

Faculty Senate Draft Meeting Minutes
December 12, 2018
Approved January 23, 2019

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

1. Call to Order: 3:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call:

Present: Bustos, Leon (Psychology); Coggins, Kip (School of Social Work); Ensor, Kevin (Counseling & Guidance); Gardner, Sandra (Nursing); Jeffries, John (Computer Science & Math); Jenkins, Kathy (Exercise & Sports Sciences); Karaba, Robert (Education; Education Leadership); Kent, April (Library); Jennifer Lindline (Natural Resources Management); Meckes, Shirley (Education; Teacher Education); Meron, Angela (Media Arts & Technology); 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: R. Alvarez (Social & Behavioral Sciences), B. Cespedes (Natural Resources Management), C. Chen (Marketing; Business), S. Corey-Rivas (Biology), G. Gadsden (Social & Behavioral Sciences), G. Gallegos (Math & Computer Sciences), R. Gonzales (Academic Affairs), M. Langer (Media Arts), R. Moore (Social Work), D. Pan (Social & Behavioral Sciences), M. Petronis (Natural Resources Management), J. Rivas (Biology), D. Rodda (Social Work), M. Romero (Business), J. Snow (Biology)

Excused: Garcia-Nuthmann, André (Visual & Performing Arts); Yerende, Eva (Education; Curriculum & Instruction)

Absent: Moreno, Yvonne (Education; Special Education/Gifted); Ortiz, Luis (School of Business)

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

4. Approval of Minutes from November 28, 2018. MOTION MADE AND SECONDED to approve the meeting minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

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

- **Shared that she met** with Registrar this morning. Urged faculty to get grades in on time. Hiccups in paperwork can cause delays in financial aid, degree posting, and other items requiring grade submission. Especially contingent faculty.
- Shared that we may possibly need additional members for the tenure and promotion committee (SSW and SOE).
- Reminded that winter break is coming up; want to make sure that everyone is having a relaxing holiday. Know that tests and papers can be taxing for faculty and appreciate your commitment to students.

- Question from FS. *Can you please share what we have uncovered re evaluations?* KJ sent information today re challenges with evaluation system. Sent inquiry to Joe Gieri about how to stop end-around evaluation system. RG will look into problem
- Comments from FS. *Can you please address the disappearance of grades?* RG will look into system.
- at time.
- Addressed reorganization proposal. Noted that this is the first place, institution for which proposed change. Has been at very similar educational settings with different structure. Made several points:
 1. So many colleges. Why are we so spread out? I really think that part of our challenges are the administrative side. We have not worked in a structure that supports innovation. Bring in additional support. Minimize paperwork. Deans are not doing dean work; chairs doing a lot of paperwork. Not doing work re growth and innovation. Proposed reorganization provide dean with that responsibility. Funding – we only have a few sources of income (state and tuition). More and more institutions have Deans being responsible for degree completion, certificate program, and other revenue sources. Need product to “sell”, something that folks will understand. Let’s use for example “Health.” Much easier for me to sell at Clarion University a “Health” program to potential donors. Able to go to equipment specialist because of who Clarion was as a College – to get them to donate to a program or a college. The proposed construct will help Deans and other administrators promote programs. Would even help Deans to go out and get more technology in their programs (Health, Computers, other). We will be able to attract students. We will be able to generate money. “H” is part of the new branding but what does that mean to people. A restructure will help with branding and moving forward.
 2. Proposed structure is fiscally neutral. Have a new proposal (not distributed) with new reporting levels.
 3. Now is the time to move forward for sustainability and future resiliency. Dean accountability. Strategic enrollment management. Recruitment and retention. Can put programs like Forestry in place to better market and succeed.
- Took questions from Faculty Senate and guests.
 - OT. 1. Does not understand how giving deans new responsibilities requires restructuring. 2. Has not seen a spec of data to show needs for this restructure. 3. Utter lack of shared governance. I was a student at Arizona State. FS there was engaged with administration at developing process of reorganization. Engagement takes time but includes all of the stakeholders. Has not seen any effort to reach consensus.
 - KJ: 1. With a lot of research, came today with rhetorical question how many people are going to lose their jobs? Going to cut down on administrative staff. People are going to lose their jobs. Both NEA and AFT show that

reorganization is often used to cause RIF. Usually RIF is called on by claiming financial exigency or by getting rid of programs. Obviously cannot claim financial emergency (HLC), so is this a way of getting rid of programs? RG response: will not lose a single admin or single teaching job. KJ ok that's good; we'll hold you to that. 2. Research on reorganization requires involvement of all constituents. All new jobs need to be defined and provided with training. There is no mention of how this new structure would improve quality of instruction or student success. 3. ESS is the #1 major in terms of enrollment growth, considers program a science. In this new model you take away Exercise Science. If you take away a program and put it under "Health" it is hidden and setup for failure. Unclear about how, where going.

