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TO: Members of the UNM Faculty Senate  
FROM: Christine O'Dowd, Office of the University Secretary  
SUBJECT: December 15, 1994 Meeting  

The UNM Faculty Senate will meet on Thursday, December 15, 1994 from 3:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. in the Kiva. 

The agenda will include the following items:  

1. Approval of Agenda  
2. Summarized Minutes for November 8, 1994  
3. Memorial Minutes for Professor Emeritus Karl Christman and Professor MaryBeth Johnson  
4. Comments from Senate President Bel Campbell  
5. Honorary Degree Nomination -- Professor Virginia Seiser  
6. Approval of Degree Candidates  
7. 4:00 p.m. -- Core Curriculum Discussion  
8. 4:45 p.m. -- Assessment Committee Report by Professor David Kauffman  
9. 5:15 p.m. -- Faculty & Staff Benefits Committee ERB Report by Professor Emerita Zella Bray
The December 15, 1994 meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Bel Campbell at 3:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

Senators present: Lynndianne Beene (English), Steven Block (Music), James Boone (Anthropology), Jane Bruker (Gallup Branch), Bel Campbell (Physics and Astronomy), Jeff Davis (Math & Statistics), Ernest Dole (Pharmacy), John Finklestein (Management), Charles Fledderman (Elec. & Comp. Engr.), Robert Glew (Biochemistry), Deborah Graham (Med. Sch. Lib.), Andrew Hei (Pediatrics), Roy Johnson (Civil Engineering), William Kane (Education), Astrid Kodric-Brown (Biology), Tom Kyner (Math & Sciences), Cheryl Learn (Nursing), Harry Liull (General Library), Kurt Molte (Pathology), Alan Reed (Public Admin.), Richard Santos (Economics), Howard Schreyer (Mech. Engr.), Henry Trehitt (Comm. & Journ.), Maurice Wildin (Mech. Engr.), Beulah Woodfin (Biochemistry) and Nancy Ziegler (Gallup Branch).

Senators absent: Judith Brillman (Medicine), Anthony Cardenas (Spanish & Portuguese), Joseph Champoux (Management), Monica Cyrino (Foreign Lang. & Lit.), Tom DeCoster (Orthopedics), Linda Hall (History), Blaine Hart (Radiology), Peggy Kelley (Medicine), Demetra Logothetis (Dental Hygiene), Bill MacPherson (Law), Richard Melzer (Valencia Branch), Carolyn Mold (Microbiology), Elizabeth Nielsen (Special Education), Peter Pabisch (Foreign Lang. & Lit.), Ed Reyes (Pharmacology), Joe Rothrock (Art and Art History), Gloria Sarto (Obst. & Gyn.), Stephen Schreiber (Arch. & Planning), Jerome Shea (Univ. College), Leonard Stitesman (Public Admin.), Sylvia Veal (Medicine), Holly Waldron (Psychology) and Gerald Weiss (Physiology).

Excused absences: Beverly Burris (Sociology), Joan Bybee (Linguistics), Leroy Ortiz (CIMTE) and Lynnette Oshima (CIMTE).

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

Minutes of November 8, 1994. The minutes of November 8, 1994 were approved as distributed.
Memorial Minutes for Professor Emeritus Karl Christman and Professor Mary Beth Johnson. Memorial Minutes for Professors Karl Christman and Mary Beth Johnson were read by Senate President Bel Campbell. Secretary Anne Brown was asked to send copies to the next of kin.

Memorial Minute for Professor Karl Christman

Karl Christman, professor emeritus at the Anderson Schools of Management, passed away in October of this year.

Karl Christman received an MBA in Accounting from Indiana University in 1952 and joined the faculty at the Anderson Schools in September of 1955. His principal teaching and research interests were Auditing, Not-for-Profit Accounting and Financial Theory and Practice.

Prior to coming to the University, Professor Christman was an auditor and tax specialist with Easterday and Easterday, CPA's in Kokomo, Indiana and instituted and managed the Loan Credit Analysis Department for Union Trust Company in Indianapolis, Indiana.

As past chairman and member of numerous ASM and UNM committees, including several terms on the Faculty Senate and task forces, Professor Christman was truly an "elder statesman" of the university community.

His extraordinary service to the Anderson Schools includes the BBA Program Directorship, Membership on the ASM Coordinating Committee, and Accounting Area Coordinator.

A respected colleague, a fine teacher, and a person always willing to serve the University wherever a strong helping hand was needed, Karl Christman will be missed by many of us.

I ask that these words be inscribed in the official minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy of this memorial minute be sent to his wife Pat.

Presented by John M. Finkelstein
Associate Professor
Anderson Schools of Management

Memorial Minute for Mary Beth Johnson

Mary Beth Johnson, faculty member of the General Library, died October 31, 1994, at the age of 47.

Born in Altadena, California, Professor Johnson received her undergraduate degree from the University of California in 1970 and
her advanced degree in Library Science from the University of Oregon in 1975. Subsequently, Professor Johnson began her library career as Head Catalog Librarian at the Klamath County Library, Klamath Falls, Oregon. From 1977-1984, she was Head Librarian at the Forest History Society Library and Archives in Santa Cruz, California. From 1985-1988, Professor Johnson worked in several capacities at the RAND Corporation. She served as a catalog librarian, head of technical services, head of collection services, and systems librarian. At RAND, Professor Johnson dealt with health policy, civil and criminal justice, aerospace engineering, computer science, political science, including Soviet studies for the armed forces.

