University?
      a. Are these services currently offered by any other unit in the university, associated with it, or contracted by it? If so, do you plan to supplement what exists or to replace it? How would potential conflicts with the other units be resolved?
   2. What services will the unit provide to organizations outside the university?
      a. Are there units, either public or private, already offering these services? If so, justify the need for you to provide them via the proposed unit.

E. Discuss your plans for the unit for the next three to five years.
   1. What needs, opportunities, or demands will the unit satisfy that are not currently being adequately met?
   2. How will the unit's functions and size change during this period? For example, will they remain static, grow, or diminish?
   3. How will faculty, staff, and administrators be acquired to support this unit?
F. Provide detailed budget information for the first three to five years of operation of the proposed unit. For operating costs, include at least personnel, space upkeep or rental, utilities, contracted services, and equipment maintenance and replacement. For one-time costs, include at least space, furniture, utilities connections, and equipment.

Originally approved by the Faculty Senate Long Range Planning Committee, April 1, 1994. (Vote: Yes - 6, No - 1, Abstentions - 0). Revisions approved by consensus at the Long Range Planning Committee meeting on September 23, 1994.
September 21, 1994

TO: Bel Campbell, President, Faculty Senate
FROM: Janet Roebuck, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs
SUBJECT: Articulation Issues and Credit Transfer

The recent Senate discussion brought forward many of the many concerns which often impinge upon discussions of the core curriculum. A thoughtful discussion of the central issues might be facilitated by defining a few of these concerns for separate action in order to solve some current problems. This would remove a few distractions and clear the way for the Senate to focus on the fundamental educational issues of the core curriculum. In this note, I would like to offer information and suggestions which would allow us to deal with some immediate practical issues in the area of articulation.

As was noted in the Senate discussion, other higher education institutions in New Mexico, especially the two-year institutions, are concerned about the transferability of credit. This is also of great interest to students, legislators and other members of the community. As a larger and larger proportion of our new students transfer in, rather than entering as new freshmen (see attached data), it must be a matter of increasing concern for UNM too. While this issue will intersect with discussions about core curriculum, it is one which can be addressed, at least in part, on a practical basis with tools currently at hand.

The fundamental concern of the two-year institutions is that the credit which their students earn in their "college courses" be transferable and accepted as degree credit by the universities. Over the past year or so, representatives from various New Mexico institutions and the CHE met to try to address this very legitimate concern. With the UNM Admissions Office undertaking the technical and staff work, we used the current "articulation matrix" to develop a list of courses which were acceptable for degree credit by all the universities in the State. This gave us 31 "universally acceptable hours" or a transferrable "freshman year" (copy attached). This is very sound and works well for UNM's needs but for the two-year institutions it does not go far enough.
Bel Campbell  
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The two-year institutions see it as part of their mandate to offer "the first two years" (lower division classes) of a baccalaureate program and they want a system in which the entire "two years" will be fully acceptable. Given the very different preparation, entrance and degree requirements of our many colleges and programs, this 'simple solution' does not, and cannot, work for UNM. I believe that, if we take the initiative, we will be able to offer a solution to the problem which will work for us while also meeting the needs of the two-year institutions.

Using the "transferrable freshman year" as a foundation and working with the entrance and graduation requirements of our colleges and programs which are already in place, we can, I think, work on a solution to the "second year" problem. Courses in this category would not be universally acceptable, but would be organized into groups which reflect the current realities of our need for increasing specialization on the part of prospective baccalaureate students. With definitions based on current college and department requirements, and courses already defined in the State matrix, we could, for example, develop 'pre-major preparation packages' of courses which would begin to prepare students to major in general (and some specific) academic areas. These might include, for example, natural sciences, humanities, social sciences, engineering, business, education, and health sciences.

Some "packages" might offer many courses currently taught by the two-year institutions, others might offer only a limited number -- we would have to devote a good deal of time and considerable staff expertise to working out enough details to see if this would indeed provide an acceptable solution. Some work has already been done along these lines (by the College of Pharmacy and for UNM/T-VI transfer) which illustrates this general approach (see attached materials).

As this process uses requirements and course equivalencies which are already in existence and approved by the faculty and thus requires no new action by academic units or by the Senate, we can move ahead with it right away. It is a very nuts-and-bolt approach to solving some of the current problems in the State which are being described, somewhat misleadingly, as a "core curriculum" issues.

This project allows the Senate to work with a wider creative range as it considers the intellectual and educational issues of undergraduate competencies and the core curriculum. For example, the Senate would have the option to list a core of current courses, develop new courses which could be either unique to UNM or reproducible at other institutions, or set out principles for the modification of current courses. It could even consider a pre-major capstone "core" which transfer students could take on entry and native students complete at the end of their "sophomore year." Whatever direction is taken, however, it is imperative that the faculty of UNM take the lead in defining the
essential set of knowledge and skills our undergraduates need to have in common. Once decisions on the UNM core are made, of course, the issue of articulation would have to be revisited to account for the changes.

I would be happy to discuss this with you, the Operations Committee or the Senate or simply be on hand to answer questions as the Senate continues its debate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Transfers</th>
<th>% Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FRESHMEN YEAR TRANSFER CREDITS

The following courses are accepted as degree credits at all the 2 and 4 year institutions of higher education in New Mexico.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Course Description</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area I: Communications</strong></td>
<td>(a) College Level English Composition I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) College Level English Composition II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Public Speaking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area II: Mathematics</strong></td>
<td>(a) College Algebra</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area III: Laboratory Science</strong></td>
<td>(a) General Biology, with lab</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) General Chemistry, with lab</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) General Physics, with lab</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Geology, with lab</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area IV: Social and Behavioral Sciences</strong></td>
<td>(a) Economics (Micro, Macro)</td>
<td>3 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Introductory Sociology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Political Science</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area V: Humanities and Fine Arts</strong></td>
<td>(a) Western Civilization I or II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Philosophy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Music and Art Appreciation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Acceptable Courses in Pre-Pharmacy Programs

## Pre-Pharmacy Program for Eastern New Mexico University Students

**Eastern New Mexico University Courses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Equivalent UNM Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology 131</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Biology 123L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology 131L</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chemistry 123L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 151</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chemistry 123L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 151L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chemistry 123L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 152</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chemistry 123L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 152L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chemistry 123L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics 201</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mathematics 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 102</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>English 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 104</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Economics 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 104</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Economics 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Economics 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 102</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Economics 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 104</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Economics 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics 222</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Economics 201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-professional electives (6-9 semester hours) to be selected from speech communication, literature, history, philosophy, anthropology, psychology, economics, geography, political science, sociology, foreign languages, history, appreciation and criticism of art, music, theatre and dance.

## Pre-Pharmacy Program for Fort Lewis College Students

**Fort Lewis College Courses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Equivalent UNM Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology 100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Biology 123L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chemistry 123L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 151</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chemistry 123L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics 222</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mathematics 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics 222</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mathematics 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>English 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Economics 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Economics 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Economics 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Economics 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Economics 201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-professional electives: at least 9 hours to be selected from speech communication, literature, history, philosophy, anthropology, psychology, economics, geography, political science, sociology, foreign languages, history, appreciation and criticism of art, music, theatre and dance.

## Pre-Pharmacy Program for Navajo Community College Students

**Navajo Community College Courses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Equivalent UNM Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology 180</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Biology 123L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 151</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chemistry 123L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 152</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chemistry 123L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics 191</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mathematics 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>English 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>English 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mathematics 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>English 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mathematics 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>English 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mathematics 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>English 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mathematics 180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-professional electives: at least 6 semester hours to be selected from speech communication, literature, history, philosophy, anthropology, psychology, economics, geography, political science, sociology, foreign languages, history, appreciation and criticism of art, music, theatre and dance.

*Mathematics 192 suggested at Navajo Community College.*
Information Packet for Faculty Senate: 11 October 1994

1. Preliminary information on faculty compensation suggests that 1993-94 salaries at UNM increased at an equal or slightly higher rate than did salaries nationally and regionally. It appears we also held our own with regard to the official peer institutions. Sketchy data suggest that the increase in compensation (salary and benefits) at UNM for 1994-95 will give us at least a 2-3 percentage point gain on our official peers.

2. Undergraduate enrollments are down all over the state this fall, not only at UNM -- though our decreases in headcount and SCHs are especially large (3.91% and 4.62% respectively). Possible reasons are a drop in the local unemployment rate; lower than predicted high school graduates in state; more rigorous enforcement of academic standards in University College; slightly improved graduation rates; and tuition increases at most 4-year campuses, including UNM. (Note: tuition at T-VI = $28.50/CH; at UNM = $68.50/CH) See Attachment #2: Excerpts from Fall 1994 Official Enrollment Report.

3. A Forum for Gubernatorial Candidates will be held at UNM on Thursday, 3 November, 630-830PM, in Woodward Hall. All three candidates are expected to attend.

4. A progress report on UNM’s fiber optics network: all 128 buildings on campus have been connected; 9 intra-building networks have been completed (with a total of 1900 connection plates); 13 intra-building networks should be added during 1994-95 (1665 plates), with an additional 41 added in 1995-96 (2581 plates).

5. Students concerned with the “racist, sexist, and pro-science” murals in the west wing of Zimmerman Library have proposed to the Regents that several steps be taken: (1) a deconstructionist plaque in front of the current murals; (2) a book there for viewers’ comments; (3) a new mural adjacent to the older ones that addresses the “historical inaccuracies” and other concerns raised by them.

6. In a brief update on the new faculty hires arising out of the Incentive Retirement Plan, Provost Coleman stated that several new minority faculty have opted not to self-identify as minorities, stating their preference to be hired very clearly on merit alone.

7. The Mercer Report on Human Services will be presented to the Legislative Finance Committee in Santa Fe this coming Friday, President Peck said that it is the LFC's decision whether the report can be released to the University Community. The Regents are planning a meeting (open?) in November to consider the recommendations of the Report prior to a formal presentation to the Legislature in early December by President Peck and Regents President Melendres.

8. Campus Police Substations are being established in three locations: the SUB, Centennial Science and Engineering Library, and the Basic Medical Sciences building on north campus. In addition, two officers are based in Zimmerman Library. In order to address officer vacancies, AKAL Security has been contracted to provide security personnel to south, main, and north campuses.

DOCUMENTS ATTACHED:

ITEM PAGE NO.
(1) News and Information 1
(2) Excerpts from Fall 1994 Official Enrollment Report 3
Fall 1994

Official Enrollment Report

Main Campus, Graduate Centers & Branches

Office of the Registrar

Registrar's Systems Team

The data included in this report are as of the census date.
September 9, 1994
To: President Peck
Provost Coleman
Vice Presidents

From: Fred M. Christ, Jr., Registrar

Subject: Fall 1994 Official Enrollment Report

Enclosed is the Fall 1994 Official Enrollment Report for the University of New Mexico, including the Main Campus, the Graduate Centers, the Branches, and Taos Center. The enrollment statistics are as of the close of registration on the census date, September 9, 1994. A degree summary for the Main Campus is also included.