- MR: Who in the Math and Sciences is going to be doing what the Chairs typically does? Who is going to do what I usually do to keep group going (grades, schedule, etc.)? If you think Program Coordinators in there, not going to be fiscally neutral and going to be MORE expensive than stated.
- KC: remarked on something that he is sure RG has received the report from SSW about what they thought of reorganization. Vast majority not opposed to restructuring but is opposed to process. If SSW is one of largest entities on campus, makes no sense to put certain groupings together.
- GG: 3 points to make. 1. Know you are very big on data collection and bench marking. Wants to see some sort of bench marking to see how something like this made a huge difference in enrollment, graduation rates before we radically change who we are. 2. Concerned about faculty morale. Many people put a lot of time into that committee. Did not come to consensus about reorganization. Feeling incredibly disrespected and disregarded. Moving forward with discussions without the data. Feeling very disenfranchised that time and work is not taken into consideration. 3. How can we have growth opportunities for certain programs in megadepartments? CJ, Soc and Poli Sci, How is one chair going to focus on issues within megadepartments? Seems counterintuitive if you really want programs to grow. Why haven't we grown over the last few years? Scared to death to propose anything under probation and upset that putting downward trend on NMHU when it is a national trend. Don't want low morale faculty in advance of HLC visit.
- ER: We went from 3.5 to 1 faculty member in our discipline. Of course that is going to affect ability to promote program. Have faculty who have been here through multiple reorganizations and feel neutral to topic. Don't see + or - to restructuring. Questioned what is happening to all of the Chairs to individual departments. RG responded only one Chair to mega-department, but will have Assistant Deans to whom faculty can go to with issues. ER says seems like centralized utilitarian sort of government, will impact relationships with students.
- JL: I reject having this conversation as a university body without having had ever met as a CAS. Not acceptable to me.
- OT: Disconnect between admin and faculty is growing, not narrowing. Top down process is unhealthy and unproductive. Some faculty wants to write to AAUP and other external bodies. Proposal scares the heck out of people.

- KJ: Feels like cart is before the horse. There is no description of Deans and Assistant Deans of this discussion in the CBA. Should have understood all of this before entering negotiations. How can we go through negotiations without knowing what the end result of reorganization is going to be? Has never been discussed with FS if this should go into Faculty Handbook.
- JJ: What is going to happen to Chair responsibilities or summer contracts. We have had experiences with some groupings but nothing of this size in the Math-Sciences. Chair works much more in Math & Computer Science than 0.25-time (release). Would never do this proposed Mega-department Chair's job but whoever does is never going to be able to speak for all.
- MR: Who is the "we" who put this together? RG initial conversation started with Deans. HU Futures (~ 50 people) had input. MR asked, *From who?* RG Different organizational feedbacks. Out of those models that everyone looked at, what would work best for Highlands University? This is what came out of that. OT: But this is not what they proposed!
- JL: Cannot be a restructure with some winners some losers. RG I agree. Every program is vital to this institution. Looking at how we can reorg (pointing to who?) during program review. Not sure what we are going to do?
- KJ: Remains offended that used her words in report to defend an administration proposal. Glad that conversation has opened door to website and research office, things that we can tackle.
- DS: where the boxes go is less critical to the process to how we determine best placement. Adult needs, online programs are all mixed up from main campus needs. Have to consider how these 2 facets work together before moving forward.
- MR: When we had the highest faculty morale was when we had faculty council. They were the best advocates, best communicators. More layers in between destroy who we are and how we function best.
- SCR: Used to be one large department and persisted through. Have federal funding to support innovative initiatives, and having success. Know that during that time that we had a lot of to do with only one coordinator. Having to innovate with very little resources was very hard. Very concerned about having the time and space to be creative, be innovative under new structure.
- (?): On Task Force in Spring. One of the things during communication flow was that if models were not viable that no change was still an option. A lot of stuff going around on campus and not hearing that much. RG Still an option of not doing anything. Not off the table.
- MP: Speaking as FRC Chair, we have a problem. We want to generate more money. Deans maybe should go out and do something. Our Research Office is suffering. Position needs to be full time, supported 100% institutionally, not through soft money. Same with administrative assistant. Trying to champion to increase strength of that office, not decrease strength of department. Sean needs resources to improve web page. Need solution to identified problems and reorganization is not that.