MaryBeth began working at UNM in 1988 as the Assistant Director of the Parish Memorial Library, which deals primarily with business economics, and management. MaryBeth was promoted to associate professor and awarded tenure in 1994. MaryBeth was professionally very active—nationally, regionally, and locally. She published widely in a variety of professional journals. She co-authored a prize-winning documentary film, Timber on the Move: A History of Log Moving Technology. She wrote features for the Encyclopedia of American Forest and Conservation History. MaryBeth’s last publication was her book The International Monetary Fund, 1944-1992: A Research Guide—published in 1993 by Garland Publishing. At the time of her death, MaryBeth was researching a book on Ludwig Wittgenstein as a literary figure.

MaryBeth Johnson was an outstanding academic research librarian. Undergraduate and graduate students, faculty and researchers alike, consistently remarked that MaryBeth had excellent reference, teaching, and research support skills. In her capacity as a librarian, MaryBeth was an exemplary role model. MaryBeth was well-admired and highly respected by her colleagues and peers. She was a most vivacious, compassionate, and courageous person. MaryBeth, the beautiful person, will be greatly missed and forever remembered by her many friends.

Presented by Robert L. Migneault
Dean of Library Services
Zimmerman Library

Comments from Senate President Bel Campbell:

President Bel Campbell informed the Senate that:

1. A meeting of the New Mexico Legislative Finance Committee was held on Tuesday, 13 December, in order to receive the responses of the UNM (via Regents President Art Melendres and President Peck) to the Mercer Report on Human Resources.

-- Peck and Melendres announced that, beginning very soon, monies would be set aside to fund up to eight "opportunity hires" (presumably minority) faculty per opportunity hires."
2. Peck asserted that the Mercer Report was not representative because it included the input of only 500+ faculty and staff out of a total of several thousand;

3. Senator Manny Aragon questioned Melendres, Peck, Coleman and Campbell about articulation, tenure, faculty workloads and accessibility to students, isolation of faculty from the broader communities and slowness to hire minority faculty;

4. More than one legislator expressed the opinion that tenure was obsolete and outmoded, and an obstacle to progress and accountability. Senator Kyser said that tenure was unjustified and ought to be abolished, or if not, there should be "three firings a year;"

5. Max Coll, Chair of the LFC, said that the Legislature is "not trying to run the University," but intends nevertheless to press us to focus more on articulation.

2. Hank Jenkins-Smith of UNM's Institute for Public Policy has produced a commissioned report on "New Mexicans' Views of the University of New Mexico."

3. On Tuesday, 13 December, the Board of Regents approved a Resolution on Campus Climate, attached. They tabled for further consideration and revision a statement by the Mural Coalition regarding murals by Kenneth Adams in Zimmerman Library. The distribution of the proceeds from the State GO Bond Sale approved in November and the next Severance Tax Bond Sale is also attached.

4. The national office of the AAUP sent a representative to the 13 December Board of Regents Academic Affairs Committee meeting in order to request that the Regents respond to the petition by faculty of the UNM - Gallup Campus for an open election of a collective bargaining agent.

5. Intense conversation within the CHE and LFC and input from both the 2-year and 4-year sectors resulted in an updated draft of legislation regarding articulation.

Honorary Degree Candidate. Upon recommendation of Professor Virginia Seiser for the Honorary Degree Committee, the Senate approved granting an honorary degree of Doctor of Fine Arts to artist Agnes Martin.

Candidates for Degrees, Semester I, 1994-95. Upon recommendation of the deans of the various schools and colleges, the Senate approved the degree candidates for Semester I, 1994-95.
Core Curriculum Discussion. President Campbell directed discussion to the motion moved by Senator Maurice Wildin at the November 8, 1994 meeting, which, she said, had been seconded and tabled for present discussion. The motion read as follows:

Moved: That the Faculty Senate, in consultation with the Provost's Office, appoint an ad hoc committee comprised of faculty and academic staff to identify a core curriculum that is comprised of existing courses, or a set of core competencies that can be satisfied by using existing courses, to the maximum possible extent. This core shall be acceptable to all academic units, i.e., to all colleges and schools. Attention shall be given to issues of cost, implementation, and articulation. An initial report shall be made to the Faculty Senate at its February meeting, and a final report with recommendations shall be submitted to the Senate prior to its April meeting.

Questions arose concerning the difference between the articulation issue from the two-year sector and the core curriculum/competencies issue referred to in Senator Wildin's motion.

Associate Provost for Academic Affairs Janet Roebuck explained that she thought the issue of articulation was a short term emergency and separate from the discussion of core curriculum. She said the core curriculum issue would once again be important to the legislature in a year or two and it would be wise to be prepared. She further explained how transferability was different from articulation. As an example she listed a Technical Vocational Institute (TVI) program deliberately preparing students for the Anderson School of Management. That TVI program articulates with our UNM program. Articulation deals with program agreements while transferability is the transfer of an individual course.

Senator Richard Santos stated that he thought the issues of transferability and articulation were important, but if the words "core curriculum" were used, the faculty would vote against it, and he was opposed to it.

Senator Santos moved to call the question and suspend discussion. Senator John Finklestein seconded the motion. With fifteen faculty opposed, seven in favor and two abstentions, the motion failed to pass. Discussion resumed.

Senator Steven Block suggested including the community colleges, perhaps by establishing a state-wide committee, in UNM's core curriculum discussions.
Senator Santos suggested that the term "core competencies" better represents the concept, because within a "core curriculum" there might be courses having nothing to do with competency. He agrees a committee should work on core competencies, but thinks outcome assessment is a better indicator of knowledge, rather than required courses.

The Senate approved a motion to end debate and call the question.

The Senate also unanimously approved, with one abstention, Senator Wildin's motion.