Overall, the headcount and student credit hours for the Main Campus have declined significantly for the Fall 1994 semester. Headcount is down 3.91% and student credit hours are down by 4.62%. More detail about these declines are described on page 1 of the Report. Headcount and student credit hours are up, however, in the Graduate Programs and Anderson Graduate School of Management. Headcount for American Indian students is up 4.72% this semester. The Main Campus awarded a record number of degrees for the 1993-94 academic year, including a record number of degrees awarded to Hispanic and to Native American students. A record number of bachelor degrees were awarded, including records for the Hispanic and Native American students.

If you have any questions, you may contact me at 277-8466.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
Office of the Registrar

Fall 1994 Official Enrollment Report
Main Campus
As of the Census Date, September 9, 1994

Headcount
Student Credit Hours
Full Time Equivalent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall 1990</th>
<th>Fall 1991</th>
<th>Fall 1992</th>
<th>Fall 1993</th>
<th>Fall 1994</th>
<th>Percent change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>24,600</td>
<td>25,009</td>
<td>25,132</td>
<td>25,334</td>
<td>24,344</td>
<td>-3.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Credit Hours</td>
<td>264,174</td>
<td>264,200</td>
<td>264,389</td>
<td>266,459</td>
<td>269,590</td>
<td>-4.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Equivalent</td>
<td>18,168</td>
<td>18,208</td>
<td>18,285</td>
<td>18,508</td>
<td>17,653</td>
<td>-4.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: Headcount, student credit hours, and FTE are at their lowest levels in five fall semesters. There is no single cause or factor for the decline, but some possibilities include:
- The unemployment rate is down, meaning jobs are up, and fewer students are maximizing.
- The predicted boom in high school graduates in the 1990’s statewide has yet to materialize.
- More rigorous enforcement of academic standards in the University College.
- Tuition increases may have encouraged some students to seek alternative educational opportunities (e.g., TVI) or defer education temporarily.

UNM did not experience enrollment declines across the board. Graduate Programs continue the trend established several semesters ago, with modest gains in student credit hours and headcount for the Fall 1994 semester. Anderson Graduate School of Management also experienced small gains. Enrollment declines for Fall 1994 are not unique to UNM—several New Mexico four-year institutions are down in headcount and student credit hours.

Headcount by Enrollment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Status</th>
<th>Fall 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Returning</td>
<td>16,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readmit</td>
<td>2,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Freshmen</td>
<td>1,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>2,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Transfers</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Change *</td>
<td>1,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Headcount</td>
<td>24,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A "Status Change" occurs when, for example, a student moves from Non-degree status into a degree granting college.
### Student Credit Hours by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Fall 1990</th>
<th>Fall 1991</th>
<th>Fall 1992</th>
<th>Fall 1993</th>
<th>Fall 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>202,051</td>
<td>200,038</td>
<td>200,721</td>
<td>202,737</td>
<td>192,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>20,441</td>
<td>20,246</td>
<td>19,259</td>
<td>18,402</td>
<td>16,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGSM</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,247</td>
<td>3,502</td>
<td>3,222</td>
<td>3,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Programs</td>
<td>28,517</td>
<td>30,173</td>
<td>31,214</td>
<td>31,966</td>
<td>32,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>4,997</td>
<td>5,146</td>
<td>5,173</td>
<td>5,191</td>
<td>4,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>5,068</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>5,120</td>
<td>5,641</td>
<td>5,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>264,174</td>
<td>264,200</td>
<td>264,989</td>
<td>268,459</td>
<td>265,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Full Time Equivalent by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Fall 1990</th>
<th>Fall 1991</th>
<th>Fall 1992</th>
<th>Fall 1993</th>
<th>Fall 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>13,470</td>
<td>13,336</td>
<td>13,381</td>
<td>13,516</td>
<td>12,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>1,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGSM</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Programs</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>2,814</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td>2,664</td>
<td>2,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>18,158</td>
<td>18,226</td>
<td>18,355</td>
<td>18,528</td>
<td>17,851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:** Follows student credit hours pattern.

### Average Student Load by Level (Student Credit Hours/Headcount)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Fall 1990</th>
<th>Fall 1991</th>
<th>Fall 1992</th>
<th>Fall 1993</th>
<th>Fall 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>12.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated/Prof.</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:** Average student load has declined slightly, indicating that students are taking fewer hours.

### Headcount by Classification

#### Fall 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Fall 1990</th>
<th>Fall 1991</th>
<th>Fall 1992</th>
<th>Fall 1993</th>
<th>Fall 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>3,501</td>
<td>3,444</td>
<td>3,278</td>
<td>3,337</td>
<td>3,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>4,901</td>
<td>4,639</td>
<td>4,521</td>
<td>4,357</td>
<td>4,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>3,240</td>
<td>3,102</td>
<td>2,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>4,541</td>
<td>4,621</td>
<td>4,964</td>
<td>5,203</td>
<td>5,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th year</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Bacc Cert</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Undergrad</strong></td>
<td>15,993</td>
<td>16,047</td>
<td>16,155</td>
<td>16,402</td>
<td>15,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>3,933</td>
<td>4,022</td>
<td>3,782</td>
<td>3,602</td>
<td>3,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19,926</td>
<td>20,069</td>
<td>19,937</td>
<td>20,004</td>
<td>18,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGSM</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Programs</td>
<td>3,667</td>
<td>3,907</td>
<td>4,199</td>
<td>4,243</td>
<td>4,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Grad/Prof</strong></td>
<td>4,874</td>
<td>4,940</td>
<td>5,198</td>
<td>5,330</td>
<td>5,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>24,600</td>
<td>25,009</td>
<td>25,135</td>
<td>25,334</td>
<td>24,344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Headcount by Level & Gender

#### Fall 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7,413</td>
<td>5,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7,348</td>
<td>7,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total HC</strong></td>
<td>15,961</td>
<td>13,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td>1,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,477</td>
<td>1,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total HC</strong></td>
<td>3,108</td>
<td>2,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/AGSM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>1,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2,118</td>
<td>2,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total HC</strong></td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>3,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total HC</strong></td>
<td>328</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total HC</strong></td>
<td>296</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46,629</td>
<td>53,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46,406</td>
<td>53,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total HC</strong></td>
<td>93,035</td>
<td>107,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** HC = Headcount
### Headcount by College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Fall 1990</th>
<th>Fall 1991</th>
<th>Fall 1992</th>
<th>Fall 1993</th>
<th>1994 From Fall 93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGSM</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>4,076</td>
<td>4,217</td>
<td>4,491</td>
<td>4,821</td>
<td>4,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Programs</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Allied Health</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. College</td>
<td>6,506</td>
<td>6,238</td>
<td>6,009</td>
<td>6,189</td>
<td>5,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>1,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Programs</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. Programs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>3,933</td>
<td>4,022</td>
<td>3,782</td>
<td>3,602</td>
<td>3,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undergrad</td>
<td>19,926</td>
<td>20,069</td>
<td>19,887</td>
<td>20,004</td>
<td>18,988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduate

| AGSM          | 399       | 399       | 458       | 436       | 449               |
| Grad. Programs| 3,667     | 3,907     | 4,109     | 4,248     | 4,368             |
| Law School    | 328       | 334       | 335       | 342       | 330               |
| Medical School| 286       | 300       | 296       | 309       | 299               |
| Total Grad/Prof| 4,674    | 4,940     | 5,196     | 5,330     | 5,546             |
| Grand Total   | 24,600    | 25,009    | 25,135    | 25,234    | 24,434            |

Comment: These headcounts are based on college affiliation, irrespective of the student’s major or course taken. Enrollment increases have occurred in several colleges and programs for the Fall 1994 semester.

### Graduate Programs

#### Headcount by College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Fall 1990</th>
<th>Fall 1991</th>
<th>Fall 1992</th>
<th>Fall 1993</th>
<th>Fall 1994 From Fall 93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>1,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>1,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Science</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Headcount</td>
<td>3,667</td>
<td>3,907</td>
<td>4,109</td>
<td>4,243</td>
<td>4,269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on student's declared major.
### Application Experience by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Fall 1990</th>
<th>Fall 1991</th>
<th>Fall 1992</th>
<th>Fall 1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian</td>
<td>4.66%</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
<td>3.22%</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>28.69%</td>
<td>30.42%</td>
<td>31.45%</td>
<td>31.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>59.60%</td>
<td>57.29%</td>
<td>56.01%</td>
<td>54.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Applied</td>
<td>3,661</td>
<td>3,580</td>
<td>3,635</td>
<td>3,721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Admission By Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan A</th>
<th>Fall 1990</th>
<th>Fall 1991</th>
<th>Fall 1992</th>
<th>Fall 1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian</td>
<td>46.91%</td>
<td>64.38%</td>
<td>70.49%</td>
<td>65.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>58.32%</td>
<td>58.62%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>73.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>82.92%</td>
<td>78.38%</td>
<td>94.74%</td>
<td>71.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>63.14%</td>
<td>70.54%</td>
<td>72.19%</td>
<td>79.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57.24%</td>
<td>72.16%</td>
<td>77.18%</td>
<td>83.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comment

Beginning Freshmen enrolled for the first time in Summer and who have returned for Fall are not included in this table.
### Beginning Freshmen Class Profile (continued)

#### ACT Composite Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Fall 1990</th>
<th>Fall 1991</th>
<th>Fall 1992</th>
<th>Fall 1993</th>
<th>Fall 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29.21%</td>
<td>28.50%</td>
<td>28.37%</td>
<td>28.18%</td>
<td>29.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SAT Combined Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Fall 1990</th>
<th>Fall 1991</th>
<th>Fall 1992</th>
<th>Fall 1993</th>
<th>Fall 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transfers

