

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
February 13, 2019
Approved February 27, 2019

Lora Shields, Room 329 and via ZOOM, 3:00 to 5:00p.m.

1. Call to Order.

2. Roll Call.

Present: Chadborn, Daniel (Psychology); Coggins, Kip (School of Social Work); Ensor, Kevin (Counseling & Guidance); Garcia-Nuthmann, André (Visual & Performing Arts); Gardner, Sandra (Nursing); Houliez, C. (Business); Jeffries, John (Computer Science & Math); Jenkins, Kathy (Exercise & Sport Sciences); Karaba, Robert (Education; Education Leadership); Kent, April (Library); Jennifer Lindline (Natural Resources Management); Meron, Angela (Media Arts & Technology); Moreno, Yvonne (Education; Special Education/Gifted); Rodriquez, Elaine (History & Political Science); Romine, Maureen (Biology); Sammeth, David (Chemistry); Tamir, Orit (Sociology, Anthropology & Criminal Justice); Valenzuela, Norma (Languages and Culture); Villarreal, Ben (English & Philosophy)

Also Present: L. Allard (OIER), C. Chen (Marketing; Business), J. Flood (Nursing), E. Martinez (Strategic Enrollment Management)

Excused: Meckes, Shirley (Education; Teacher Education)

3. Approval of Agenda. MOTION MADE AND SECONDED to approve the agenda. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Approval of Minutes from January 23, 2019. MOTION MADE AND SECONDED to approve the meeting minutes. Motion passed with 1 abstention.

5. Communication from the Administration (R. Gonzales).

- Announced that she has made an offer to one of the candidates for Director of Online and Extended Learning with a deadline of Friday.
- Shared that there are many on-going Search & Screens, including Chemistry, Biology.
- Shared that NMHU has a partnership with San Juan CC in Farmington. They will be moving across the street to the Haliburton Center. This move may impact some of our academics, technologies. Will be visiting the center and talking with Buddy Rivera (Farmington Center Director). Question – *What programs and how will be affected?* RG responded don't know, that's why she is going to gather information. Question – *Are the impacts happening now?* RG responded no, the move hasn't happened yet. Question – *What programs are impacted?* We do a lot of Education, a lot of Social Work. Leaning on BR to assist with evaluating the impact.
- Brought up enrollment declines; this is a multi-area problem. Will talk about fixes for the fall.

Lee Allard; Spring enrollment is down about 9%. No smoking gun; down across the board (new, continuing, graduate, and undergraduate cohorts). Retention down a little bit. Have had a larger number of graduates which is good in some areas, bad in that now coming back. Significant enrollment drop. Don't know what's happening across the state. *Are other NM universities*

experiencing similar enrollment declines? Possible that federal government shutdown impacted students' decision to enroll (shutdown impact on finances, on financial aid). Still evaluating data.

KJ – Offered that what we need to understand from the administration is the retention piece in light of what we know about problems with the Business Office and Registrar's Office. *How many students did we lose because of disenrollment and Degree Audit errors?*

DS – Commented that can't keep patching the boat. If doing 2025 Strategic Planning, *what is our path towards understanding these enrollment declines?*

RG – Shared that we are competing with other institutions in the same boat. Challenge don't want to steal from Peter to pay Paul. Do we offer classes now that should/could be offered in the Fall? Looking particularly to summer courses that are asynchronous, the student who wants to remain employed while working on their degree.

OT – Stated that looking at the data, these are not innovative ideas.

RG – Said we need to bring in programs that are innovative and novel. The GIS program has the potential to bring in undergrads and grads. *What does the populace need? What are we going to identify as our niche?* One of our strongest programs is Social Work. If we can get the Native American track going, we will be the only ones in the country to complete a BSW in this field with this population.

ER – Offered that we have heard this multiple times that the faculty needs to create new programs. I understand that piece but now we are losing students who are dropped by the Business Office for balances or stopped by the Registrar for conflicts. That's process. *Why do we make it difficult for our students to get into our classes?*

RG – Responded that not going to get any arguments from her that we have barriers in the process. Dr. Martinez is helping to identify some of these problems and work through solutions. We have to make it easier, have to streamline things.

KC – Agreed, the process is really cumbersome. I'm looking at some of the other issues. Just today we had a meeting where the Registrar said that the university will not let someone graduate from the SSW program with 2 C's on their program. That isn't even in the catalog! Yes, they have to maintain a 3.0 but there is nothing stated about C's.

KJ – Shared that we have so many students that we don't know how to deal with them. There are programs that are doing well but don't have the resources to do what they need or maintain their programs.

DS – Asked *why hasn't anything changed?* Been hearing about these problems and possible solutions for 3 years.

RG – Replied that a lot of this is held up on your end, in your docket. We have sent people to training, got information out. The Deans were given \$10k to distribute to units to apply for innovative programs. To date, only one application from your program.