President Campbell stated that the Operations Committee would return to the Faculty Senate with a membership proposal at the February 7, 1995 meeting. She suggested anyone with input contact the Operations Committee.

Faculty & Staff Benefits Committee Educational Retirement Board (ERB) Report by Professor Emerita Zella Bray. Professor Emerita Zella Bray reported that Vice President for Business and Finance David Mc Kinney was in support of University faculty and staff retirement benefits being in parity with the Public Employee Retirement Act (PERA).

The ERB board has accepted (and will take to the Legislature) the recommendation moving the multiplier (x years worked) from 2.35 to 2.5. PERA's multiplier is 3.0. The proposed Cost of Living Allowance (COLA) would be given to retired individuals at the age of 62 rather than 65, and it would be three-quarters of the Consumer Price Index (CPI), capping at 4%, maintaining the highest five years.

Professor Emerita Bray added that increased benefits also meant paying for them and that possibly the Legislature would do so. It may come out of future salary increases. They are asking that employers pay 5%, rather than 4.41%, to help pay off the debt which is being accrued yearly by people retiring.

The new changes would probably only be applicable to people who retire in (approximately) 1996 and later. None of the changes would be retroactive.

Assessment Committee Report by Professor David Kauffman. Professor David Kauffman stated that the University of New Mexico's accrediting agency, the North Central Association (NCA), requires a student outcomes assessment development plan, showing that some aspects of it are functional. He also cited accountability to the public and the Legislature's customer-oriented attitude as reasons for outcomes assessment. He said the Student Outcomes Assessment Committee recommends presenting the assessment of individual degree programs to the NCA because a comprehensive plan at this time would be impossible. The Committee plans to prepare a draft of the plan
by early February for review and then the final report for approval in April before submitting it to the NCA in May.

Senator Maurice Wildin asked whether the Senate should further support the Student Outcomes Assessment Committee. Professor Kauffman said the Senate's help in reviewing the draft of the development plan would be sufficient.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anne J. Brown, Secretary
The Senate will continue discussion of a core curriculum by considering the following motion made by Senator Maurice Wildin at the meeting of November 8, 1994:

Moved: That the Faculty Senate, in consultation with the Provost's Office, appoint an ad hoc committee comprised of faculty and academic staff to identify a core curriculum that is comprised of existing courses, or a set of core competencies that can be satisfied by using existing courses, to the maximum possible. This core shall be acceptable to all academic units, i.e., to all colleges and schools. Attention shall be given to issues of cost, implementation, and articulation. An initial report shall be made to the Faculty Senate at its February meeting and a final report with recommendations shall be submitted to the Senate prior to its April meeting.
STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

Presentation to the Faculty Senate and the Deans' Council, Dec 1994

Background:
UNM is required by the North Central Association (NCA) to submit a plan for student outcomes assessment (SOA) in May 1995. All schools accredited by NCA are required to do so, though the timing varies. The ad hoc SOA Committee has been studying the issues and recommends the plan outlined below.

The purpose of SOA is to improve the instructional process. It is related to a number of issues in higher education. In some states, but not yet in New Mexico, it is tied very closely to legislature-mandated accountability programs. The generally accepted definition of SOA includes the following features:
- Setting of goals
- Determining means to measure achievement of those goals
- Making the measurements
- Evaluating the results
- Using the results to improve the educational process

SOA can encompass a great many features of a university educational experience: campus-wide goals, student-life goals, general education goals, and goals within specific degree programs, both undergraduate and graduate. It does not normally include assessment at the individual course level. The leaders in developing and implementing SOA programs have been small liberal arts colleges and community colleges. Nationwide, large research universities have been slow to implement SOA, though there are a few well-established programs in place.

The proposed SOA Plan for UNM:

The requirement from NCA is that we develop a plan and show that some aspects of it are being implemented. We are not expected to have in place at this time a comprehensive plan that covers all aspects of university life. NCA recognizes that it is virtually impossible to do so at a large university. It is the SOA Committee's recommendation that SOA at UNM start with assessment of individual degree programs. Issues of campus-wide nature can be considered in future years. Long term, we should establish SOA for all academic and major support programs.

What does SOA include?

At the individual degree program level, SOA may encompass a number of different activities: alumni surveys, exit surveys, selected tests (either local or nationwide in origin), portfolio evaluation, reviews by "outsiders" (professionals, the local community), graduate and undergraduate unit reviews, program accreditation reviews, and more. It is expected that the faculty of each program will determine the means that best meets the needs of their unit.
What does NCA require?

NCA requires that SOA plans include the following features:
- Faculty participation
- Definition of goals for students
- Measurements against those goals by students or by professionals outside the unit
- Means for evaluating the data from the measurements
- Means for using the data to improve the education process

Where does UNM stand now?

There are already many SOA activities taking place at UNM: results of professional board examinations, job placement data, departmental alumni surveys, graduate and undergraduate program reviews, etc. The Planning and Policy Studies (PPS) office has prepared a survey of SOA activities at UNM. Copies are available from Patricia Burris-Woodall (ext 75115).

PPS has assembled a small library of materials on SOA, including plans that have been submitted by other institutions. In addition, Dr. Burris-Woodall and the members of the SOA Committee will work with units to assist in developing SOA programs.

What is the plan of action?

It is the intention of the SOA Committee, working with PPS, to prepare a draft UNM SOA plan by early February, so that it may be reviewed by the Faculty Senate, the Administration, the Deans' Council, and other bodies, with comments back to us by mid March. We will then prepare a final report for approval by these bodies and submission to NCA in May.

As presently envisioned, the report will contain a general statement of SOA purpose and goals and state our intention to concentrate initially on individual degree programs. It will describe, as best we can envision it, how SOA activities will eventually encompass other aspects of university life. A key feature of the report will be descriptions of the SOA activities in academic units either now taking place or planned for the near future.

