

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
October 23, 2019
Approved November 14, 2019

Sininger Hall 100 and via ZOOM, 3:00 to 5:00p.m.

- 1. Call to Order.**
- 2. Roll Call.**

Present: Chadborn, Daniel (Psychology); Gardner, Sandra (Nursing); Garcia-Nuthmann, Andre (Visual & Performing Arts); Fox-Hausman, Mariah (Media Arts & Technology); Valenzuela, Norma (Languages and Culture); Arshad, Al (Business Administration); Lindline, Jennifer (Natural Resources Management); Jeffries, John (Computer & Mathematical Sciences); Hayward, William (Exercise & Sports Science); Karaba, Robert (Education; Education Leadership); Kent, April (Library); Meckes, Shirley (Education; Teacher Education); Romine, Maureen (Biology); Tamir, Orit (Sociology, Anthropology & Criminal Justice); Williams, Steven (History & Political Science); Villarreal, Ben (English & Philosophy); Ulibarri, Chris (Student Senate Representative); Park, Seonsook (proxy) (Curriculum and Instruction); Gonzales, Roxanne (Provost, Ex-Officio Member)

Also Present: Nariman Arfai (Psychology); Ann Wolf (Nursing); Inca Crespin (Interim Registrar); Donna Miles (Education); Gloria Gadsden (Anthropology, Sociology, and Criminal Justice).

Excused: Coggins, Kip (School of Social Work); Ensor, Kevin (Counseling & Guidance)

Absent: Minner, Sam (President, Ex-Officio Member)

- 3. Approval of Agenda.**

Motion, Approved, unanimous

- 4. Approval of Minutes from 10/16/2019.**

Fix typos and corrections regarding misspelled names. Added member marked absent as here

Moved, Seconded, 1 abstention.

- 5. Communication from the President (S. Minner)**

Was stuck in meetings in SF. Asked Orit to share information

Looking for RISP faculty input, will be scheduling EC meeting to work on input. Up to now there is no input and they want to include faculty

He and other university college presidents will seek 5% full funding compensation increase to salary

Rogers building renovation is no longer on schedule due to cyberattack. They were working on electronics in building, set us back due to that.

Asked to set up time for discussion for governor's free tuition proposal to get faculty voice.

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

BOR has been moved, action items approval of MA in Cultural Resource Management, information piece on summer programs list. Work with Dr. Fath to propose or work on new programs.

Search on Education and Business Deans is moving forward to assemble committees after a call for faculty

Transfer credits for nursing and a supplemental piece of accomplishments across the university and submitting a list of programs looking for approval, being worked on, or being prepped.

Thanks for patience and volunteering with issues regarding the attack.

7. Communication from the Chair (Tamir).

Thanking ITS and noting the incredible work they have done to get campus back up and running.

After last general faculty meeting, faculty voted unanimously to send reply to letter for reorg. Faculty asked EC to come up with a letter to submit it. Gist: NMHU still do not support 2 college plan. Faculty is not opposed to idea of reorg, there is a need to put future changes in line with strategic plan as a high concern with HLC and shared governance. After many meeting main importance is recruitment and quality programs,

proposals did not address these. Not taking those committees into account violates spirit of shared governance. The strain will outweigh the benefits.

8. Communication from Academic Affairs (A. Wolf).

3 different program changes in special ed, continued discussion.

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

No updates/communication

10. Communication from the Student Senate (C. Ulibarri).

Thanks ITS, getting info about bookstore, still in committee.

11. Old Business

a. Course Evaluation or Students Feedback

i. Ad Hoc Committee Formation populated by Faculty Senate and Faculty Association members.

Since both are needed, we will need both to represent, FA will use the EC as their representatives. Volunteers? Who should be use? Jennifer, Ben, Daniel, possibly looking for 1 more. We need to resolve these issues the subcommittee will report to the EC.

b. Amnesty policy as defined in the NMHU Undergraduate Catalog (Dr. Gonzales)

Presented by Ian Williamson: we believe it came about under previous presidents. Students on probation can wipe previous grade. A student came with bad grades but didn't make probation. They didn't, but question came up as to why anyone can. Cant find where a single semester can be wiped, retake course replace grades which is normal. Should we do away or modify.

MR: we have checked other places and set a standard. Someone who had issues after X years could come back.

