

General Faculty Meeting Minutes

March 23, 2022

Approved April 27, 2022

4:00-5:00 p.m.

SUB 320/321 and ZOOM: <https://nmhu.zoom.us/j/95589633634>

1. **Call to Order.** Meeting called to order. 25 members counted; made quorum (> 25% of 91 member body = quorum).
2. **Approval of Agenda.** Motion made and seconded to approve the agenda. Agenda approved by consensus.
3. **Chair's Announcements (B. Massaro).**
4. **Annual Evaluation of Administrators.**
 - DC shared that evaluations were historically administered with hard and soft copy options. What questions to ask has varied over last 3 years. Most important issue is participation. Need a higher "n" value.
 - Questions were raised about who sees evaluations. DC responded that typically send to individual and their supervisor (for example, President Minner's evaluations to go President Minner and the BOR). Question raised, *Should the public (General Faculty, Optic) see all of the Administrator Evaluations?*
 - KJ noted that the biggest turnout in recent years was during the Administration's reorganization efforts; faculty rallied around universal concern.
 - KJ shared that she did not like the evaluations tailored to individual goals. Liked uniform questions tailored to faculty interests.
 - BV asked, "At what levels are we discussing? Are Chairs still included?" DC responded yes.
 - GG shared that she, too, liked recent formats with uniform questions rather than tailored to admin goals. Shared that her unit had concerns about anonymity.
 - Voice raised that we want to affect behaviors and choices. Not out of the realm to ask what they want to achieve.

- KJ reminded that we took Chairs off last year because of change in CBA language. Chairs are no longer considered “Administration.”
- Member noted that the faculty’s vote of no confidence in Minner and the continuing enrollment decline should be rallying cries.
- DC reminded that there is still the issue of hard copy v. soft copy.
- MR brought attention to Chair Evaluation p. 3-5. Faculty Handbook. Not same as Administrator Evaluations, but it is a Faculty Senate process. Urged that we see how that fits in.
- GG agreed that we have to evaluate Chairs, but maybe not lump into Evaluation of Administrators (?).
- KJ clarified that chairs are evaluated in biannual evaluation.
- DC acknowledge lack of trust in NMHU Survey Monkey system and suggested other means outside of email to accommodate center and online faculty.
- GG shared that every option that we can possibly use should be available to this process.
- DC offered his personal Qualtrics account for use. BV appreciated that, but said that is kicking can down the road to another time when DC not available to this process.
- DS mentioned that best security is hard mail!
- BM summarized that:
 1. FS EC setup own secure sight.
 2. FS EC draft evaluations that are more uniform as in past.
 3. FS provide multiple options (digital and hard copy) to faculty.
 - WH offered that there may be new questions pertinent to the times to add to the sheet.
 - BC offered to put in comment versus recommendation (?). Don’t want to limit that.
 - DC made idea about using the process to gather Chair evaluations but splitting from when and how we send forward.
 - Motion made and seconded that FS EC draft evaluation format.

5. Other.

- GG asked about President Minner’s comments on his Vote of No Confidence. JL read minutes from FS meeting. Others added points.
- SW asked about the VNC relative to the hiring of the Human Resources Director.
- KJ shared the Administration’s 3 prong approach.

1. Bring consultants in quickly so they could execute a search for a HR Director.
 2. Do a Search.
 3. Go to the SHRM People to select a Director out of their Directory of Membership.
- Member asked Faculty Senate to explore the impact that the new AVPAA-Forestry on the organizational structure of the university.
 - Member asked about oversight with CAS Dean (curriculum, scheduling, budget). *Where does that now stand?*
 1. Reorganization has to go through FS process.
 2. Have a process for new colleges, but not new positions overseeing CAS units.
 3. Concerns about unbalanced system.
 - General issues about AVPAA-Forestry included:
 - Unclear relationship between AVPAA-Forestry and Dean CAS.
 - Unclear responsibilities of AVPAA-Forestry over other programs.
 - Unclear how position fits into overall academic structure.
 - Questions about AVPAA duties and responsibilities. *What if there is a conflict between him and the unit Chair? AVPAA's are not in the academic structure? How can we assure that he is not involved in university processes?*
 - Member said that person should not be involved in curricular development of any sort. Sets a dangerous precedent.
 - Member said discussion makes all of the sense in the world. Forestry is not going to be treated exclusively. It sets a precedent that is worrisome for all. Expressed that this role should be defined relative to Dean, Academic Affairs Office, etc. Let's take it further. Appreciated this very constructive, mature discussion.
 - Other issue raised: Faculty Handbook says that GF meets at least once a semester but is possible to meet more often. It is healthy to talk about things. Asked that FS EC revisit vote and consider meeting more often.

6. Adjournment at 5:00 p.m.