Student Outcomes Assessment Committee members:

Alex Beach, Alumni
Steven Block, Music
Patricia Burris-Woodall, PPS
Fred Christ, Registrar
Robert Fleming, A&S
Brian Hansen, Theatre
Mary Harris, Ed Found
David Kauffman, Eng
Committee chair
Janet Neubuck, Assoc Prov
Ron Schrader, Math
Dones Shane, Nursing
Jerry Shea, U College
Cynthia Stuart, Admis
Michael Voil, Gallup
The University of New Mexico

**See 2nd page, last paragraph for final FSCC meeting information.**

To:
- Members, Faculty Staff Benefits Committee
- Members, Staff Council Benefits Committee

From:
- Karl Ward Kerr, Chair/PRO

Subject:
- Minutes of 11/17/94 Joint Meeting of Above Committees

Date:
- 11/21/94

Members Present:
- David Padilla
- Karl Ward Kerr
- Beth Killergret
- Mary Haas
- Carl Scherzin
- Carmen Cant, ex-officio

Guests:
- Frank weekly/ERB

I. Minutes of previous October 1994 FSCC meeting were approved.

II. Frank Readied with the new spoke at length regarding changes in the EB in University employee health insurance. He also discussed and clarified information on exceptions from various members of the plan and the EB benefits, and regarding comparisons of how and the EB benefits as outlined in the "formula" by which retiree employees' salaries are defined. He cautioned members that any increases in benefits will substantially increase the employee's contributions and will subsequently increase the employer's contributions, and that any contributions to the retirement fund. Readied stated that on the next meeting to look at cost of living 12/1/94 the EB will meet to look at cost of living. Also, the EB will meet in January 1995 to adjust over retirement, and other retirement, and other retirement, and other retirement, and other retirement.
II. Cont.

David Padilla pointed out that employees need to realize that this was a long-term benefit—raises would not be as high if/when this change in retirement benefits is implemented.

Marc Imber led a motion to request the following changes in UNM's retirement plan: an increase in the employer's contribution, change the "multiplier" or "factor" to 2.5% (from current .25%), have the CPI (cap) at 4%, and the age reduced to 62 years of age. Carl Scherwin seconded the motion, all FSBC members present agreed. Staff Council Benefits members then voted and also agreed to request the above changes. The Chair had requested that both committees vote separately on this issue and then give their recommendations, etc., to Frank Ready.

Some members had concerns about the advantages of averaging annual salaries over either a three or five year period. Ready specified that this did not affect the final retirement salary as much as the other factors mentioned above (such as the multiplier/factor). One additional change Frank Ready discussed was that of the membership of the ERR— he stated that a "support" personnel member should be added to the Board currently there is no one in this capacity from a university on the Board. (Ready also announced that there will be a meeting on 11/30/94 in Santa Fe to discuss changes before the ERR meets and he invited the Chair and someone from Human Resources to attend.) Marc Imber will try to attend this meeting for the Committee due to the Chair's previous commitment in delivering a presentation on that date. Dependent on that meeting and other factors, the Chair may invite Mr. Ready back to the next FSBC meeting in December.

III. Milton Sanchez, with the New Mexico Retiree Health Care Authority, was unable to speak with the members of both committees due to the length of the above discussion. The Chair invited Mr. Sanchez back to speak with the committees at a more convenient future date (dependent on Ready again addressing the committees).

IV. Other Agenda Items

The Chair spoke briefly to FSBC members regarding the tuition remission draft policy. She will take comments/suggestions to V.P. Mc Kinney in the near future. Concerns were again raised regarding work time being taken for classes and also being used in the eight tuition job-related. The bottom line so far is that all hours will be available, but specifics are not defined as yet.

Due to concerns raised by some FSBC members, at this time a future joint meeting with the Staff Council Benefits Committee will not be held. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the FSBC will be on hold. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the FSBC will be on

Thursday, 12/13/94, 1:30-3:00 pm in Room #100 at Scholes.
INFORMATION PACKET FOR FACULTY SENATE: 15 December 1994

1. A meeting of the New Mexico Legislative Finance Committee was held on Tuesday, 13 December, in order to receive the responses of UNM (via Regents President Art Melendres and President Peck) to the Mercer Report on Human Resources. A few selected comments:

-- Peck and Melendres announced that, beginning very soon, monies would be set aside to fund up to eight "opportunity hires" of (presumably minority) faculty per year;

-- Peck asserted that the Mercer Report was not representative because it included the input of only 500+ faculty and staff out of a total of several thousand;

-- Senator Manny Aragon questioned Melendres, Peck, Coleman, and Campbell about articulation, tenure, faculty workloads and accessibility to students, isolation of faculty from the broader communities, slowness to hire minority faculty, etc.;

-- More than one legislator expressed the opinion that tenure was obsolete and outmoded, and an obstacle to progress and accountability. Senator Kyser said that tenure was unjustified and ought to be abolished, or if not, there should be "three firings a year;"

-- Max Coll, Chair of the LFC, said that the Legislature is "not trying to run the University," but intends nevertheless to press us to focus more on articulation;

-- A good time was had by all.

2. Hank Jenkins-Smith of UNM's Institute for Public Policy has produced a commissioned report on "New Mexicans' Views of the University of New Mexico." An executive summary of this report and some of the results are attached [Att. 1].

3. On Tuesday, 13 December, the Board of Regents approved a Resolution on Campus Climate, attached [Att. 2]. They tabled for further consideration and revision a statement by the Mural Coalition regarding murals by Kenneth Adams in Zimmerman Library [Att. 3]. The distribution of the proceeds from the State GO Bond Sale approved in November and the next Severance Tax Bond Sale is also attached [Att. 4].