IW: they can retroactively withdraw or drop

AK: looked at other insitutions that did similar things.

IW: they pass and see their way through.

Policy wipes all courses taken, regardless.

IW: only is written as if they go on probation.

Deincentivised coming back to Highlands and thus was written as is.

BH: to understand, we need not always emulate other institutions, our demographics might need those opportunities.

The issue is equity for someone not on probation in this situation.

The policy reads probation, poor grades, OR dismissal, it sounds like they can be allowed.

With some foreign transcripts will show a reset, but we have it. There is a discrepancy with what Dr. Gonzales had and the actual catalog. The language needs to be resolved.

The EC will look at the conflict in language and decide to send to AAC or we decide which language to use. We don't know where RG's language came from working with T. So Charged

c. **Possibility of moving to adapt the HLC, policy allowing up to 12 graduate credits to be applied to the undergraduate degree while also counting towards the graduate degree (Dr. Gonzales)**

Ian Williamson: HLC allows for up to 12 credits for grad to count for grad. You can double dip. For accelerated or advanced students, we can set the standard and let them start taking classes sooner. Currently they have to take them separately in the catalog. Students advance quicker when ready, save money, and allows for better recruit. Consider a change to the catalog.

DC: department would set the standard.

Catalog is restrictive grad and under it is not allowed. If we make it allowable, departments would make the call to what and if they would allow.

OT: another way to accelerate UG to G programs and retain and increase enrollment is to do a 3+2 Students with a specific GPA can apply to grad program and start taking credits. Would allow alternative double dipping.

IW: this is already permitted, this would allow students to move faster if they are deemed by a program as grad ready.

JL: preliminarily does not like the policy as to take a chunk of UG and apply to G.

IW: it is different in that you take more advanced courses.

JL: depth of understanding or engagement of individual student. Subtract from one to move to another area

IW: could enroll at 500 level and count for 5 and 4. Hey would have the higher expectations.

JL: could be an exodus and lose experience to students.

There are additional concerns and counters, seems a need to tailor to department. They would still have to apply to grad school.

AA submit a proposal to senate EC to send as proposal or send to another committee.

d. 3rd Party Vendors (Dr. Gonzales)

Patrick Wilson to address: brief presentation. Non traditional population is a large part of the post secondary market, just by age. 40% 25 or older. Other attributes, being married, etc. number increases as high as 70% of market.

These differences also appear in priorities of post-traditional students. 70% coming back to get a job or move ahead in job, very job oriented. 25% good education and understand world (national, but not NM specific, not regionally specific).

Why a 3rd party vendor is needed? Marketing and reach students quickly and effectively. 4 year institutions do a number of digital focuses within a day of reaching out. Most post-traditional students make the decision quickly, they consider 2-3 institutions and getting in touch with them rapidly makes a difference in enrollments.

Gaps or areas of improvement: we are mostly after marketing and lead generation and rapid response to potential inquiries. Focusing on marketing and branding as online and accessible/flexible options.

Concerns and Questions:

OT: this body was not engaged last year in developing the RFP but involved to give feedback, this is not part of shared governance. The vendors will not allow Highlands to post recordings of presentations to see, so a lack of transparency. Marketing is lacking in general not just online. Creating a marketing office serving all programs, not only online, adults, etc so they can all grow. Why market for one group, but market all better as this is a consistent concern.

These are 3rd party bodies that do online and the faculty association was also never engaged and they were not engaged as this influences working conditions. The path of marketing assets will serve everyone.

PW: agrees. Chicken or egg, as far as our budget and resources to allocate a fraction of this in marketing, the OPM allows us to leverage the startup investment to share revenue with a vendor down the road.

OT: problem is we were not involved in development; they want to bring new programs to essentially create another college in cyberspace outside of all the others. Lack of transparency is glaring.

PW: much of that predates him. Concerns with adult student radius, hope is that as we build brand and reputation we will expand and lift center presence in SF and ABQ.

OT: needs assessment study with NM population not just national numbers. What do we need, do we even need it. Underrepresented populations? Not just adults? Also issues with delivery even if our marketing is on point. The 3rd party doesn't share needs of NM and students here.

PW: still have accreditation issue to deal with. Vendors has worked with in the past, they can only suggest things in academics in programs and faculty as HLC keeps them at arm's length to offer a buffer and protection of our curriculum. This is a route, if not what other ways can we do it.