#### Undergraduate, Degree-Seeking Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfers to UNM from:</th>
<th>Fall 1990</th>
<th>Fall 1991</th>
<th>Fall 1992</th>
<th>Fall 1993</th>
<th>Fall 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque TVI</td>
<td>13.52%</td>
<td>14.72%</td>
<td>16.38%</td>
<td>18.12%</td>
<td>19.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico 2 year</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>9.36%</td>
<td>11.20%</td>
<td>12.62%</td>
<td>9.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico 4 year</td>
<td>20.73%</td>
<td>17.93%</td>
<td>15.50%</td>
<td>12.96%</td>
<td>15.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other States</td>
<td>53.56%</td>
<td>56.34%</td>
<td>57.22%</td>
<td>54.67%</td>
<td>55.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Non-Degree Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfers to UNM from:</th>
<th>Fall 1990</th>
<th>Fall 1991</th>
<th>Fall 1992</th>
<th>Fall 1993</th>
<th>Fall 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque TVI</td>
<td>4.71%</td>
<td>5.73%</td>
<td>6.99%</td>
<td>5.35%</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico 2 year</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico 4 year</td>
<td>15.06%</td>
<td>9.21%</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
<td>10.93%</td>
<td>11.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other States</td>
<td>71.23%</td>
<td>75.52%</td>
<td>73.69%</td>
<td>74.14%</td>
<td>74.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
<td>6.38%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Undergraduate, Non-Degree and Graduate/Professional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfers to UNM from:</th>
<th>Fall 1990</th>
<th>Fall 1991</th>
<th>Fall 1992</th>
<th>Fall 1993</th>
<th>Fall 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico Institutions</td>
<td>28.59%</td>
<td>25.97%</td>
<td>26.55%</td>
<td>28.55%</td>
<td>28.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State Institutions</td>
<td>64.26%</td>
<td>67.17%</td>
<td>67.17%</td>
<td>65.07%</td>
<td>66.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>7.16%</td>
<td>6.86%</td>
<td>6.38%</td>
<td>6.79%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Headcount

- Undergraduate, Degree-Seeking Only: 619
- Non-Degree Only: 613
- Undergraduate, Non-Degree and Graduate/Professional: 2,458
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Centers/Branches</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>Student Credit Hours</th>
<th>FTE &amp; Average Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos Grad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Credit Hours</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Equivalent</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Load</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Grad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Credit Hours</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Equivalent</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Load</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallup On-Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Credit Hours</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Equivalent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Load</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallup Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>2,389</td>
<td>2,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Credit Hours</td>
<td>16,327</td>
<td>18,860</td>
<td>20,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Equivalent</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>1,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Load</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Credit Hours</td>
<td>5,728</td>
<td>5,938</td>
<td>5,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Equivalent</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Load</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>1,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Credit Hours</td>
<td>9,468</td>
<td>10,983</td>
<td>11,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Equivalent</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Load</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tao Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Credit Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Equivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Load</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Branches</td>
<td>4,965</td>
<td>5,120</td>
<td>5,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Credit Hours</td>
<td>32,601</td>
<td>37,383</td>
<td>39,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Equivalent</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>2,832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRAND TOTAL INCLUDING MAIN CAMPUS</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>Student Credit Hours</th>
<th>FTE &amp; Average Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>29,165</td>
<td>30,129</td>
<td>30,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Credit Hours</td>
<td>290,770</td>
<td>301,293</td>
<td>304,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Equivalent</td>
<td>20,349</td>
<td>20,897</td>
<td>20,917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branches</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>Student Credit Hours</th>
<th>FTE &amp; Average Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gallup Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>1,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Headcount</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>2,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Headcount</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Headcount</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>1,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tao Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Headcount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MARY SUE COLEMAN

I. Goals of UNM 2000

A. Diversifying the Faculty - The Provost has reiterated on multiple occasions to Deans and Department Chairs the importance of faculty diversity. The response has been positive. As an example, in 1993-94, over 20 percent of the new associate professors were from traditionally underrepresented groups. The Office of the Provost managed the Regents' extension of the early retirement program (80 faculty have retired under this program in the past 3 years and the gender and ethnic composition of new hires in these positions is furthering our diversity goals). We are working closely with EOP on defining unit goals and have met with faculty focus groups to elicit ideas about new techniques we might use to increase the pace of diversification.

B. Targeted Recruitments - The Office of the Provost was actively engaged in assisting the recruitments of underrepresented scholars at the senior level (Lewis Owen - Native American scholar), (Lawrence Prescott - African American Spanish Professor - whom we were unable to lure from his appointment at Penn State), (Jane Buikstra - senior female anthropologist), (Joe Martinez - senior Hispanic neuroscientist, currently at Berkeley).

C. Minority Doctoral Program - This is a program funded by the New Mexico Legislature which offers to pay full graduate tuition to minority students to pursue terminal graduate degrees at other institutions, if New Mexico scholars will agree to accept these individuals as probationary faculty members (3 year minimum) upon completion of their degrees. The Office of the Provost assumed active responsibility for this program in 1993-94, under the coordination of Associate Provost and Dean Ellen Goldberg. UNM placed two students in this program for 1994-95 (both Hispanic) and has committed faculty positions in Communicative Disorders and American Studies on their return.

D. The Provost has proposed a plan to WICHE and to the CHE to initiate along with the doctoral preparation program, a postdoctoral program in which minority scholars could be recruited to UNM and then to faculty positions.

E. The Provost has requested that Dean of Graduate Studies Ellen Goldberg begin discussions with all Directors of Graduate Study to identify mechanisms to recruit more minority students for graduate study. She has formed a task force headed by Dean Leo Romero to generate new initiatives in this area.

F. Our office has made multiple presentations to student groups (high school) to encourage application to UNM.

G. Native American Initiatives - Our office supported the establishment of the Native American Studies concentration and the Provost is participating in the Native American Council at UNM.
II. General Academic Issues, Personnel Management and Staff Development

A. Academic Issues

1. Dean's Council - The Office of the Provost has worked closely with this body to identify issues that affect all the colleges. Recently, for example, we discussed alternative models for faculty evaluation and for assigning faculty distributions of effort. In September of 1994 we initiated the data collection stage for a study of the effects of research on undergraduate education.

2. University College - An extensive review of the unit was conducted in 1993-94 by a committee chaired by Dr. Reynaldo Saenz, which resulted in many suggestions for change. The Office of the Provost has continued to reassess and evaluate all functions of the unit after the resignation of the sitting dean. Dr. Jan Roebuck, Associate Provost, was appointed as Acting Dean for 1994-95. A Faculty Senate Committee chaired with oversight of the B.U.S. degree will be asked to play a more active role in 1994 and beyond, in consultation with Dr. Barry Gaines, Professor of English, who was appointed on a part-time basis to direct the B. U. S. degree program in 1994-95. With input from these sources, we anticipate that the Bachelor of University Studies degree will be restructured. In various other dimensions as well, we anticipated that UNM will see a much - altered University College by the end of 1995 academic year.

3. Libraries - With Robert Migneault, Dean of Libraries, the Office of the Provost has worked on library issues. We have devised a multi-faceted approach to increase sources of revenue for collection development. Part of the strategy has been to increase the involvement of the Faculty Senate Library Committee in planning for collection development. A regular review of the Libraries and of Dr. Migneault’s leadership is now underway, in accord with the Faculty Senate plans for periodic reviews.

4. Anderson Schools of Management - In collaboration with the faculty and administration of the School, the Office of the Provost worked to establish an accelerated BBA program for evening students, a program which the local business community had been requesting for some years. The sitting dean resigned effective August 1. Our office has worked with the faculty of the School and the business community to identify an Interim Dean - Howard Smith - and to position the School in a competitive position to launch a national search.

5. College of Arts and Sciences - With Dean William Gordon, the Office (Chemistry), Jane Buikstra (Anthropology), and Murray Gell-Mann (Physics). Two of these recruitment have been successful. The Office of the Provost supported the move of Women's a strategic planning exercise, which will guide resource allocations in the future. Several thorny faculty personnel issues, which carried over from the time before my arrival, were addressed because they required the attention of the Provost. Preemptive efforts to retain certain highly productive faculty were supported.

6. The Maui High Performance Computing Center - This project, funded by Phillips National Laboratories, in which UNM works collaboratively in Hawaii with partners such as Carnegie-Mellon University and the Cornell Theory Center (one of the few NSF-funded high performance computing centers) has surpassed its original performance targets. The machines are up and running. The Office of the Provost has worked with the PIs on this project to hire an on-site Director, and to address a number of other personnel issues. We have initiated the High Performance Computer Learning and Resource Center on campus in the Galles Building.

7. College of Engineering - During the year the Office of the Provost has worked closely with Dean Jim Thompson to solve space and personnel issues in the College, particularly those reflected in research centers. Dean Thompson received one job offer in mid-spring, to which the University made a successful counter-offer. Dean Thompson accepted an offer from the University of Missouri in late summer without giving UNM an opportunity to respond. We are consulting now with the faculty in the College and will begin a national search for a permanent dean in the fall of 1994.

8. College of Education - The Office of the Provost has worked closely with Dean Peggy Blackwell to continue efforts to restructure the College teaching programs. We have resolved some of the leadership and fiscal issues related to the NSF-funded statewide System Initiative in Math and Science Education.

9. Continuing Education - Following the retirement of the sitting Dean, an evaluation group for programming in continuing education was convened and an Interim Dean, Dr. Jeronimo Dominguez, was appointed. A search committee for a permanent head of this committee will be appointed early in the 1994-95 academic year.

10. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee - The Office of the Provost has worked diligently with the Faculty Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee to move forward the discussions on a revision of Section B of the Faculty Handbook. We have engaged an editorial writer to produce a draft that can be submitted for discussion as my office is concerned to assure that the final document be straightforward, readable and acceptable to all parties.

11. Graduate Reviews - The Provost has attended most of the graduate review team meetings (7) held during the 1993-94 year. Our office has initiated a pilot program to combine graduate and undergraduate reviews. The History Department carried out such a review quite successfully in 1993-94.

12. Planning Council - The Office of the Provost has begun discussions preparatory to engaging with other sectors of the University in the revision of the UNM 2000 document.

B. Personnel Management

1. Valencia Branch - Personnel issues in administration. The Office of the Provost oversaw the resignation of the Branch Director and initiated a search for a new director (in the finalist pool were two Hispanics, one African American, one Anglo). The various constituencies could not reach a consensus and the search has been reopened. We appointed Phyllis Pepin as Interim Director. Our office worked with the Branch faculty to solve some internal issues. We have restructured administrative and teaching units.
2. Gallup Branch - The Office of the Provost has worked with the Director on a difficult personnel issue (faculty). Our office will oversee the retirement of several administrators at the Branch and will coordinate the search processes.

3. Northern Advisory Group - We are currently working with this group to restructure its membership and its charge. I would like for the group to alert us about emerging issues within the organizations of Taos Education Center, Los Alamos Branch, Graduate Education Center and the Harwood Museum.

4. Restructured my office and hired two new individuals - Ms. Linda Bacher and Ms. Bea Graff. We are working now to integrate the office of the Provost with the offices of the Associate Provosts. A combined staff group has been initiated. We successfully recruited Ms. Sally Meyer (Washington State University) to be Director of Faculty Contracts. We are working to make this office more useful to faculty.

5. University Secretary's Office - After working for the entire year to restructure this office and align it with its new duties, I have vacated the Assistant Secretary position. We are hiring new personnel now. I am looking forward to a vigorous, active unit.

6. KUNM - Our office (with the assistance of the University Secretary) managed the second KUNM election after vacating the results of the first election. We have successfully recruited Richard Towne as the new KUNM Manager. I will charge Mr. Towne to align KUNM more closely with the educational mission of UNM.