4. A useful comparison of ERA and PERA Retirement Benefits is attached. It was graciously provided by Scott Obenshain, M.D. [Att. 5].

5. The national office of the AAUP sent a representative to the 13 December Board of Regents Academic Affairs Committee meeting in order to request that the Regents respond to the petition by faculty of the UNM - Gallup Campus for an open election of a collective bargaining agent. A mission statement of the UNM - Gallup AAUP chapter is attached [Att. 6].

6. A further draft of legislation regarding articulation is attached [Att. 7]. This has resulted from intense conversation within the CHE and LFC and input from both the 2-year and 4-year sectors.

Att. 1: Excerpts from "New Mexicans' View of UNM" pp. 1-5
Att. 2: Regents' Resolution on Campus Climate pp. 6-7
Att. 3: Proposed Statement from Mural Coalition pp. 8-9
Att. 4: Projects funded from GO & ST Bond Proceeds pp. 10-12
Att. 5: ERA/PERA Comparison pp. 13-15
Att. 6: Mission Statement from UNM - Gallup AAUP pp. 16-19
Att. 7: Revised Draft Legislation on Statewide Articulation
New Mexicans' Views of the University of New Mexico

I. Executive Summary

This report provides results from a survey of 1030 New Mexicans about perceptions of the University of New Mexico. The data were collected in June and July of 1994 by the UNM Survey Research Center.

When asked for their general impressions of the University, most New Mexicans (about 60%) perceived UNM to be "very" or "somewhat" good. Impressions were most favorable among respondents who (a) live outside Bernalillo County and (b) are Hispanic.

When asked to compare UNM with other universities, UNM ranked better than UTEP, about equivalent to the University of Colorado at Boulder and the University of Arizona, and as inferior to Stanford University.

Among the survey respondents, UNM is best known for its sports teams (about 33%), cultural diversity (about 14%), and its graduate programs (about 12%).

Some of the most frequent images that respondents had regarding the University concerned education and study, the physical attributes of the campus, the location of the campus, and UNM's sports teams. From among the images our respondents have of UNM, the most favorable of the University concern the branch campuses, the UNM Hospital and Medical School, and "personal advancement".

While many New Mexicans have a reasonable working knowledge of the University (e.g., over 80% know the UNM mascot is the Lobo), relatively few know the approximate size of UNM's student body, the annual tuition, the ratio of minority students, or the name of the University President.

Among UNM's programs, the University Hospital is the best known, followed by the basketball program, the undergraduate program. Relatively few respondents were aware of the University for the Americas program.

From among those respondents who said they would choose to attend UNM, the most frequent reason for picking UNM was that it was close to home, family and friends, followed by academic excellence and the availability of a specific program. The most frequent reason given for choosing other universities was academic excellence, followed by the reputation of the college.

When asked to evaluate the stringency of UNM's admissions policies, most respondents thought them about right, with a significant fraction perceiving them to be "too lenient".

Most respondents thought UNM's admissions policies were fair to all ethnic and racial groups. The primary exceptions were African American respondents, among whom 40% perceived unfair admissions.

When asked whether employee hiring and promotion were subject to discrimination at UNM, 25% of those in Bernalillo County, and 16% of those residing elsewhere, said "yes". African Americans were most likely to perceive employment discrimination (48%).

Most respondents thought UNM's current level of emphasis on athletics was about right. Roughly a third would prefer to see the level of emphasis on athletics decrease at UNM.

When asked to evaluate the current level of emphasis on research at UNM, a plurality about 49%) would prefer to increase emphasis on basic research, and a majority (about 70%) want to see an increase on emphasis in applied research.

Respondents were asked to allocate a budget of $1000 across five general categories of expenditures at UNM. The approximate allocations for each category were as follows: arts and cultural programs: $140; health care programs: $220; teaching programs: $310; research activities: $265; and intercollegiate sports programs: $65.
II. About the Survey

The findings in this report are based on interviews conducted with a randomly selected sample of New Mexico citizens. One thousand and thirty individuals were interviewed by telephone in June and July of 1994. The surveys were conducted using the UNM Survey Research Center's computer assisted telephone interviewing laboratory (see Appendix A for details). The survey was conducted both in English and Spanish.

The survey questionnaire was designed (in consultation with the University of New Mexico's President's Council) to obtain information about how New Mexicans perceive UNM. To obtain unbiased responses from respondents, open-ended questions were included that encouraged free-association about the University and elicited the mental images respondents associate with UNM. In addition, interviewees answered specific questions about the University and its programs, and they were asked how they believed the UNM should set priorities and allocate resources. The full wording of the survey questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

To assess the unique views of New Mexicans from specific regions and ethnic groups, the survey sample was structured to include a sufficient number of interviewees in each of these subgroups. Thus, the sample includes disproportionate numbers of respondents from (a) Bernalillo County, (b) Hispanic households, and (c) African American households. For this reason, this report will describe survey results for specific regional (Bernalillo County and "Rest of New Mexico") and ethnic or racial groups (African American, American Indian, Hispanic and White, Non-Hispanic).

This diverse sample makes it possible to take comparative snapshots of how different groups of New Mexicans understand and evaluate the University of New Mexico and its programs. The survey also will also serve as a baseline for evaluating changes in New Mexicans' perceptions of the University over time.