Edward Martinez – Brought up that the Matriculation Task Force met almost every week for a year and talked about ideas. Ask you to help in soliciting faculty representation on this committee. Need ideas, action. We are bringing in more students, but not at the rate that we are losing students.

Trying to tease out the data. For example, we have 107 new graduate students, but they are not all new, some are seniors who moved into the graduate program. How do we account for that? Know, too, that the freshmen retention rate is improving. We are barely maintaining with respect to the sophomore and juniors. *How can we address that?*

OT – Offered that from the faculty in the trenches, we are losing students because of mishaps. I didn't hear about anybody talk about fixing it. Heard excuses, did not hear solutions. I applaud you for purchasing names. I am going to do a GRE search next month; I hope that I don't hear from the Interim Dean CAS that we don't have an account (!). We don't have equal effort at graduate level to bring in national and international graduate students. Haven't heard anything about bringing in tenure-track, tenured faculty to help teach potential classes. College grants are not going to help address any of these things.

KJ – Asked question – *What are our short term plans for the semester?*

6. Communication from the Chair (D. Sammeth).

a. Faculty Marshals – Las Vegas & Rio Rancho.

- Need Faculty Marshals and student flag carriers named asap. *How has this been done in the past?* KJ – Dean coordinates soliciting names and students with most votes are chosen.
- *What about Faculty Marshals?* That is coordinated by the Faculty Senate. So, Senators are asked to go back to their units and bring forward names.

b. Search for Interim Director CTE

- As you know, D. Marrs resigned. The CTE Board met with the FS Executive Committee to share issues, urgency. FS EC voted to move forward with Search & Screen.
- Question came up about the \$20k that was given to the Outcome Assessment Committee. *Where is this outstanding money?* KJ and OT reminded that we voted to return the money to the departments. DS said will look into it and confirm.

7. Communication from Academic Affairs (S. Gardner).

- There was a charge to look into the Retroactive Add/Drop policy. Basically there is no policy about this. No definition has been found for a hardship, so the AAC is looking into what defines such. What constitutes a hardship for one student may not apply to another.
- There was nothing discussed about the active military.
- There was a discussion about the common course numbering. Should be a 4-digit course. *Add a zero at end of our 3-digit courses?* Need to align with other NM universities.
- The English Program proposed course revisions. There was discussion about “repeatable” courses.
- There was some discussion about the Faculty Handbook procedures; *Do Academic Affairs decisions go to the Faculty Senate or Board of Regents?* Looking to streamline the process. Seems like it will take years to get anything in place.
- Announced that catalog changes due February 28. Get in ASAP.
- There was some discussion about the Faculty Senate charge re course-based masters. *What kind of Master's degree can be taught without a thesis? Is an exam a consideration?*
- There was a discussion to change Women Studies Program name to Gender and Women Studies.

8. Communication from the Student Senate (A. Samora). None provided.

9. Communication from Staff Senate (A. Ludi).

- Shared that Staff has 9/12 positions filled.
- Shared that Staff is working on goals, including efficiency. Willing to work with FS to best make that happen.
- Shared that ITS is working to address that there are Brightspace issues that need decisions. Send emails, provide recommendations.

10. Old Business.

a. Shared governance and the organizational structure of NMHU. Response to the administration.

OT – MOTION MADE AND SECONDED in response to proposed reorganization. After careful deliberations on the pros and cons of a campus reorganization in general, and in particular, the draft proposal for Academic Affairs Organization that Provost Gonzales presented to the Faculty Senate, the recommendation by this body is to not consider nor implement a reorganization until New Mexico Highlands University develops and completes its 2025 Strategic Plan. The aforementioned strategic plan will provide NMHU with vision and direction for the next five years and beyond. Only after a strategic plan is put in place NMHU should consider changes, if necessary, that correspond with the Plan.

CH – Asked *When will the new SP be finalized?* Will be developed in the fall and implemented in the spring.

KJ – Offered let's use proper process. Let's get a SP in place so that we know what we want to be before we restructure the university.

OT – Shared that not that against a reorganization, but thinks SP needs to come first to be the driver with a roadmap and way points.

ER – Offered that this is hard b/c some people in department want to reorganize, but others do not. Feels split.

AK – Reiterated that the General Faculty resoundingly wanted a Strategic Plan in place before considering a reorganization. Wants to remind everyone that the General Faculty also want a reevaluation of the role of the College Deans.

JJ – Asked that if the proposed reorganization went forward, *would it necessitate changes in the CBA (release time for chairs, release time for program coordinators)? Is there a deadline for the reorganization?*

KP – Shared that some in SSW for, some against. Vast majority is for a process.

JL – Reiterated that large amount of faculty members speaking at the last General Faculty meeting spoke about the need for a process, for shared governance.

KJ – Noted that the proposed reorganization doesn't address the things that need to be fixed in the nuts and bolts.