7. University - Labs Office - With Dean Ellen Goldberg I have initiated a University - Labs - Industry Office that will stimulate and work to coordinate our efforts in productive interactions. This should be a large potential growth area. Professor Ed Walters (Chemistry) has been hired into this position.

8. Tenure and Promotion Decisions - This year our office reviewed all of the Code 3 files and we made three negative Code 3 decisions. In addition, we reviewed more than 70 promotion and tenure files and completed the decisions in all cases. There were 9 negative decisions this year.

C. Fiscal Management

1. Office Operations - We have merged the budgets for the Provost, Associate Provosts and Faculty Contracts Offices in order to maximize our efficiency and reduce duplication. We will continue this process in the next year.

2. Budget Planning - We devised a new system of budget planning for the analysis of all budget planning, operations, minor and major capital as well as equipment was rolled into one document. Our plan is to minimize duplicate efforts for the colleges.

3. Networking Priorities - The UNM 2000 Networking plan has completed intrabuilding wiring plan. This is now completed and we are migrating the entire network. We plan to complete this process in 18 months.

4. Minor Capital - Using information generated in the college plans we have created a priority list for minor construction. Working with David Mc Kinney, we have devised a plan to complete all priority 1 items on the list.

5. Major Capital - Working with information and justifications (including site visits) we have devised a 5-year priority order for capitol construction projects. We plan to bring these projects to fruition working closely with David Mc Kinney.

6. Strategic Planning for use of IDC Funds - Working with Dean Ellen Goldberg and a strategic planning group, we have requested a complete re-examination of institutional uses of IDC funds. The new goal will be to maximize our flexibility to enhance research and respond to new funding opportunities.

7. Research Administration - We have challenged the research administration office to re-examine all of their activities with the goal of maximizing services to faculty. I have brought Grantsource™ to UNM (named MIDAS here), an electronic vehicle to inform faculty and students, on demand, about funding opportunities.

8. CIRT - We are working closely with CIRT to help devise mechanisms to give clear priority to administrative requests. Computing equipment - we completed (through the Computer Use Committee) a process whereby $500K in computing equipment was placed in laboratories for student/faculty use. Benefits statements (CIRT) have been individually prepared for all employees. We are working to create an improved telephone directory for UNM.

9. Colleges - We have worked closely with each of the Deans to maximize their budget flexibility. We have responded to a number of external initiatives to aid faculty members from Education, Engineering, Fine Arts and Arts and Sciences.

III. Professional Activities

A. National Service - Biochemistry:

Chair, Medical Biochemistry Study Section, National Institutes of Health. This involves reviewing and directing the review of up to 60 grant proposals three times per year in Washington, D.C. 1990-94.

Member of Burroughs-Wellcome Fund grants review board. Review up to 25 proposals per year for United Kingdom fellowships and 30 travel grant proposals.

NSF Presidential Faculty Fellow review panel, Feb. 1994.

B. Publications:


C. Speeches:
"And Miles to Go Before We Sleep: The Unfinished Journey of Women in Science" UNC Women in Science Program, Nov. 1993; Sigma Xi Awards Banquet, May 1994.

"Women in Academic Administration" Bridges Program, UNC, Nov. 1993.

"So If She Gets the Job, What Difference Would it Make?, Women in Academic Administration" American Society for Pathology, April, 1994.


"Life after Indirect Cost Modifications" NCURA meeting, Seattle, WA., August 1994 panel discussion.

"Nursing Under Health Care Reform" Friends of Nursing Banquet - UNM, May 1, 1994.


Multiple informal presentations at UNM.

D. Meetings:
NASULGC, November 1993
American Society for Biochemistry and Biophysics, May 1994
Rockefeller Foundation, May 1994
NASULGC (Chief Academic Officers) July, 1994

FIVE EVALUATIVE QUESTIONS ON ASSESSMENT PLANS

1) To what extent has the institution demonstrated that the plan is linked to the mission, goals, and objectives of the institution for student learning and academic achievement, including learning in general education and in the major?

2) What is the institution's evidence that faculty have participated in the development of the institution's plan and that the plan is institution-wide in conceptualization and scope?

3) How does the plan demonstrate the likelihood that the assessment program will lead to institutional improvement when it is implemented?

4) Is the timeline for the assessment program appropriate? Realistic?

5) What is the evidence that the plan provides for appropriate administration of the assessment program?
NCA REGIONAL WORKSHOPS

- Appendix A, Assessment of Student Academic Achievement from the Handbook of Accreditation 1994-95, Selected Chapters.
- Suggested Characteristics of an Assessment Program.

Note: This material will be reprinted in the complete Handbook 1994-95 to be published in September of 1994. While the material will remain the same in substance, it may be edited and placed in a different format.
The newly revised Criteria for Accreditation capture the impact of assessment of student academic achievement within the third and fourth criteria. "The institution is accomplishing its educational and other purposes" and "The institution can continue to accomplish its purposes and strengthen its educational effectiveness." Not only must an institution have a plan and program for assessing student academic achievement, but also that plan and program should be related to other institutional strategic and long-range plans and planning processes. It is important to note that the third and fourth criteria also address overall institutional effectiveness, including assessment of student academic achievement. Evaluation of institutional effectiveness, like assessment of student academic achievement, calls for a program that provides consistent information to assist the institution in making useful decisions about the improvement of the institution and in developing plans for that improvement.

Approved by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, August 1993

The new Statement presents a philosophical foundation for the Commission's mandate on student academic achievement and defines its relationship to the Commission's requirement in the recently revised Criteria Three and Four on documenting institutional effectiveness. It replaces the 1989 Statement.

With the revised Statement the Commission sets the record straight by clarifying any confusion that we have encountered. There are institutional effectiveness and assessment of student academic achievement and not overall institutional effectiveness. Both institutional effectiveness and assessment of student academic achievement are to be addressed in response to the Criteria for Accreditation. However, the Commission's ongoing assessment initiative, begun with the adoption of the earlier Statement in 1989, places a specific requirement on all institutions to have a plan for implementing a program to assess student academic achievement.

Timetable for Implementation of the Assessment Initiative

When it began the Assessment Initiative, the Commission established a specific timetable whereby all affiliated institutions will have their plans reviewed either through already scheduled evaluation visits or through the Assessment Plan Review (APR) process. The current timetable is as follows:

- For institutions that have a comprehensive or Commission-mandated focused evaluation scheduled for 1994-95:
  - The team will review the institution's assessment plan submitted with the self-study or focused report.

- For institutions that completed a comprehensive evaluation by the Commission between Fall 1991 and Spring 1994 or a Commission-mandated focused evaluation between Fall 1992 and Spring 1994:
  - The team reviewed your progress in responding to the Commission's assessment initiative at the time of the visit. Please refer to the Commission action letter to determine whether any followup monitoring (typically a report or focused visit) was required.

Institutions that recently had or will have a focused visit for consideration of a proposed institutional change should check with their staff person to determine whether assessment was or will be included in the scope of the visit.

Appendices

- For institutions that are not in either of these two categories (almost half of all affiliated institutions):
  - An assessment plan is due in the Commission office by June 30, 1995. The plan should respond to the expectations outlined in the section that follows. The plan will be reviewed by an Assessment Plan Review panel that will determine whether further development is needed before the plan is found to meet the Commission's requirements. A small number of plans have been reviewed through this process.
  - An institution that fails to file a plan with the Commission by June 30, 1995, will be scheduled for a focused visit.

Institutions that have questions about this timetable should call the Commission office.

Commission Expectations for the Assessment Plan

The ultimate goal of the Commission's initiative on assessment of student academic achievement is to ensure that all of its affiliated institutions have a program for assessment of student academic achievement that is defined by and implemented through an assessment plan. However, we are learning that the link between development of a plan and implementation of a program is not always as linear as one might expect.

For example:

+ some institutions, especially those that approach assessment of student academic achievement in a somewhat decentralized manner, might have components of a good assessment program before the institutional plan is created

+ some institutions might have focused attention on developing an overall institutional plan for assessment of student academic achievement, but significant components of the institution have yet to fulfill their parts of the plan

Through visits reviewed to date, the Commission has determined that unless institutionalized through a formal institutional assessment plan, assessment of student academic achievement will not become part of the institution's basic educational culture even if it might pervade the culture of some departments or schools within the institution.

Therefore, beginning in the fall of 1993, evaluation teams will be asked to measure the institution's commitment to assessment of student academic achievement by the existence of an appropriate plan for assessment of student academic achievement.

- A formal plan for assessment of student academic achievement must be developed and included in its entirety either in the body of the self-study report or in an appendix to that report.

- If such a plan has not been developed, the team in its report should comment on the various assessment efforts at the institution but its recommendation should call for the submission of a formal plan on assessment of student academic achievement by a specific date in the future.

In its self-study report the institution should measure its plan for assessment of student academic achievement against five evaluative questions. These same five questions, originally developed for the...
APPENDIX B

Suggested Characteristics of an Assessment Program

The following characteristics are provided as a guide and stimulus to ongoing discussion and collaboration within and among institutions. They are an elaboration of material that appeared in an article titled "Criterion Three and the Assessment of Student Academic Achievement" by Gerald Patton and Austin Deherty, in the NCA CHE Assessment Workbook (1991).

A program to assess student academic achievement should:

1. Flow from the Institution's mission

Central to the existence of every institution of higher education is the intention to educate students, to ensure their academic growth and attainment, and to certify other levels of accomplishment publicly through awarding credits and diplomas. Each institution expresses this central aspect of its mission and purposes in language that recognizes the particular characteristics that distinguish it from its peers: its origin and tradition, the types of students it serves, the kinds of education and professional training it seeks to provide these students, and its philosophy of learning. It is this specific formulation of mission and purposes that will determine what the appropriate assessment program will be, and how the results of this program will be utilized to provide evidence of students' academic achievement and to enable the institution to use the results of such assessment to improve its educational programs and instruction and thus further enhance student learning. This characteristic, therefore, directly links assessment to Criterion One.

2. Have a conceptual framework

The assessment program must be constructed upon a conceptual framework that flows directly from the institution's published mission and purposes. The conceptu

3. Have faculty ownership/responsibility

Given the historic responsibility of faculty in determining credit, certificate and degree requirements, the content of courses, and what is to be accepted as evidence that a student's accomplishment has met established standards, it is self evident that the faculty must assume primary responsibility for the design, implementation, and evaluation of any program to assess student academic achievement. This fact in no way precludes participation by academic administrators or the use of consultants whose research or experience would enable them to serve as helpful resources. The means by which faculty carry out these responsibilities for the design and implementation of an assessment program will, of course, depend upon the organization of the faculty and the form of governance in place within the institution.

4. Have institution-wide support

Board members, the chief executive and chief academic officers, and all other administrators and staff, as well as the faculty, should be informed and in basic agreement about the nature and importance of ongoing assessment of student academic achievement.