III. General Evaluations of the UNM

This report begins by asking how New Mexicans evaluate the University of New Mexico. To answer this question, survey items were developed to (a) measure the respondents' general or overall assessments of the University, (b) compare UNM with other universities in the Western US, and (c) identify those attributes or programs for which UNM is best known. Responses to these questions, broken out by regional and ethnic groupings, are provided in this section.

A. Overall Approval of UNM

To assess overall evaluation of the University, respondents were asked the following question:

Now we would like to ask you about your overall impression of the University of New Mexico. On a scale of one to five, where ONE is VERY BAD, THREE is NEUTRAL, and FIVE is VERY GOOD, what is your general impression of the University of New Mexico?

Table 1 and Figure 1 show the distribution of responses, broken out by region of residence.

Table 1: New Mexicans' Evaluations of the University of New Mexico by Region of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of Residence</th>
<th>Bernallillo County</th>
<th>Rest of New Mexico</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Bad</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Good</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Distribution of New Mexicans' Evaluations of the University of New Mexico by Region of Residence

Table 1 and Figure 1 indicate that UNM receives a generally positive evaluation, though New Mexicans outside Bernalillo County tend to rate the University more favorably than do
those within the County. In both regions, well over half of the respondents rated the University as "somewhat good" or "very good". Only eight percent in Bernalillo County, and four percent elsewhere, rated UNM as "somewhat bad" or "very bad".

Different ethnic groups vary in their evaluations of the University. The frequency distributions for the UNM evaluation by ethnic groups are shown in Table 2, and the mean values with 95% confidence intervals² are shown in Figure 2.

Table 2: New Mexicans' Overall Evaluations Of UNM by Ethnic and Racial Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White, Non-Hispanic</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Bad</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Good</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that the University gets its most positive ratings from Hispanics (66% "good" ratings) and its least favorable rating from African Americans (50% "good" ratings). Figure 2 shows that a statistically significant gap between Hispanics' ratings of UNM (avg. = 3.96) and those of both White, Non-Hispanic non-Hispanics (avg. = 3.66) and African Americans (avg. = 3.58).

Resolution on Campus Climate

The University of New Mexico reaffirms its commitment to creating and maintaining a diverse community and a campus in which students, faculty and staff can learn and work together in an atmosphere that is productive and free from harassment, exploitation, intimidation, hate crimes, discrimination and retaliation. The University will act decisively and promptly to deal with those who engage in criminal acts and who violate applicable administrative policies and procedures, thereby demonstrating in the strongest terms that such actions will not be tolerated on this campus.

In fulfilling its institutional obligation to provide leadership with regard to campus climate, the Board of Regents also urges every student, faculty and staff member to exercise his or her individual responsibility to contribute to a safe and positive campus environment. Only by working together, through institutional processes and individual behavior, can the University community deal with actions which subvert the mission of the University and threaten students, faculty and staff.

The President of the University shall distribute this resolution to all faculty and staff, along with information about policies and procedures which address the issues of harassment, exploitation, intimidation, hate crimes, discrimination and retaliation.


² The 95% confidence interval shows the estimated range within which the mean value for each group would fall 95 times out of 100 with equivalent size samples.
MEMORANDUM:

TO: Regents' Student Affairs Committee
FROM: Olga Zúñiga Forbes, Vice President for Student Affairs
RE: Proposal from Mural Coalition

The Mural Coalition has submitted a proposal to accomplish two actions:

1. Installation of an explanatory plaque in proximity to the Library murals.
2. Commissioning of a new mural in the library across from the current murals.

I. Explanation Plaque

Legal counsel does have concerns with the specific "wording" submitted by the Coalition. The wording could be challenged by the artist's family if assessed as a "defamatory" statement.

I suggest the following wording:

Since the 1970's, these murals by Kenneth Adams have been the subject of continuous, heated debate. Many people have found offensive the distributions of labor along racial and gender lines, and the implicit assessments of cultural legacies. It is worth noting that at the time the artist Kenneth Adams created these images, he was widely applauded for the breaking down artistic stereotypes which had previously restricted American Indian and Hispanic peoples to the roles of colorful accessories. Times, however, change, and the explicit centrality of white males in the Adams murals is no longer defensible. As with most public art which dares to address social issues, these murals now need to be understood in the contexts both of their time and of ours.

The impetus to place this statement nearby the murals came from the Mural Coalition - an organization of students and other concerned individuals.

December 2, 1994

II. Commission of New Mural

If funding is provided for a new mural the following process would be in place.

- Items over $10,000 must be sent out for competitive bids.
- Items under $10,000 can be sole source.
- The University Art in Public Places Committee would review the proposals and placements of any art work that is commissioned, regardless of cost.

I am not prepared to recommend the source of funding at this time.

Thank you.

OZF/nps
MEMORANDUM

TO: David L. McKinney
Vice President for Business and Finance

FROM: Julie C. Weaks
Director of Budget

DATE: November 23, 1994

RE: Action by Board of Regents Relative to State General Obligation Bond Sale

The 1994 New Mexico State Legislature approved $12,105,650 of capital project funding for the University of New Mexico from State General Obligation Bonds. Those projects are listed in Attachment A. With the approval of this General Obligation Bond Issue by the voters on November 4, 1994, the state is preparing to sell these bonds around February 1995. We wish to have all of the authorized UNM bonds included in this sale.

The Budget Office and Facility Planning Office have completed the appropriate questionnaires relative to these General Obligation Bond projects. However, before the projects can officially be incorporated in the state sale, the attached resolution must be adopted by the UNM Board of Regents. If at all possible, I would ask that this be added to the December 6, 1994 Finance and Facilities Committee agenda in anticipation that it could be adopted by the full Board of Regents in their meeting on December 13, 1994.
MEMORANDUM

TO: David L. McKinney
Vice President for Business and Finance

FROM: Julie C. Weaks
Director of Budget

DATE: November 21, 1994

RE: Action by Board of Regents Relative to Next State Severance Tax Bond Sale

The 1994 New Mexico State Legislature approved $5,857,000 of capital project funding for the University of New Mexico from Severance Tax Bonds. Those projects are listed in Attachment A.