DS – Shared that even though there is some fraction of faculty that like patches here and there, there aren't enough to carry the day. There is a majority that did not like the proposed reorganization as a whole.

OT – Reminded people that President Minner visited with Faculty Senate and shared models for Strategic Planning. That is shared governance, something that she has been advocating for some time.

Motion carried with 16 favored, 0 opposed, and 2 abstained.

b. Plan for development of new NMHU Strategic Plan. DS opened up conversation about a developing a plan for a Strategic Plan.

OT – Continued on her comments appreciating President Minner’s invitation for faculty shared planning. We have an opportunity to reach for regionally best programs.

DC – Asked, Being the best regional university is a good goal, *but how do we get there?*

KJ – Stated that she’s a realist; let’s start with existing Strategic Plan. (several *yeahs!*). Recommended a process that includes representation from the staff, students, community, program partners, Regents.

DS – Shared that he’s been reading a number of SP from schools throughout country. It is shocking how similar the programs are to what was prepared in the proposed structural reorganizational chart. Most of our ideas are not new. Must give some thought to online education. Good for them, but questioned that *if enrollment drops, what happens to that school and its infrastructure?* Fear if put too much leaning into online education we would be done in. Hope that there remains the place for residential and on-campus learning. We do it well and we are distinct. We do well online, too, but asks for care in balancing our instructional methods.

KJ – Offered that one of the documents that we have been talking about is that to be successful in online learning, need an identity. *What is our online identity? Is it the same as our on-ground identity?* Data shared by the OISP show that we should be increasing senior residential students (!). Not agrees with DS about need for same identity between on-line and on-ground. ESS program uses both modalities and not necessarily same cohort with same goals.

AK – Stressed importance of using existing SP but with more detail and maintenance of traditional on-ground programs and input with staff, community, students and other stakeholders.

OT – Concerned about Online Director candidates not considering the New Mexico student population and state-wide infrastructure. Not only does NMHU’s infrastructure need an uplift, but statewide infrastructure uplift needed.

AK – Asked, *Who is going to take the lead on SP? Is it the Faculty Senate?*

ER – Reiterated support of on-ground programs. Noticed that Colorado universities recruit New Mexico students with in-state tuition. *How to compete with that?* Really need a strong statement.

MR – Agreed with AK and wants to walk out of this meeting with a plan forward.

KC – Asked, *Why aren’t we using our own local talent to guide conversation (not external company like RNL)?* We do need to be innovative, need to be out there.

DS – Offered idea. “I’m not generic, why should my education be?” *What if we embraced a view where we brought vocational and academic content together?* Encouraged faculty to not download packages but rather create their own unique content.

OT – Defended a liberal arts education. Students need communication, technology, content, whole package.

DS – Summarized thoughts about Strategic Planning: ***adjust current mission; increase specificity; and develop a SP committee.***

RK – offered motion for FS EC to develop language for plan, then bring it back to the Faculty Senate for consideration. Motion passed unanimously.

c. **Resolution of conflicting language in NMHU Catalog (handout).**

KJ concerned that some non-accredited universities obtain their standing because their credits are accepted by accredited universities.

RG – Shared that the Department of Education has a list of accrediting bodies that are approved regionally and non-regionally.

KJ – Brought up need information from the administration. To make a really good decision we need to know what’s going on in the national discussion.

MOTION MADE AND SECONDED to table the issue. Motion passed unanimously.

MOTION MADE AND SECONDED TO table item 10 d and 11 a and move to 11 b. Motion passed unanimously.

d. **AAC charge: review of agreement with NNMC for course collaboration. Tabled.**

11. New Business.

a. **Charge – Instructional Technology Committee.**

b. **Charge – Nursing Program (J. Flood).**

Shared that historically, nursing students come from a variety of Associate’s degree backgrounds (ASN, AS, AA, AAS). What was happening in the Registrar’s Office was that all were treated similarly and the general education core was waived if student had an Associate’s Degree. Things are being looked at more strictly; students are being asked to take additional credits to meet NMHU’s General Education Core requirements. Asking FS to look at and determine what appropriate acceptance pathway. Currently, going to Registrar’s Office every other week and requesting a waiver.

KJ MOTION MADE to look at Associate’s degrees that we do accept and see if they cover the core. *When did that changed?* Troubling to me. Ask Nursing to look at various Nursing Associates degrees and see if their curricula cover the core.

First part of motion to RG; second part to Faculty Senate to consider then spend to Academic Affairs. RG asks that the motion have a broad stroke to cover all incoming associates degrees to consider.

- c. Respond to enrollment drop (handout).**
 - d. Auditing Policy.**
 - e. Athletic Travel Rosters; charge to Faculty Affairs for where to post travel rosters.**
- 3. Executive Session.**
 - 4. Public Action as Necessary on Other Closed Session Discussions.**
 - 5. Adjournment at 5:03.**