In order to achieve this end, academic officers and faculty committees may find that it is helpful to provide clear, written descriptions of the respective roles and responsibilities of the individuals and groups comprising the academic community who are involved in the development, implementation and assessment of assessment activities so that assessment is accepted as an integral part of institutional life. The planning documents, the resource allocations (budget), and other institutional decisions, should reflect that the institution is monitoring how well the institution is meeting its goals for student learning and should document how to improve the effectiveness of the curriculum and teaching. Publications intended for internal and public dissemination should stress the centrality of student learning and achievement and describe how the assessment program contributes to this.

APPENDIX E

Appendices

The Checklist for the Advisory Committee on the APA Process is available for downloading and printing.
The institution's current emphasis on the importance of academic achievement is reflected in the assessment program of the institution. This is evidenced by the fact that the institution has developed a comprehensive assessment program that includes various measures to evaluate the effectiveness of its educational programs.

The assessment program includes:

1. The assessment of student learning outcomes.
2. The evaluation of educational resources and processes.
3. The monitoring of institutional effectiveness.
4. The assessment of institutional accountability.
5. The evaluation of institutional performance.

The assessment program is designed to provide a comprehensive view of the institution's academic performance and to ensure that the institution is meeting its goals and objectives.

In conclusion, the institution's assessment program is an important aspect of its mission and purpose. It plays a critical role in ensuring that the institution is meeting its goals and objectives and is providing high-quality education to its students.

Assessment: Comments from the Assessment Plan Review Process

The following is reproduced from the December 1992 issue of Dinkin's Plan, Vol. 14, No. 1, published by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, North Central Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. North Central's Commission on Institutions of Higher Education approved a "Statement on Assessment and Student Academic Achievement" that in part expressed the expectation that "some institutions have and are able to describe a program by which students develop academic achievement." After some experience in reviewing campus assessment plans, the panel members offered the following comments on what distinguishes good plans from adequate plans.

T he first review of required assessment plans by the Assessment Plan Review (APR) process was held in 1991. APR, youth composed of three APR members, reviewed four plans. A total of twenty plans were reviewed. Panel members conducted site visits to major campus to ensure that all programs. They then conducted by phone to develop their recommendations. Committee staff participated in telephonic conferences. This is the first review of its kind, and the process raised many good questions but about individual plans and about the process in general. Although this is a very early effort, the staff thought it useful to share some of the comments with a wider audience. We will continue to share comments with you as the review process continues.

Plans were critiqued for:
- failing to provide a mission statement to the panel with the plan;
- not articulating a rational conceptual framework for the plan;
- omitting detailed and clear descriptions of assessment activities;
- failing to address some critical educational goals:
- superficial treatments of graduate programs.

Evidence that the Institution's Plan Is Articulated and Institution-wide in Conceptualization and Scope

Plans were praised for:
- providing evidence of campus-wide participation in the design of the plan (including faculty involvement);
- involving the entire institution in the design of the plan and in the activities called for in the plan;
- having a broad-based assessment plan that would lead to a program that measures all aspects of education (basic skills, general education, and the majors), that is valued added in design, and that continues on after graduation.

Plans were criticized for:
- involving only the assessment committee in assessment planning and/or failing to involve the rest of the institution in planned assessment activities;
- failing to inform students about not only what was assessed, but why those assessments were useful;
- not having a broad enough range of activities to involve all parts of the institution;
- failing to assess graduate education and programs;
- lack of breadth across all academic areas of the institution;
- lack of appropriate information on remedial and off-campus programs.

Relationship of Plan to Institutional Improvement

Plans were praised for:
- providing evidence that the analysis and feedback loop existed and appeared strong;
- providing evidence that efforts were being made to use the results of assessment to improve educational programs and processes.

Plans were criticized for:
- providing vague information on the "mechanism and transparency" lines of assessment for review and dissemination of the data or for the improvement process itself;
- ignoring improvement as a goal of assessment.

Note: Reviewers found the following lacking in most plans: mechanisms for reviewing and analyzing data and feeding those data back to departments, mechanisms for ensuring that the departments were accountable for improvements based on data, and evidence that improvements had indeed occurred.

Tangible for Implementation of the Plan

Plans were praised for:
- providing a reasonable timetable with some evidence that they had already begun to meet deadlines;
- being made to a plan that seemed reasonable;
- providing a plan with unrealistic deadlines within which it would be impossible to accomplish the proposed plan.

Administration of the Plan

Plans were praised for:
- demonstrating that an assessment committee represented a broad cross-section of the college community was functioning;
- providing evidence that there is some- one with authority at the institution who is charged with making sure that the assessment data are collected, analyzed, and distributed;
- clearly identifying the specific charges and responsibilities of each individual or group in the assessment process.

Plans were criticized for:
- providing vague information about the administrative process or changes to the picture (and how they would...
Assessment Measures
Gary R. Pike

Since coming to the Center for Educational Assessment (CEA) in January, one of my major projects has been the statewide assessment of college writing for grades K-12. Because many colleges and universities are interested in assessing the quality of student writing as part of their evaluation of general education programs (or their writing-across-the-curriculum programs), I thought that it might be helpful to recount some of our experiences. In this column, I will provide a brief description of the writing assessment program in Missouri and discuss some of the basic questions that must be addressed in developing a writing assessment program. In a subsequent column, I will be discussing some of the findings of recent CEA evaluations of the Missouri Writing Assessment program. The easiest way to organize this description is to examine three of the key questions that should be answered in order to establish a viable writing assessment program. I want to stress that there are no "right" answers to these questions. However, in the ways in which institutions answer them profoundly shape the nature of writing assessment on their campuses.

The first question is "What sort of writing task should be used?" The choice initially lies between what I call a one-shot writing assessment and an assessment of the process of writing. In the one-shot assessment, students are given a topic and told that they have a certain amount of time (usually about one hour) to write an essay. This approach is frequently used in commercial general education assessment instruments, such as the Academic Profile and College BASE. The strength of the one-shot method is its ease of administration. Its limitation is that it usually does not reflect the writing process students use. The alternative, a process-writing approach, is designed to parallel more closely the actual writing process of students. The present Missouri Writing Assessment is an example of the process-writing approach. Students are allotted three days to complete it in which to write. The first day is devoted to previewing activities and an initial draft. During the second class period, students are encouraged to continue drafting and to begin revising their essays. During the final period, students complete their revisions and prepare a final copy of the essay. Clearly, the major liability of the process-writing approach is the time required for administration and scoring. Scoring takes longer because the essay (continued on page 11).

Concluding Comment

The fact that many institutions are still struggling to understand assessment was very clear. One reviewer suggested four basic questions to help institutions sort out the seeming complexities of assessment:

1. What do we want to know about student learning and academic achievement? (Remember the Mission)
2. Why do we want to know it?
3. How will we get the information?
4. What might we change if we get the information? (One might add: How will we make sure that if we need to change we will?)

Changes to the Process

On December 9 the Commission's Assessment Advisory Committee recommended in its review of the Commission's progress in implementing the Statement on Assessment and Student Academic Achievement that the Committee has been expanded to include two APE members. As a part of their work, Committee members reviewed the materials resulting from the initial review of plans and determined that the new Commission's progress in implementing the Statement on Assessment and Student Academic Achievement. The Committee has been expanded to include two APE members. As a part of their work, Committee members reviewed the materials resulting from the initial review of plans and determined that the new Commission should be "devoted" to providing clearer direction about the Commission's expectations. The revised questions are as follows:

1. To what extent has the institution demonstrated that the plan is linked to the mission, goals, and objectives of the institution for student learning and academic achievement, including learning in general education and in the major?
2. What is the institution's evidence that faculty have participated in the development of the institution's plan and that the plan is institution-wide in content, centralization and scope?
3. How does the plan demonstrate the likelihood that the assessment program will lead to institutional improvement when it is implemented?
4. Is the time line for the assessment program appropriate? Realistic?
5. What is the evidence that the plan provides for appropriate administration of the assessment program?
UPDATES TO FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS — 7 OCTOBER 1994

The following list indicates those faculty who have resigned from committees and faculty who have been added. Current vacancies on committees are also noted. Senators from Colleges listed with vacancies are encouraged to contact either Harry Lull (hlull@hal.unm.edu, x74734) or Bel Campbell (bel@triton.unm.edu, x75148) with recommendations for filling those vacancies.

Athletic Council:
Drop Gregory Bowes 1995/Vacancy

Bachelor of Univ. Studies Faculty Advisory:
Add Anne Taylor, Architecture
Add Martin Bradshaw, Engineering
Fine Arts Vacancy

Budget:
Fine Arts Vacancy
Pharmacy Vacancy

Campus Planning:
Drop Rupert Holland (South Neighborhood Assn.),
Add Don Hancock
Drop Summers Kalishman (North Neighborhood Assn.),
Add Artemis Chekarian

Community Education:
Los Alamos Vacancy
Valencia Vacancy

Curricula:
Drop Jennifer Predock-Linnell/Vacancy
Add Pat Peters, Gallup
Add Jim Wright, Library
Add Sandra Schwanberg, Nursing
Architecture and Planning Vacancy
Los Alamos Vacancy

Faculty Ethics & Advisory:
Two Main Campus Vacancies

Faculty & Staff Benefits:
Add Sally Meyer, Faculty Contracts Officer, ex-officio
Drop Alexander Stone/Vacancy
Drop Holly Waldron, Do Not Replace,
Faculty Membership Complete

Library:
Drop Anthony Cardenas,
Add Gary Scharnhorst, English
Add Leonard Stitelman, Public Administration

Long Range Planning:
Drop Raymond Radosevich/Vacancy
Drop Alan Reed/Vacancy

Research Policy:
Add Teresa Kokoski, Education

Scholarships, Prizes and Loans:
Add Javier Gallegor, ASUNM
Drop Ronald DeVries/Vacancy

Teaching Enhancement:
Drop Maryann Willie,
Add Gordon Hodge

Undergraduate:
Drop Steve Rubio
Add Margaret Grady, Nursing
Architecture and Planning Vacancy
Fine Arts Vacancy
Education Vacancy

International Affairs:
Add Santa Falcone, Public Admin., Advisor
Add Suleiman Kassicieh, Anderson, Advisor

KUNM Board:
Diane Furno (Communications)
Bruce Thomson (Civil)
September 14, 1994

TO: Distribution

FROM: Mary Sue Coleman, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Appointment of Nasir Ahmed to Interim Dean, College of Engineering

Nasir Ahmed has accepted the appointment of Interim Dean of the College of Engineering effective October 1, 1994. Dean James Thompson has accepted a position with the University of Missouri at Columbia.

A national search for the next Dean of the College of Engineering will begin soon and Ellen Goldberg, Associate Provost for Research, will lead this search assignment.