Of course, funding for these projects is not actually available until the state sells the appropriate bonds. The state had Severance Tax Bond sales in May and June 1994, and some of the University's bonds were included in each of those sales. The University, however, still has $2,190,000 in authorized but unsold Severance Tax Bonds (see Attachment A for details of sold/unsold bonds). We wish to request that $200,000 of these authorized bonds be included in the next (January or February 1995) state Severance Tax Bond sale.

The Budget Office and Facility Planning Office have completed the appropriate forms relative to the above project. However, before the project can officially be incorporated in the next sale, the attached resolution must be adopted by the UNM Board of Regents. If at all possible, I would ask that this be added to the December 6, 1994 Finance and Facilities Committee agenda in anticipation that it could be adopted by the full Board of Regents in their meeting on December 13, 1994.

Attachment A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Authorized 1994</th>
<th>Unsold Balance Remaining 1995</th>
<th>Jan/Feb Sale</th>
<th>May Sale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry Building Remodel</td>
<td>192,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Classroom Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallup Computer &amp; Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Learning Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Tons Education Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Tate Facility Buses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM Student Services Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Center Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadium Addition (Phase III)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of ERA and PERA Retirement Benefits

Individuals with same final salary of $32692.00 retiring at same age & years of service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ERA</th>
<th>PERA</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yrly. Retirement Pay</td>
<td>$17,820</td>
<td>$23,634</td>
<td>$5814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay @ age 65, if you retired @ 50</td>
<td>$17,820</td>
<td>$29,973 to @ 2%/yr. to $37839 to @ 4%/yr.</td>
<td>$12,153 to $20,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier, % x years worked</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of quarters salary averaged</td>
<td>20 (5 years)</td>
<td>12 (3 Years)</td>
<td>8 (2 Years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. %@ Retirement</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Work to Max.</td>
<td>42.6 (34 yrs to 80%)</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>16 years (7.33 yrs to 80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset of COLA (Cost of Living Adjustment) @ age 65, no matter retirement age</td>
<td>3 years post retirement</td>
<td>Depends on age at retirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Contribution</td>
<td>7.4-7.6%</td>
<td>7.4-7.6%</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Contribution</td>
<td>8.65%</td>
<td>16.59%</td>
<td>7.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age + Service = 75 yrs. Rule</td>
<td>Yes, although penalty accrues if &lt; 59 yrs.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>PERA employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can retire with 25 yrs. service no penalty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Employees pay in US</td>
<td>45-47th in USA</td>
<td>31st in USA</td>
<td>14-16 positions in US rankings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Counted Years Salaries</td>
<td>5 years: $27972, $29152, $30332, $31512, $32692, Ave. = $30332</td>
<td>3 years: $30332, $31512, $32692, Ave. = $31512</td>
<td>$1180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised 12/6/94

American Association of University Professors
University of New Mexico
Gallup Campus

MISSION AND OBJECTIVES

MISSION: It is the mission of the organization to advance the conditions of employment and the contractual agreements of the faculty of this institution. It does so by engaging in collective bargaining procedures mandated by the legislative of the State of New Mexico, interpreted and enforced by the Attorney General of the State of New Mexico. It supports the cause of Academic Freedom, nationally, state-wide, and locally. In so doing, it engages in activities, communicates its mission, and argues the tenets of the AAUP whenever the need and opportunity arise, in individual instances where it is perceived that the rights of a faculty person have been compromised or threatened or when the collective interests are similarly diminished.

SHORT-TERM OBJECTIVES: The immediate objectives of the faculty of the University of New Mexico, Gallup Branch, are as follows:

1. Merit Pay Increases for Faculty. The Gallup AAUP Chapter conditionally endorses the current plan written by the Senate of this campus because that plan is a reasonably fair document. At the time the PERA is fully implemented, the GAAUP will review the merit system again.

2. Tenure for Vocational Faculty. Gallup AAUP recognizes the need to develop an acceptable system for translating experience and training into an evaluation system for qualified interested faculty in the vocations and senses the need for such a system to be developed as soon as possible for the well-being of our valued instructors in the trades and applied technologies.

3. Workloads. Until such time as the State’s fifteen hour workload is re-evaluated, the AAUP recognizes it as a standard for all faculty. The “equivalent” clause in the State’s directives, as recorded in the Faculty Handbook, needs clarification. All faculty are entitled to release time under the conditions of that clause. Release time should be granted on the recommendation of the chairs and on the approval of the Associate Director.
Release time for chairs, as with all non-teaching duties, needs a standardized system of quantification. In addition, there needs to be a system of evaluation that will objectively determine who is eligible for release time.

Finally, there needs to be a clear differentiation between those duties for faculty that create workloads exceeding the 15 hour standard that are not meritorious and those that are. To be considered are those activities that are voluntary but not relevant to the faculty's career or departmental objectives, those that are voluntary and relevant to those objectives, those that are assigned to faculty without their consent and are yet not remunerated, and any other assignment or professional activity.

4. Day Care. The Gallup Chapter recommends a study of needs, costs and willingness of employees to contribute to this objective.

5. Joint and Community Appointments. All faculty duties outside of teaching must be accompanied by descriptions, a clearly delineated chain of command, and a written system of evaluation. The AAUP does not recognize as valid any oral contractual agreements between faculty and the administrative officers of the University.

