

Special General Faculty Meeting Minutes

April 29, 2020

Approved September 23, 2020

April 29, 2020

LS 265 Zoom Only

VIA ZOOM <https://nmhu.zoom.us/j/411560906>

3:00 to 4:00p.m.

1. **Call to Order.**

2. **Roll Call.**

Roll + Angela Meron (quorum achieved)

3. **Approval of Agenda.**

Unanimous approval

4. **New Business**

a. **Student Advising Handbook**

Discussion:

KJ: Degree works to degree audit copy/replace to make it consistent language.

KG: Some minor typos

BH: To what degree do our faculty actually understand the content changes. The success coach is the other question. We have had mentoring, orientation, etc.

GG: The decision was not really up to the faculty

BH: this could be for further discussion

RK: at BoR meeting and Dr. Law has indicated that retention has improved.

SCR: ask a question? Verify success coaches are for the freshmen year? Benito mentioned a plan where they extend advising and coaching through senior year.

GG: required 1st year, available all 4 years

KJ: comments from BH and SCR: as soon as a student declares they are the responsibility of the declared faculty and one of the most important sentences in the document and needs to be brought out as advisement is the role of faculty. Good with the coach being available, but they need to coordinate with the faculty advisor and the relationship needs to be fostered at the very beginning.

GG: issue here is the declaration of a major after the first year.

KJ: What about students who enter with a declared major?

MFH: they have to declare a major when they apply so its moot

JR: Advising is important and essential within the department, sees the issues with not advising on time as an issue with being advised wrong by student success coaches. Academic advising is tied to their major advisors.

GG: inviting Benito to address these concerns.

KJ: Advisement manuals over the last 24 years, every time we do advisement training this comes up and get ignored. Impacts administration in the departments, classes out of sequence, etc. will show enrollment decreasing. Also important in regards to sticking with plans of study.

SCR: define coaches and academic advisors in the early part of the document and then discuss faculty advisors. Other confusing language.

KJ: can't change working conditions in a manual and it is obscene that they will demand we make adjustment to program of study without departmental discussion or decision and that they question that we are in our offices during office hours. **Statement must be removed unless it is bargained.**

BH: discussions of students perception of who is in charge of advising and offering the best advice.

SCR: statements for natural sciences having coaches in the second years and they were not consulted and included in this.

KJ: Keep this manual as a draft and change the date on the cover page as there are a number of issues involved in this. There are issues approving it as a draft.

“this manual is in place until a new one is approved”

MR: we did this with the contingent faculty manual, so there is precedent as there are a number of problems as everyone did not have input and we cannot vote on this manual at this time.

RK: a lot of the language regarding the role of the coach and the discussion of defining advising types.

JR: Issues with the planner and not working.

A Motion to table and that the current manual stays in existence until a new one is agreed upon with changed language as discussed above and below. Seconded.

SW: a long history of student support office usurping faculty responsibilities, would like to see explicit language saying that when a student goes to that office and begins an academic conversation that the coach is required to stop the conversation and advise the student to go to the department.

KJ: additional issues with the manual aside, there are issues with an Us and Them system instead of a collaborative approach. No manual should have orders for us to do. Good with senate or subcommittees working it out.

JR: agreement with Steve by adding explicit language to make sure language is super clear that after the 1st year the student needs to be advised by the department.

SCR: there is some contention, but is this historic, as success coaches are important to students, like near-peer mentors. Will this change things in the fall if we don't approve.

It doesn't look like it will change things

SW: administration issue here as well, the individual overseeing everything needs to ensure enforced rules.

Motion Vote: unanimous approval.

Motion to invite Benito to next Senate meeting to discuss issues, seconded: 20 for, 1 against

5. Adjournment.

Motion, seconded, unanimous.