The University of New Mexico
Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Scholars Hall 225
Albuquerque, NM 87131-1001
Telephone: (505) 277-5064
FAX: (505) 277-8700

September 14, 1994

Dear Collegues:

The primary task of the Interim Dean of the College of Engineering will be to position the College so as to be a highly attractive environment in which to recruit a dean in an open national search process. Jim Thompson has brought the College to a position of prominence within this region. Now we need to continue that progress as we begin the national search. The interim dean will not be a candidate in that search.

I am pleased to announce that Nasir Ahmed has accepted this appointment which is so crucial to the future of the College. The effective date of this appointment is October 1, 1994. The charges to which he and I agree are:

1. Examination of the fiscal condition of the College.
2. An analysis of the administrative structure of the College.
3. Examinations of mechanisms for regular faculty and staff consultation and participation.
4. Analysis of the freshman program with the goal of increasing departmental involvement and enhancing undergraduate enrollments.

The process by which I arrived at this decision included solicitation of input, advice and ideas from the faculty of the College, the faculty policy committee, the department chairs and the current dean. I appreciate the open and frank responses that I received from many quarters. Several names were suggested as potential interim dean candidates. I contacted some, but not all of these individuals in my deliberations. Given the variety of views expressed, I am confident that the best choice as interim dean is Nasir and I look forward to working with him this next year.

It is important that a national search for the next Dean of the College of Engineering be directed by a senior faculty member who enjoys the respect of the institution. I am pleased to report that Ellen Goldberg has accepted this assignment. We are soliciting nominations for faculty candidates for the committee and for external committee members. Please send your suggestions to the College Policy Committee.

It is in the collective interest of the University of New Mexico to attract the best pool of candidates for the deanship. Your contribution is essential in conveying to candidates the potential that the College of Engineering could bring to fulfillment with continued strong leadership. I believe in the College of Engineering and ask that you please join me in expressing the pride that UNM feels in this College and in our collective hopes for its future.

Sincerely,

Mary Sue Coleman
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
MEMORANDUM

Date: June 16, 1994

TO: Deans, Directors, and Department Heads
Staff Council Executive Committee
Faculty Senate Operations Committee

RE: "Reporting Misconduct and Retaliation" -- Policy 2200

Recently enacted federal and state statues provide protection to employees who report suspected fraud, abuse, illegal activity, or misconduct (whistleblowers). Although these statutes vary, they typically prohibit discrimination or retaliation against an employee who has reported illegal activities or misconduct allegedly committed by his employer. Such retaliatory action would include discharging, threatening or otherwise discriminating against an employee by affecting the employee's compensation, terms, condition, location, or privileges of employment. Recent court cases have resulted in large fines against employers who at best ignore and at worst harass, demote or fire an employee who reported misconduct. GE is expected to agree to pay a $70 million fine to resolve a Justice Department action brought by a whistle-blower.

The National Association of College and University Attorneys advises that the best way a college or university can avoid entanglements with whistleblowers is to:

- Establish a credible procedure employees can use when they wish to disclose either a suspected violation of the law or an apparently improper practice.
- Develop an internal structure and procedure to investigate an employee's allegations.
- Respect the sensitivity of an employee's allegations. Strive to maintain confidentiality and to respect the privacy of both the employee and any persons accused of misconduct. Ensure that the employee's supervisor will not take any actions which may be considered retaliatory.
- Educate employees about management's willingness to listen to their complaints and allegations.
- Keep the employee informed about the institution's response to the allegation.

The attached draft policy statement was developed to address this issue. It has been reviewed by University Counsel to ensure compliance with the law. Your comments on the proposed policy are requested by July 8, 1994. Please send your comments to my office.

Thank you for your review; I look forward to receiving your comments.

Respectfully,

David L. McKinney
Vice President for Business & Finance

Attachment

cc: President's Council
The University of New Mexico encourages all University employees, acting in good faith, to report misconduct, an action commonly called "whistle blowing." UNM is committed to protecting individual employees from interference with or retaliation for reporting misconduct by the Internal Audit Department, the Department of Human Resources, Equal Opportunity Programs, and the department who investigated the report of misconduct. If an employee alleges retaliation by the Internal Audit Department, the President's Office will investigate the allegations.

3. Misconduct

Misconduct is any on the job activity by a UNM employee that violates state and/or federal laws or regulations, local ordinances, or University policy. Misconduct includes, but is not limited to, the examples listed below.

- Release of confidential information.
- Corruption or bribery.
- Theft of University property.
- Falsification of documents or reports.
- Willful failure to perform duties.
- Discrimination.
- Sexual harassment.
- Alcohol or drug use at work.
- Personal use of University materials or assets.
- Endangering of public health or safety.
- Misuse, mismanagement, or misappropriation of funds, security, property, facilities or any other University asset.

4. Reporting Alleged Misconduct

Employees who are aware of or have reason to suspect misconduct should report the conduct, either verbally or in writing, to the Internal Audit Department. However, nothing in this policy prohibits an employee from reporting misconduct to the department responsible for dealing with the conduct in question as outlined in Section 7.1, herein. An employee should report misconduct within ninety (90) days from the time the employee becomes aware of the misconduct. The Internal Audit Department may extend this time requirement if circumstances warrant an extension. Employees reporting misconduct by the Internal Audit Department should report the conduct to the President's Office.

Reports of misconduct should include the following information:

- Name of employee filing the report.
- Address and telephone number where employee may be contacted.
- A detailed description of the alleged misconduct. This should include the names and departments of all those believed to be involved.
- Dates of alleged misconduct.
If misconduct is reported verbally, the Internal Audit Department will document all information received at the time the report is made or as soon afterwards as possible.

The Internal Audit Department will not accept complaints concerning allegations of misconduct or retaliation that have previously been investigated or are currently being investigated by another University department or that have been or currently are the subject of a grievance under University personnel policies. If the employee reports misconduct which personally affects the reporting employee in the workplace, the Auditor shall consult the University Dispute Resolution (DR) Coordinator to determine whether to proceed under this policy or to transfer the matter, in whole or in part, to the DR Coordinator for proceedings under "Dispute Resolution" Policy 3220, UBP.

5. Confidentiality

The University will try to prevent disclosure of the identity of the employee reporting alleged misconduct and the person accused without their consent. However, often the identity of an employee may become obvious to others due to the nature of the information. The employee's identities will be: 

- to any law enforcement agency investigating the matter; 
- to University employee assigned to investigate the matter; 
- if required pursuant to a subpoena or by law; 
- if necessary to defend a grievance by an employee; 
- to University administrators to the extent necessary to conduct an investigation (on a need to know basis); or 
- if required by due process in connection with disciplinary action against the person accused.

The employee will be notified when his or her identity will be disclosed under any of the above circumstances. Employees reporting misconduct or subsequent retaliation may need to testify in order to prove misconduct occurred and to defend against a legal action or grievance that may be brought against the University, its officers, or its agents.

6. False Information

An employee who knowingly gives false information or knowingly makes a false report of misconduct or a subsequent false report of retaliation will be subject to disciplinary action, up to and including dismissal, by the University.

7. Investigation of Misconduct

The Internal Audit Department will review and evaluate reports of misconduct to determine if the report should be referred for further review and/or investigation. If such a determination is made, the Internal Audit Department will prepare a written report of the review. The University will act upon Internal Audit's recommendations promptly. However, the timeliness of any investigation will depend on the type and complexity of the report, the alleged act, and the type of investigation interrupted during an investigation. The accused shall be notified of alleged misconduct and will be allowed to respond.

7.1. Investigations will be conducted by the appropriate University department listed below in accordance with that department's investigation procedures. Allegations against any of the departments listed below will be investigated by the administrator to whom the department head reports. A joint investigation may be conducted when more than one area is involved.

- The Department of Human Resources will investigate allegations related to violation of personnel policies.
- The Equal Opportunity Programs Office will investigate any allegations of discrimination or sexual harassment.
- The Occupational Safety Office will investigate any allegations concerning safety or an unsafe work environment.
- The Internal Audit Department will investigate any allegations concerning the handling of University money, documents, information, or equipment in accordance with " Dishonesty or Fraudulent Activities" Policy 7285, UBP.
- The Campus Police Department will investigate any allegations concerning security or criminal activity.

7.2. Great care must be taken in the dealing with suspected misconduct to avoid the following:

- Incorrect accusations.
- Violating any employee's right to due process.
- Making statements that could lead to claims of false accusation or other offenses.
- Alerting suspected individuals that an investigation is under way.

8. Report of Investigation

8.1. When the investigation is completed, a confidential report of the investigation will be sent for appropriate action to the vice president responsible for the unit where the investigation was conducted or to the President for units that report to the President. If the investigation is conducted by Internal Auditing, the report will be filed in accordance with Internal Auditing policies.

8.2. If illegal activity appears to have occurred, the findings will be reported to the appropriate audit and law enforcement agencies. This will be coordinated with University Counsel and University administrators.

9. Disciplinary Action

All disciplinary action taken as a result of investigations will be in accordance with the personnel policies contained in the "University Business Policies and Procedures Manual", the collective bargaining agreements, and the Faculty Handbook.
MEMORANDUM

Date: June 16, 1994

TO: Deans, Directors, and Department Heads
    Staff Council Executive Committee
    Faculty Senate Operations Committee

RE: “The University’s Right to Manage, Discipline, and Discharge” -- Policy 3215

Enclosed is a revised draft of the University’s policy on disciplinary actions. The policy was revised to:

- expand the description of progressive discipline;
- indicate which employees the policy applies to;
- explain when a particular disciplinary action is appropriate;
- provide a partial list of employee actions that constitute “proper cause”;
- clarify which disciplinary actions require approval from the Department of Human Resources.

Your comments on the proposed policy revision are requested by July 16, 1994. Please send your comments to my office. Thank you for your review; I look forward to receiving your comments.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Vice President for Business & Finance

Enclosure

cc: President’s Council
24. Contract Employees

Contract employees are administrators, designated by the President, who are hired on periodic employment contracts. Contract employees may be suspended, demoted, or discharged for proper cause during the contract period; however, the University has the right to renew those contracts when they expire. Terms, conditions, and notification requirements for employees hired under contract are described in "Contract Employees" Policy 3240, UB.

3. Proper Cause

Proper cause is any behavior relating to the employee's work that is inconsistent with the employee's obligation to the University. Proper cause includes, but is not limited to:

- Violation of University policies.
- Inefficiency.
- Incompetence.
- Misconduct.
- Negligence.
- Sexual harassment.
- Violation of the University's "Policy on Illegal Drugs and Alcohol".
- Insubordination.
- Performance which continues to be inadequate after reasonable time has been allowed to correct it.
- Conviction of a felony or misdemeanor where the provisions of the Criminal Offender Employment Act apply, depending on the nature of the offense and the level of the position.
- Theft or dishonesty.
- falsification of records.
- Assault.
- Creating a hostile working environment.

Disciplinary Action for Post-Probationary Employees

The University of New Mexico recognizes the concept of progressive discipline for regular employees who have successfully completed their probationary period. Progressive discipline may include the use of verbal warnings, written warnings, suspensions, demotions, salary reduction, and/or discharge. The specific discipline, depending on the individual circumstances, must generally conform to the procedures listed below.