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

- Visited Rio Rancho. Nice to see world through their point of view and understand need to consider their needs in light of proposed reorganization.
- Went to Georgia State along with admin team. GS high retention rate increase not due to any changes in academics, but to changes in activities. Increased revenue more than justifies some of their activities.
- Met with Governor's transition team. 3 things we all agreed upon included salary, state mandates were heavy top down, and institutions are very different. Board selection process is very upper decided. Looking at arranging a meeting to see if faculty bodies have common ground.
- Shared that the CTE currently does not have a director for Spring 2019. We do have a board that advises CTE; *how keep running?* Provost shared that time to consider could change or keep things as-is. Time for reflection. *Can there be an interim?* CTEs done differently at different institutions. If we are going to change, *what do we want that to look like?* Would like a replacement position to be posted by February 2019.
 - OT: Often when a faculty member gets release time to take something over, their program is not sufficiently compensated. RG assured that understands. Would address that. Pedagogy versus operational.
 - Training needs versus pedagogical science of teaching issues. *Should we put technology of teaching under ITS?*
 - KJ: CTE Board is a Senate Committee. Needs surveys and information so Senate can decide how to proceed.

7. Communication from Academic Affairs (E. Rodriguez).

- Spent a lot of time talking about CTE. Members asked to go back to departments and gather information.
- Moving slowly through Program Reviews. If working with your program, work together and get it in.
- Highlight of your Christmas Break – we are going to hire a webmaster in Spring 2019 as well as a consultant. Question from Senator - *what is the budget?* ER don't know, just know going to have support.
- Have had some discussion of Brightspace.
- HLC recertification forms all in. Now waiting for response and what edits or new information is needed.
- Disenrollment date has been announced – January 2nd. Communicate with your students.

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

9. Communication from the Staff Senate. None provided.

10. Old Business.

- a. AAC response to Charge: Explore coursework Master's degree.

11. New Business.

- a. Response to reorganization proposal.
 - i. Statement to Board of Regents. DS and Executive Committee will cull information from above's discussion to present to BOR at upcoming meeting (12/14/18).
- b. One-Year Biology Master's Degree proposal.

JL: Given New Mexico Highlands University's current standards requiring a thesis and/or project for a Master of Science degree (all disciplines) –

MOTION MADE AND SECONDED to charge the Academic Affairs Committee to develop a new type of Master's degree that will be an addition to and distinguish it from our current MS and MA degrees and therefore will have a different name. It will be defined as one that does not require a thesis and/or project. The motion was seconded. A lengthy discussion ensued, after which the motion passed with 8 in favor, 1 in opposition and 3 to abstain.

Discussed the need for something on the books that differentiates between different programs that we have. Current structure doesn't allow for that.

MR: Program does have a title. If you don't like the title, then you can elect not to support it. Have to look at the timing and the sequence in this. KJ: The question that is out that was raised at General Faculty meeting, *Do we need another degree option that is fair to our students? Does there need to be something instead of just MS and MA's?* Maybe there does, maybe there doesn't. But that question has to be addressed before considering your proposal. RG spoke to some of these coursework masters being called Professional Masters, not MS. Need to differentiate from other types of masters.

DS: We do know that there are other programs that are lining up behind Biology to do these types of programs. Let's be careful.

KJ: *How do we label this?* We wanted AA to look not at the content of what you proposed but the direction of where the university is going. Must have the big philosophical discussion before we can put something to approval. Do think that AA has to come up with an answer for us that do we need to have a different designation for this or are we comfortable keeping this the same.

DS: If we proposed a coursework based Masters degree in Chemistry, would not want to call it a M.S. Not the same. It is honesty. If you are a citizen coming to

university for a degree, what honesty in labeling. College degrees are the standard but how we get there are getting more and more different.

OT: On one hand, we are possibly looking at how to label programs that do not have a capstone. We already have that in the SOE. KJ Yes we do. Comprehensive exams.

JR. At Highlands we have the capacity to revise a program within our programs. Question about whether masters looks like other programs. Have had question raised repeatedly. Predates this charge by many many months. Been determined that thesis non thesis will be distinguished on transcripts.

SCR. Don't know if we are really at odds on this. There has been a re-dress in capstone, portfolio ... so the content may be the way that you would want this to go. Already recruited students who are expected to graduate in May 2019. Thought that the way things were going that this would be approved this year. DS Finds that incredibly unethical.

After lengthy discussion, MOTION MADE AND SECONDED to approve the Biology discipline's one-year coursework-based Master degree with a requirement to change the labeling on this or any similarly proposed program if the information returned from the Academic Affairs Committee supports such. Motion passed with 9 in favor, 1 in opposition, and 2 to abstain.

- c. Athletic Rosters.
- d. Auditing Policy
- e. Undergraduate Directed Study Policy
- f. Course Substitution Policy

12. Session.

13. Public Action as Necessary on Other Closed Session Discussions.

14. Adjournment at 5:15.