Max: we cannot wait as other institutions are getting more aggressive. Data suggests if we don't expand into these markets are likely to result in tough decisions. Same discussions with Rio Rancho center propositions. Need either options or better options or move with this.

OT: process is important and shared governance is key. Bringing in shared governance as an aspect of accepting position. It won't work unless we have it. Reopen RFPs and bringing in faculty to create it instead of bringing the RFP and then being asked to deal with it.

WH: we can talk about shared governance later, but we have other issues with registration, blocks are up, dropped, etc. many other issues cutting our registration with the students coming in having issues where they are being road blocked. Students who actually want to attend are not getting the support. They are being pushed back and made to feel that it's a tough task, regardless of reaching out we have these issues.

IW: we don't have the staffing we need to support students in getting them in the door that these companies provide.

DC: more students doesn't solve the issues Bill brings up.

OT: there isn't clear understanding and transparency about what these vendors will be doing registrars job? just recruitment? Course development? We don't know. Association also needs to be involved. Information was not presented to most of the faculty. If we need support, we need to apply to appropriate process and open discussions.

SG: taught at a school that had one and it was a bandaid, a director of marketing, advertising, recruitment. 80k on a salary rather than 2 mil on vendor. All departments were asking for money for marketing and recruitment. Using that requested money to find someone to handle these issues.

PW: difference between marketing VP and marketing spend. We can hire someone but still don't have the issues with marketing spin.

BK: this money is only taken if they double enrollment

OT: national data is generic, they need to show specific needs regionally

PW: right now we are in the proposal stage, we are not discussing contract, that is when they provide marketing and regional information. Right now we are just looking to have broader discussion.

OT: originally proposed by Provost, the RFPs are already there and companies being interviews, do you want Senate to approve without original approval. What does AA want to do?

PW: If they see potential promise in this, the insistence of shared governance, its not until the contracting process that we would have a where the specifics are played out. This is where involvement of faculty is really there to turn direction of where we go forward. The online firms, there are only 4 that are real big players.

BH: marketing is important, but if first step is negative on how they enter, the student in specific are given a view of Highlands and we don't have the staffing once they get here and a bad first impression when they show up, the money for marketing could be used to boost registrars and admissions offices.

JG: infrastructure review and our ability to take in, they would look at offering feedback on those processes. Those would be suggestions and feedback.

JL: We contracted a few years ago, we contracted, a lot of the results were stuff that came out of AAC, Senate, etc, there are people who already know these issues.

IW: this is not analysis, but support for this. There is a difference than just feedback, there is a support system to helping this. It is a service.

OT: question: what do you want from us, we weren't engaged at the beginning, what do you want from us now? Never made clear what AA wants from this body.

MR: we don't understand as we did not see what these people do, we were not invited to presentations.

Max: What do we do now? How do we need to solve this? Think about it.

MR: how can I have input on what I know nothing about?

OT: it needs to be posted and AA needs to report what we need to do?

MF: do we have any focus group data on student feedback on how anything has worked. (OT: no, presentations were limited) comments about registrations (OT: AM has data from students last year we don't have data beyond)

12. New Business

a. Changes to the graduate catalog (discussion).

Grad catalog, changes were passed last semester and we were about to vote on handbook. We have to address the catalog first and then go back to handbook.

AW: just saw document. If you look in Ed, Curriculum is its own thing, given charge to work on it.

Tabling.

RK: were departments have given feedback on accurate information?

AW: Grad counsel has looked at it, it has not been brought to AAC.

This is not the handbook, a different dc, was dealt with in AAC, may want to check if it was sent to departments for approval.

BK: we can do it, take changes to department.

OT: take changes to the departments and each departments will provide the feedback and offer changes. This is why we need to bring changes. 2 weeks to take back and review. **Send email out.**

Catalog will have to be changed and updated before we can look at the handbook, which has been reviewed as the catalog controls the handbook.

b. Changes to Contingent Faculty Handbook

Finally received from chair with tracking. Was sent out for review. This has been in process for some time, we need to approve sooner rather than later for HLC. Review the document, share with colleagues for feedback. We can't change anything until the Faculty Handbook is in line.

13. Executive Session.

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

15. Adjournment.

Motion, Seconded, Unanimous.