4.1. Verbal Warning

A verbal warning is a verbal notice to the employee advising the employee:

- of the nature of the problem;
- of the policies or rules violated (if any);
- of the specific action to be taken by the employee and/or supervisor to correct the problem, including specific time frames, if appropriate; and
- that disciplinary action may continue should the problem persist.

A verbal warning may be given by any employee in a supervisory position. A verbal warning may be documented in the employee's personnel file.

4.2. Documented Warning

A documented warning is a written notice to the employee advising the employee:

- of the nature of the problem;
- of the policies or rules violated (if any);
- of the specific action to be taken by the employee and/or supervisor to correct the problem, including specific time frames, if appropriate; and
- that disciplinary action may continue should the problem persist.

A documented warning may be given by a supervisor at any level, after approval by the supervisor's supervisor. A copy of the documented warning must be sent to the University Department of Human Resources for inclusion in the employee's official personnel file.

4.3. Suspension

A suspension is a temporary involuntary separation of employment without pay for disciplinary reasons. Supervisors must consult the Labor Relations Manager at the Department of Human Resources before suspending an employee.

The following are examples of infractions normally requiring suspension. This is not meant to be an all inclusive list, and depending on the circumstances, whether the infraction has been repeated, an infraction on the following list may also justify demotion or discharge.

- Gambling on University premises.
- Fighting with co-workers.
- Sleeping on the job.
- Failure to follow safety rules.
- Punching another's time card.

4.4. Demotion

A demotion is a temporary or long-term involuntary reassignment to a position in a lower classification and a corresponding reduction in salary for disciplinary reasons. Supervisors must consult the Labor Relations Manager at the Department of Human Resources before demoting an employee. Demotion is usually appropriate in cases of poor performance, when the employee performed satisfactorily in a lower level position; provided a lower level position exists in the employee's department.

4.5. Discharge

A discharge is a permanent involuntary separation of employment from the University for disciplinary reasons. Supervisors must consult the Labor Relations Manager at the Department of Human Resources before discharging an employee.

The following are examples of infractions normally requiring discharge. This is not meant to be an all inclusive list.
Insubordination.
- Theft, dishonesty, and fraud.
- Misappropriation or personal use of University funds, property, possessions, or resources.
- Willful damage to University property.
- Assault or battery on another person.
- Deliberate falsification or omission of information on employment applications or resumes, time cards/records, or other University records.
- Possession of or working under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol.
- Abuse of authority.
- Violation of confidentiality or the release of confidential information.
- Repeated infractions listed under Section 3., herein.

4.6. Involuntary Transfers

Involuntary transfers may also be imposed on employees as part of a disciplinary action.

4.7. Other Forms of Disciplinary Action

Other forms of disciplinary action or alternative treatment may be considered as appropriate, after consultation with the Labor Relations Manager at the Department of Human Resources.

5. Procedure for Disciplinary Action

5.1. Notices

Except for verbal notices, notices shall be in writing and should be served in person, if possible. At the time of service, the employee will be asked to sign an acknowledgement of receipt. If the employee declines, the supervisor shall make note for the record. If the notice is required to be sent by certified mail with a return receipt requested. The notice must be properly stamped and addressed to the last address provided by the employee. Service of the notice is complete when the notice is hand delivered or deposited with the United States Postal Service by certified mail.

5.2. Computation of Time

Any time period required or allowed by this policy, does not include the day of the action from which this time period begins to run. If the last day of the time period falls on a Saturday, Sunday or holiday, the last day of the time period shall be the next working day.

5.3. Notice of Contemplated Action

To initiate a suspension, demotion or discharge of a post-probationary employee, the supervisor must serve the employee with written notice of the contemplated action. This notice must include all the following points:

- Cite the acts which the supervisor believes may constitute proper cause. These may be any one (1) or more of the acts listed in Sections 3., 4.3., and 4.5. herein.
- Give a summary of the evidence against the employee.
- Specify what the contemplated action is.

State that the employee has five (5) work days from service of the notice to respond verbally or in writing to the contemplated action.

5.4. Response to Notice of Contemplated Action

The employee or a representative of the employee's choosing may respond verbally and/or in writing to the notice of contemplated action. The response is served to the supervisor who signed the notice. If the employee responds verbally to the notice, the supervisor who signed the notice shall meet with the employee and/or his or her representative within five (5) work days following written receipt of a request for a verbal response. Any extension of time must be agreed to by both the employee and the supervisor and must be in writing.

5.5. Notice of Final Action

After considering the employee's verbal and/or written response, the supervisor shall decide on the final action and serve the employee with a written notice of final action. The notice of final action shall be within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of the employee's response and include all the following points:

- The final action to be taken.
- The acts constituting just cause, which shall only include allegations specified in the notice of contemplated action.
- A summary of the evidence.
- A reply to the employee's response, if any.
- The effective date of any disciplinary action.
- A statement that disciplinary action may be grieved according to the provisions of "Dispute Resolution" Policy 3220, UBP within five (5) work days from the effective date of the action.

5.4. Pay Status

Regular employees who have successfully completed their probationary period will remain on paid status at all times pending completion of the disciplinary action process. In extreme cases for reasons of safety or if removal of the employee from the job is in the overriding interests of the University, an employee may be placed on administrative leave with pay pending completion of the investigative or disciplinary process.

6. Required Consultation with the Department of Human Resources

Supervisors contemplating the suspension, demotion, or discharge of any employee, including probationary and temporary employees, must consult with the Labor Relations Manager at the Department of Human Resources before disciplining the employee. Whenever prior consultation is not practical because of reasons perceived to be of such an urgent or serious nature that the employee should be immediately removed from the job, the employee must be placed on administrative leave with pay until the case can be discussed with the Labor Relations Manager at the Department of Human Resources.
Dispute with Facts or Process

Regular employees, who have successfully completed their probationary period, who disagree with any disciplinary action taken may address disputes under the "Dispute Resolution" Policy 3220, UBP.

The University of New Mexico
Equal Opportunity Programs
821 Roma NE
Albuquerque, NM 87131-0051
(505) 277-5251

October 3, 1994

Bel Campbell
Assoc. Professor
Physics and Astronomy
500 Yale Blvd. NE Rm. 111

RE: Sexual Harassment

Dear Bel:

There are a great number of concerns about sexual harassment across campus. Concerns range from failure to report incidents of sexual harassment to how reports of sexual harassment are reacted to on campus. The Office of Equal Opportunity Programs is convening a meeting to air these concerns and develop an effective strategy for addressing them. We are inviting anyone who has an interest in this area to attend the meeting and assist in the problem solving process.

This collaborative meeting will take place on Wednesday, October 19, 1994 in Scholes Hall, Room 100 at 3PM to 5PM. We have asked Erin Leff, Dispute Resolution Coordinator, to facilitate this meeting.

The initial meeting will concentrate on problem identification. A second, follow-up meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 25, 1994 in the Roberts Room at 3PM to 5PM. We intend the second meeting to serve as a planning session. One idea that our office would like to expand upon with your input is the development of a survey to determine the scope of the sexual harassment problem on campus.

We welcome everyone's ideas and suggestions as well as constructive criticism on the topic. Please plan to attend both sessions and RSVP to 277-5251!

Sincerely,

Anne B. Thomas
Director, Equal Opportunity Programs

cc: Erin Leff, Dispute Resolution Coordinator
EOP Chron File
A New Face for the Profession

Let's not kid ourselves about what is at stake: it is nothing less than the profession as we have known it.

By Linda Ray Pratt

The year I was nominated for office the buzz word in higher education was "restructure." The next year, the word was "re-engineer." With retrenchment, a faculty member might get laid off; with re-engineering, faculty are de-recruited. If the words describing the fate of faculty have become increasingly jargonized and euphemistic, the words describing the extent of the proposed change have become increasingly comprehensive. Retrenchment—restructuring—re-engineering. The first step implied cutting some of the parts away from the whole; the second implied shuffling those parts in new ways; but the third implies a redesign that uses new parts to build a different machine.

Taking advantage of the trouble arising out of an economic crunch on tax dollars at the state level, and a public demand for more and better education in return for higher tuition, the New Engineers for the Reform of Higher Education do indeed seek to "re-design" our institutions. The question before us is what that new design will be, who will it serve, and who will control the steering. All the signs point toward answers few of us can welcome: uniform standards, performance-based assessment, vocationally oriented programs, limitations on tenure, heavier workloads, and more part-time and temporary employment for faculty.

At both the state and federal level government is moving toward more control of budgets, working conditions, and academic standards. Federal regulations are being drafted this summer that would set national standards for accreditation and assessment, standards that could affect what all of us teach and how our performance is evaluated. Numerous states have prescribed, or threatened to prescribe, how many hours we should work and what we should do with them. State coordinating commissions are determining what programs and degrees the faculty will be allowed to offer. In short, higher education is being told what it ought to do and how it ought to do it by politicians and education bureaucrats who don't teach and research, and who don't know how we do it.

Three years ago what seemed reasonable to talk about as a "fiscal crisis" has grown into something much broader and more threatening. Let's not kid ourselves about what is at stake: it is nothing less than the profession as we have known it. As faculty, we share a commitment to liberal education and the quest for knowledge. But the pressure is to produce a skills-based, performance-oriented curriculum. As faculty, we want a curriculum that reflects the diversity of our world and meets the needs of an increasingly varied student body. But the pressure is to standardize results and homogenize the curriculum. As faculty, we think student-teacher relations that allow for knowing each other and exploring together create the most productive learning environment. But the new engineers think that electronic classrooms on the bandwidth of "cyberservity" are more interactive. As faculty, we believe that colleges and universities are best run with authentic shared decision-making arrived at through faculty governance. The new administrative bureaucrats think the sham "partnerships" of TQM circles are an improvement. And worst of all, faculty think of ourselves as in the service of knowledge, sharing what we know and hope to learn with students who also hope to know and to learn with us. But the New Engineers talk of education as a product, and our students as merely the paying customers.

Linda Ray Pratt is professor of English at the University of Nebraska. This article is a condensed form of her Presidential Address at the Eightieth Annual Meeting of the AAUP.

I hope you are as offended as I am by this market-driven debasement of higher education; I hope you are as angry as I am about what the new education engineers are trying to do to our profession. Because if you are not, we will lose the meaning of this profession as we know it, as we imagined it when we chose it for ourselves, as we must preserve it for those young faculty and graduate students who want to follow us. If our vision of higher education cannot prevail, it won't just be faculty who are the losers. It will be our society as a whole, and countless young people who will never find that quality of education that allows one not only to change your job, but truly to change your life.