6. Salary Disparity And Inequity. Gallup AAUP recognizes the need to achieve salary parity with our peers in the six-state surrounding region and to remove within our ranks unjustifiable inequities in salaries.

7. Outside Employment Extra Compensation. Gallup AAUP objects to the manner in which University policies are unequally applied in reference to section B-26 of the Faculty Handbook. It is our request that the restriction to "one work day per week" needs either to be removed or enforced uniformly throughout the University.

Draft #4: Product of meeting with representatives of two-year and four-year institutions, held November 18, 1994.

Section 1. Section 21-1-26.4 NMSA 1978 (being ...) is repealed and a new Section 21-1-26.4 is enacted to read:

21-1-26.4. ARTICULATION AND TRANSFER PLAN; GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER MODULE; ACCEPTANCE OF CREDIT; ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS AND TRANSFER GUIDES.~

A. The commission shall in consultation with all public post-secondary institutions establish and maintain a comprehensive, statewide plan to encourage articulation of educational programs and facilitate transfer of students among the institutions. The commission shall adopt regulations needed to implement its plan, consistent with provisions of section 21-1-26.4 and Section 21-1-26.5. Prior to October 31, 1994, and on appropriate dates thereafter, the commission shall report to the legislative finance committee, the legislative education study committee, and the governor regarding the status of its plan and regulations.

B. Effective July 1, 1995, and continuing thereafter as part of its comprehensive statewide plan, the commission in consultation with all public post-secondary institutions shall define, publish, and maintain in current form a transfer module of lower-division general education designed to be accepted in transfer among all public post-secondary institutions and to meet lower-division general education requirements established for associate of arts, associate of science, and baccalaureate degree
programs. The transfer module shall at a minimum equal 30 semester hours of college-level work designed to provide skills in communication, mathematics, science, social and behavioral science, humanities, fine arts, or comparable areas of study of value to a well educated citizenry. To the extent feasible, the transfer module shall include multiple academic disciplines and methods for demonstrating skill within each area of study.

C. Each public post-secondary institution shall accept credit earned in the transfer module at any other public post-secondary institution as meeting lower-division graduation requirements for its degree programs and shall not increase its requirements for award of a degree as a result of this condition. This condition shall not prohibit an institution from specifying additional lower-division or upper-division general education requirements for one or more programs of study, provided that such requirements apply equally to transfer students and students originating their study at the institution.

D. The commission and public post-secondary institutions in collaboration shall establish and maintain procedures for identifying additional lower-division credit in specific disciplines of study that will be transferable among institutions and applicable to requirements for completion of baccalaureate degrees in specific programs of study.

E. Public post-secondary institutions are encouraged to establish articulation agreements with all other institutions with which they exchange a substantial number of transfer students, to publish transfer guides in formats appropriate to assist potential transfer students, and to provide advisement and related services to assist students in transfer. Transfer students should have, to the extent feasible, the same access to registration, financial aid, and other support services as students originating their study at an institution.

Section 2. Section 21-1-26.5 NMSA 1978 (being...) is repealed and a new Section 21-1-26.5 is enacted:

21-1-26.5 MONITORING AND IMPROVEMENT OF ARTICULATION AND TRANSFER: REPORTING.--

A. The commission on higher education shall establish and maintain a process of regular consultation with all public post-secondary institutions with the intent of monitoring and improving articulation of educational programs and transfer of students. Public post-secondary institutions receiving transfer students are encouraged to monitor the progress of such students and provide appropriate information to institutions sending transfer students. Sending institutions are encouraged to use this information to improve upon or confirm the success of their educational programs.

B. Prior to December 31 of each year, the commission shall report to the legislative finance committee, the legislative education study committee, and the governor regarding the status of articulation of educational programs and transfer of students. The report shall be developed in consultation with public post-
secondary institutions and may include analyses of the acceptance and denial of credits for transfer, including grounds for denials; numbers of students applying for transfer and transferring between post-secondary campuses; progress of transfer students in meeting program completion requirements; student complaints regarding articulation and transfer; and other measures needed to evaluate the status of articulation and transfer. The report may include data and other information regarding individual institutions as well as statewide summaries.

The report shall include identification of any institution electing not to apply credit earned in the lower-division general education transfer module toward graduation requirements in one or more of its programs and not demonstrating to the satisfaction of the commission that the transfer module is inappropriate to such programs. By September 30 of each year, public post-secondary institutions shall provide to the commission such information as is needed for the annual report, as defined by the commission.

Section 3. APPROPRIATION.-- Fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) is appropriated from the general fund to the commission on higher education for expenditure during the ninety-sixth fiscal year for the purpose of paying costs associated with the provisions of this act.

January 27, 1995

TO: Members of the UNM Faculty Senate
FROM: Christine O'Dowd, Office of the University Secretary
SUBJECT: February 7, 1995 Meeting

The UNM Faculty Senate will meet on Tuesday, February 7, 1995 from 3:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. in the Kiva.

The agenda will include the following items:

1. Approval of Agenda

2. Summarized Minutes for December 12, 1994

3. Comments from Senate President Bel Campbell

4. Comments from Provost Mary Sue Coleman
   a. Current Athletic Issue
   b. Legislative Update
   c. UNM 2000 Revision

5. Update on Core Competencies presented by Senator Maurice "Bud" Wildin

6. Memorial Minute for Professor Joyce Rogers presented by Professor Helen Damico

7. Curricula Committee Report -- The name change from College of Engineering to School of Engineering -- presented by Senator Ernest Dole

8. "Proposed [UNM Graduate] Bulletin Language Regarding Graduate Credit for Experiential Learning" presented by Professor Virginia Seiser