



General Faculty Meeting Minutes

April 23, 2025

Location: SUB 321 or Zoom

4:00 to 5:00 p.m.

Approved October 8, 2025

1. Call to Order.

No quorum was reached; therefore this meeting is informational only.

2. Approval of Agenda.

No vote taken due to lack of quorum.

3. Approval of Minutes of February 26, 2025.

No vote taken due to lack of quorum.

4. Communication from the Faculty Senate Chair

Chair reported the following:

- Research Day was a success. Chair thanked Drs. Valenzuela and Avery for coordinating.

Question from a faculty member about whether there was any followup concerning the Zoom bomb incident. Chair state that is has not even been brought up in any meetings.

Comment from a faculty member that ITS sent out an email about phishing. Chair confirmed that did but stated that they did not include information about the Zoom bomb.

Comment from a faculty member that another faculty member received an odd response to an IRB in Russian.

Dr. Valenzuela reported that ITS didn't say anything about what they're doing and that organizers were asked not to share the link.

- Chair reported that all faculty have been getting emails about helping to prepare cover sheets about outcomes; if you are part of the process please assist with closing the loop
- Chair reported that the Faculty Senate passed a syllabi statement about ICE which is available online.
- Chair reported that the Faculty Senate passed a statement on collegiality that will be posted to the website.
- Chair discussed the survey for strategic planning. A global went out in mid-March but faculty can aske the Chair for a copy if they need it. The survey is open for one more week.
- Chair stated that since the last General Faculty meeting, she sent out an email in response to Faculty Affairs. A proposal was submitted to the Faculty

Senate Executive Committee in January 2024, and they did not deem the proposal admissible as it was outside the jurisdiction of the Faculty Senate. The issue is now closed.

- Chair stated that the question of what nepotism is recently came up; it's defined in the NM state code, and HU is a state institution. It is defined as any kind of action that supports or promotes a relation.

5. Evaluation of Administration

Chair provided an overview of the evaluation and thanked Dr. Chadborn for assisting with the process. Highlights included:

- 38-40 responses.
- Repeated comments about not knowing what people do.
- Continued angst about discipline specific administration and hiring outside the CBA.
- Issues with the golf course.
- Angst about hiding of HLC findings and vote of no confidence and lack of trust

Faculty member thanked the Chair for her efforts and Dr. Gerardo Moreira for the visuals. Faculty member stated that they would like to add zero to the range, because they didn't want to leave 1s for some people.

Comment from a faculty member that it was a great summary and that they are happy with the survey return. Faculty member would like to see a change in the scale.

Chair stated that she met with President Woolf for their monthly meeting and told him the evaluations would be coming. Dr. Woolf suggested that some things may be informed by rumor, and Chair replied that this comes from the faculty's lived experience.

Question from a faculty member about why Joe Dominguez not on the survey as Associate Vice President of Student Affairs. Faculty member stated that they don't know what Mr. Domiguez's role is. Chair stated that when L. Fath was Chair, there was a sentiment from President that he would evaluate the proliferation of positions and that she doesn't think he has done it, but she will bring it up.

Comment from Dr. Chadborn that he has been delving into this data for 6-7 years and that having a zero would help; a 3-4 is usually seen as positive appraisals. Dr. Chadborn stated that he tried to look in the past and had a hard time trying to extrapolate why there is a huge range of numbers. Dr. Chadborn noted that communication is a big aspect. Dr. Chadborn stated that we don't have the time to evaluate every administrator and that maybe listing the people under them would be helpful. Dr. Chadborn also noted that the AccessU workshop was

insightful but that he and Dr. Lindline were the only faculty who could make it at such short notice.

Comment from a faculty member that the President said the workshop was for undergraduates, but the meeting was dominated by Deans promoting professional programs.

Dr. Chadborn noted that someone in the workshop referred to Psychology as a professional program.

Comment from a faculty member that Political Science professors consider rumors as valid data points, as it is a way that culture fills a void in data.

Comment from a faculty member that they like the idea of listing the people under them.

Comment from a faculty member that the survey can't evaluate everyone, but faculty never know who works for everyone.

Comment from a faculty member that there is a need for a formal, publicly available organizational chart. Faculty member asked how do we create accountability and can it be put in writing.

Chair noted that K. Blea was instructed to come to meetings, but she hasn't been doing so.

Chair noted that in the past, the evaluation results go to the individual with the supervisor Cced; VPs go to the President, Deans to Provost, Chairs just go to Chairs since they are not administrative.

Comment from a faculty member that the organizational chart is available in Paycom.

Comment from a faculty member that they are curious why so many VPs report to the President. Faculty member also noted that the Senate has to be careful about accountability because they are not their supervisors.

Dr. Chadborn stated that he was very careful about putting together the overview and did not include the ns to the Deans; this left it ambiguous for small departments.

Chair provided an over of the evaluation of the Deans.

Comment from a faculty member that whenever there is a huge split, that's an issue.

Question from a faculty member about whether these evaluations will be sent forward. Chair stated that without a quorum, she will use historical precedence to send these forward.

6. FY26 Operating Budget

Chair stated that the budget was difficult to read and noted that osteopathic medicine is still listed.

Comment from a faculty member that they also had a problem reading it and that they are concerned about administrators pushing programs on faculty to make money.

Comment from a faculty member that maybe it's not written easy to read on purpose and that it doesn't feel like HU is going to get many of these.

Question from a faculty member about if there is a way the faculty can have the Senate ask this and find out why they are not reporting what HU is getting.

Question from a faculty member about whether this is a House bill. Comment from a faculty member that it is House Bill 2.

Comment from a faculty member that at least faculty could compare what D. Lepre has to say with what the bill says.

Chair asked that faculty talk to their colleagues about attending meetings and remind them that it can be counted toward tenure.

Request from a faculty member to please pay attention to date grades are due.

7. Questions and Comments from Faculty.

8. Adjournment.

Adjourned. 4:56