Of course students need to be prepared for employment, and of course the United States needs to compete in a world market. From the earliest founding of our universities, vocational and civic instruction was part of the mission of higher education. But the cultivation of intellect, the training of one's aesthetic sensibility, the enrichment of the spirit, the broadening of one's perspective on an unfamiliar world were also part of what education was designed to address. Some would say that...
In their ideas-fearing workforce. Can work with budget flexibility instead of as the profession intended for the democratic mass chose. The odds are that the percentage of faculty on tenure track has remained the same or gone down in the last decade. And, check the growth of this figure against the institution's reliance on part-time and temporary faculty. While you are checking figures, let's check one more. What was the growth rate of faculty in comparison with the growth rate of administrative and managerial personnel? If you find that the last decade the faculty has grown by six percent, and the administrative personnel has grown by sixty percent, you can find cold comfort in realizing that your institution reflects the national pattern.

But I have been talking about what they have done and want to do. What about our role in that? What has the faculty done that allowed the "education know-nothings" to get us on the run? As a profession faculty are, despite the stereotypes, relatively conservative. We are not quick to change, and most of us would rather avoid conflict than engage it. Most of the time, we grumble and go along, and immerse ourselves in our work. When the target for promotion, tenure, and merit began moving upward, we clutched the reins. When the administration upped the ante on tenure and distorted what was supposed to be a probationary period to ascertain that new faculty could be responsible and productive now of the academic community, we joined in. Few of us have participated in peer assessments of our junior colleagues demanding that they meet exemplary standards?

Instead of protecting the tenure wrested from the safeguard of academic freedom, have not helped administrators make it a witch which to bear out of answer to every last measure of a suspicion "probability"? Tenure is meant to provide the position due every faculty member who has proven they are competent and resourceful scholars and teachers of the kind positive to the institutions where they were. Wasted, and abused, the tenure process is a get tool and instrument of social control. The result is many younger faculty who look critically on a process that brutalized them for seven years. If they do not understand their between academic freedom and tenure are not ready to go to the wall to defend tenure, at whom should we point the finger blame?

As our institutions embraced the management standards of business, and our own in governance reflected that shift. When those who provided the funding administered the budget, too many of them rowed our commitment, subverting the discipline for our profession. We joined our disciplinary societies and let our own militancies for the profession as a whole. When we hoped to find in the intellectual life of the discipline the satisfaction that was harder to find as the professorate. The strategy was, at best, a holding action. The practice within the discipline is not immune to the changes in the profession. The personal success in one's field is thin instigation when the profession as we know it is at risk. Focussing on the discipline, and not the profession has left faculty without the voice, and the voice of a unified voice, with no area in which to develop a common strategy. One small organizational structure to pursue our agenda.

If faculty has played a role in creating the current uncertainty and confusion about what has the AAUP been during the past year? Until recently, the answer was that we were doing just what we've always done. We have written excellent policies and we have ensured some shameful institutions. Our assurance of higher education is better than ever, and the higher education community recognizes it as such. Our record in these years is commendable. But we have perhaps been uncomfortable in our traditions, too reluctant to take on new ways or enter new arenas of action.

Four years ago, then President Barbara Bergmann set out "to shake up the AAUP." She wanted to try new things, to hire new staff, to communicate with the public community in more effective, aggressive ways. Most of us knew she was right, even when we knew it could not happen without careful planning based in the endorsement of Council. But under Barbara, the process began, and the Association has been animated and re-invigorated by the possibilities before us.

So much change in so short a term has not been easy. Both staff and members have shared an anxiety about what new people and new practices might mean. The common content that we needed to change did not guarantee a common agreement about what we should become or who might best take us in new directions. But behind all the anxieties, behind all the discomfort of displacing the familiar ways, behind all the disappointments when our personal hopes had to accommodate the general view, the commitment to seek new faces and new names remained strong. And so, the shake that began four years ago has shaken out. The AAUP has a house in order, and we are ready to turn a new face to the profession, one that brings to the best of our traditions a fresh new creative energy: one that combines policy with political action; one that takes back to the campus and the state house the expertise we have and that faculty everywhere must learn.

If we are to reclaim our profession on our terms, we must recognize that we are a profession and not just a diffuse assortment of disciplinary interests. For almost eighty years the AAUP has been the only association of university professors. Many in the profession have forgotten or never knew how many basic policies and practices that protect their professional life are the work of the AAUP. But the AAUP is ready to play that role. 

Conscientious professors keep in mind their wide-ranging influence over those they teach. It should be the hope of teachers that their students will emerge with far more than is literally taught.

The AAUP knows what this profession is about. As teachers and scholars, we know what happens in the classroom; we know the real practices of departments, the proper role of governance. We know that academic freedom is not just an abstraction, or something that happened in the McCarthy era. Academic freedom is what protects faculty from capricious or misguided charges of harassment for something you said in the classroom that someone found offensive. Academic freedom is there to see to it that you can use the books you see fit in your course and express the ideas you believe about your subject matter. If there is anyone who doesn't believe that tenure protects the academic freedom of the teacher, go ask the untenured. Go ask the teaching assistant who told her she is dropping certain books for fear that offended students will go to the chair to complain and she won't be renewed. Go ask the gay professor who faces charges that he discriminated against straight students because he included some gay authors in the reading list. The assaults on academic freedom arising out of political and social controversy continue to abound, though the forms change from season to season. The economic pressures on our institutions have not let up and show no signs of doing so. The failed hopes of those who seek a career in our profession gather in a dark cloud of disheartened graduate students and disillusioned colleagues who cannot find decent jobs, and who fight to maintain a semblance of professional work in poorly paid and insecure part-time positions. In short, both the stability and the standards of our profession are under fire. In such a moment in the history of higher education, the faculty needs—now, as much as ever, now more than ever—a national voice, a unified voice, an authoritative voice for our profession. And now, as much as ever, now more than ever, the AAUP is ready to play that role.
Dear Colleague,

We are very pleased to invite you to the Sigma Xi Forum, co-sponsored by the Office of the Associate Provost for Research and the Albuquerque Section of the Institute of Electrical & Electronic Engineers, on the theme: Research University in the Year 2000 and Beyond. It is becoming increasingly clear that research conducted at the universities will have to be redefined to meet the economic, academic, environmental and social needs in the 21st century. The forum seeks to:

- bring together research workers and visionaries from academe, national laboratories, industry, and government as well as students, alumni, administrators, regents, business representatives, and legislators (state and federal) to initiate a dialog about how we can better explain the importance of science and basic research for the long term health of the society;

- provide a platform for the participants to discuss general ideas and consider conflicting pressures on a university such as UNM;

- offer an opportunity to the participants to meet others and form collaborations to help prioritize needs, design policies and determine effective strategies to ensure that changes are beneficial for the long-term growth in excellence for UNM;

- promote renewal and strengthening of the compact between the scientific research community and society to ensure that a successful and enduring arrangement is put into place whereby adequate resources continue to be made available to the universities.

The forum will be held on Thursday, 27 October 1994, from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. in the Auditorium of the Division of Continuing Education & Community Service Building, at 1634 University Blvd NE, Albuquerque, NM. Ample, free parking is available at the site and the lot is paved and well lit. We hope that you can join us and participate actively in the forum by sharing ideas and providing comments, opinions, suggestions and critiques. Your participation is crucial in ensuring the success of this venture.

Sincerely,

H.S. Ahluwalia
President
UNM Sigma Xi Chapter
SIGMA XI FORUM:
RESEARCH UNIVERSITY IN THE YEAR 2000 AND BEYOND
October 27, 1994
Auditorium of the Division of
Continuing Education & Community Service
1634 University Blvd NE

1:00-1:05 PM
Welcome: Ellen H. Goldberg

1:05-1:15 PM
Harjit Ahluwalia: General Remarks.

1:15-2:00 PM
Kumar Patel: Reinventing the Research University

2:00-2:20 PM
Mary Sue Coleman: How Changes in External Fund Environment are Changing Scholarly Work at UNM

2:20-2:50 PM
David Marsing: Emerging Trends From an Industrial Perspective

2:50-3:00 PM
Coffee Break

3:00-4:00 PM
Panel Discussion*

* Panel Members:
Hon'ble Pete Domenici (U.S. Senator) or representative, Ellen Goldberg (Assoc. Provost Research), Arthur Guenther (Governor's Science Advisor), Mohamed El-Genk (Chem & Nuclear Engineering), Jane Henney (Vice. Pres. Health Services), Hon'ble Ramon Huerta (Repr. NM Legislature), Sherman McCorkle (CEO, Tech. Ventures Corp.), Art Melandres (Chm., Board of Regents), Joan Parman (Senator Bingaman's Office), Hon'ble Nick Salazar (Chm. Science & Tech. Committee, NM Legislature), Hap Stoller (CEO, TPL), Edward Walters (Chm. Research Policy Committee), Moderator, John Wirth (CEO, Woodworkers' Supply), Hon'ble Steve Schiff (U.S. Congressman) or representative.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
October 25, 1994

(Summarized Minutes)

The October 25, 1994, Special Session of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Bel Campbell at 3:35 p.m. in the Kiva.

Senators present: Lynndianne Beene (English), James Boone (Anthropology), Joan Bybee (Linguistics), Ernest Dole (Pharmacy), John Finklestein (Management), Charles Fleddermann (Elec. & Comp. Engr.), Robert Glew (Biochemistry), Roy Jonson (Civil Engineering), Astrid Kodric-Brown (Biology), Tom Kyner (Math & Sciences), Cheryl Lear (Nursing), Ed Reyes (Pharmacology), John Rotherock (Art and Art History), Jerome Sheu (Univ. College), Maurice Wildin (Mech. Engr.) and Beulah Woodfin (Biochemistry).

Non-Senate Faculty: Abraham Anderson, Brad Cullen, Paul Davis, Ron Devries, Patrick Gallacher, Doug B. George, Russell Goodman, Brian Hansen, David Kauffam, Wanda Martin and Gib Richards.

Discussion of Core Curriculum. President Bel Campbell explained that this meeting was called to discuss a core curriculum for two reasons: (1): Pressure from the Commission on Higher Education (CHE), the two year sector and other constituencies within the state to have two years of transferrable classes within New Mexico; and (2): Many faculty members desire a high caliber core curriculum in the future.

Of specific concern was the copy of a letter from Frank J. Renz, Executive Director of the New Mexico Council of Independent Community Colleges, to Dr. Reynaldo Garcia, Associate Director of Instruction at the UNM-Valencia Branch, regarding a legislative draft proposal entitled, Proposed Transfer/Articulation Legislation: An Amendment Relating to Education; Providing For The Implementation Of A Comprehensive Statewide Articulation And Transfer Plan; Declaring An Emergency.

Janet Roebuck, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, called attention to section 2., item 9., subheading B., lines 23-26 of the document: "Every associate degree graduate from a community college operating under such articulation agreements shall be granted admission to an upper-division program offered by a state university except to a limited access program; a teacher certification program; or a major requiring an audition or portfolio."