

1. Roll Call

Present: Rebecca Alvarez (Sociology, Anthropology, & Criminal Justice), Peter Buchanan (English), Blanca Cespedes (Natural Resources Management), Sarah Corey-Rivas (Biology), Gil Gallegos (Computer & Mathematical Sciences), Sandra Gardner (Nursing), Katie Gray (Library), Maria Haase (Teacher Education), Edward Harrington (Visual & Performing Arts), Lara Heflin (Psychology), Kathy Jenkins (Exercise & Sport Sciences), Anna Koch (Counseling & Guidance), Beth Massaro (School of Social Work), Angela Meron (Media Arts & Technology), Rod Rock (Educational Leadership), Ann Wolf (Curriculum & Instruction); **Vacant positions:** Languages & Culture, Education – Special Education

Absent: Jim Peters (Business Administration), Elaine Rodriguez (History & Political Science), Tatiana Timofeeva (Chemistry)

Also in Attendance: Helene Boudreau (Recruiter, Nursing), Leon Bustos (Interim Director, Highlands Undergraduate Enrichment), Cristina Durán (Dean, Social Work), Jeanie Flood (Director, Nursing), Gloria Gadsden (Sociology, Anthropology, & Criminal Justice), Sheree Jederberg (Interim Dean, Education), Brandon Kempner (Interim Dean, CAS), Benito Pacheco (Director, Academic Support), Sarah Santillanes (Education), Ian Williamson (AVPAA)

2. Approval of the Agenda

Request from the committee to add an executive session to the end of the meeting. Also noted that item 6 should be a vote item, instead of a discussion.

MOTION made to accept agenda as revised. Seconded. Unanimous vote. Motion passes.

3. Approval of Minutes – November 20, 2019

MOTION made to accept minutes. Seconded. Unanimous vote. Motion passes.

4. Subcommittee Reports

a. Undergraduate appeals

No new appeals received since last meeting.

b. Graduate appeals

Still on the same two appeals. Thanks to everyone for responding so quickly this time around.

This issue will be discussed further in Executive Session.

c. Ballen

Thanks to the committee, who voted to invite the candidate from the Forestry department, James Long. Dr. Long is a scholar with expertise in fire management. There are a number of activities planned to incorporate students, faculty, and staff, including a discussion of a documentary film and a couple of lectures for the Las Vegas community. More information to come.

The committee received three great proposals, and the decision was a difficult one.

5. Program Review Schedule and Procedures

a. Health/HPS (Buchanan)

The Department is currently working on the review.

b. University Studies (Wolf)

Nothing to report.

c. Southwest Studies (Gallegos)

Received the information will be working with the committee. Currently looking to see if there was a past review.

d. Computer Science (Heflin)

Department head will send revisions to subcommittee chair, sometime over the break or early next semester.

e. First Year Experience (Harrington)

Subcommittee chair has received the review and met with the Dean. Interim Director of Highlands Undergraduate Enrichment (HUE), Leon Bustos, spent many hours preparing the review.

Overview:

- Staffing for the program consists of the HUE director, no secretarial staff, 10-12 First Year Experience (FYE) instructors, and many peer mentors. The Leadership structure recently changed and placed the program under the College of Arts and Sciences. The FYE course is taught with 2 other co-requisites that should be core, but are currently not. These are regular courses taught by faculty. This component is academic and represents 2/3 of the program. The remaining 1/3 is voluntary.
- There is some ambiguity in the vision statement of the program. There has been a discussion about revisiting the vision and mission. The current organization began approximately 5 years ago. The program's values are strongly aligned with those of the university. We hope that the program is contributing to greater retention and that we will have more data in the future to prove that. The subcommittee would like to see a more consistent method of self-assessment other than the student survey. Mr. Bustos is committed to developing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the program. The subcommittee recommends that Mr. Bustos complete the co-curricular assessment currently in place and work with Dr. Lee Allard to develop a method of assessing academic success.
- This is the only program NMHU has for new Freshmen that promotes student success. The subcommittee believes the program is successful in this aspect but needs more data. There is a possibility for 24-26 faculty to participate. The program could help attract new Freshmen. The subcommittee hopes that the program will get steady leadership and a permanent home.
- The subcommittee supports HUE's work. We recommend another program review soon (within a year or so) to see that they get the necessary systems in place for self-assessment.

Comment from a committee member that it is not clear how the peer mentors for this program are selected. Please be more specific in report. Also, please be more specific defining how Learning Communities (LCs) work. All interested parties need to have pertinent information if they are working together with HUE. This work shows a lot of positive aspects. We should promote it more.

Leon Bustos, Interim Director of HUE, stated that it has been a challenge to complete the review. The program has had several directors over the last few years, so there is a lack of data. He has had to use data that has been

passed down. There are issues with structure. They are not really measuring pass/fail data. He is refining assessments and making sure they measure what they should. Currently looking for other methods that measure what we need more. The model that being used isn't designed for retention. It's designed for student success. We provide collaborative opportunities and the FYE course. That is what we've designed for now, but there are flaws.

Question from the committee: there are other models that measure factors other than retention? Mr. Bustos stated that most models nationally don't focus on retention, but rather on success. Retention is part of that, but it's not so much about whether they come back, but do they succeed in their first year. We need to look at economic factors, issues with the Las Vegas community, etc. We need to make sure that students feel comfortable on and off campus.

Question from the committee concerning logistics. The current model was bundling 2-3 classes. Is that the model Mr. Bustos wants to continue with? If so, the AAC would need to vote to continue it. Mr. Bustos stated that these models come and go. One update is the metamajor, in which students take classes together as a cohort. Students still get the tolls for first year skills, but it is less burdensome on faculty. This is something worth exploring. It opens up opportunities to faculty in different domains.

Comment from the committee that the AAC would need a proposal from Mr. Bustos for what he would like to see implemented. There is an advisory committee for HUE, so it is the purview of that committee to bounce these ideas around. That should be re-instituted. Mr. Bustos stated that he did meet with the advisory committee in the spring. They discussed the standardization of the HUE curriculum. He has reached out the members, but needs to educate himself on the process.

Question from the committee: is the motion to continue the program "as is" and then change it later? The chair of the review subcommittee stated that that is not up for vote on the floor. This is just a discussion. Subcommittee wasn't aware that the program is "on the chopping block." Comment from the committee that the AAC has to vote on whether the program should continue as is, and that we need to be shown that it's doing what it's supposed to be doing.

Comment from the committee that the question right now is whether to approve the program review. We would want Mr. Bustos to come back to the AAC early in the spring semester after having reconstituted and met with the advisory board. This gives the AAC committee members the chance to go back to their departments.

Dr. Kempner asked how we can get the maximum amount of support from faculty.

Comment from the committee that we need to close the loop.

Motion made to accept the program review. Seconded.

Question from the committee about prior motions in play. Comment from a committee member that the original motion only gave short term approval to the program to see if it would work. Dr. Williamson stated that the program has already evolved. The peer component is new. The LCs work better at liberal arts institutions, while the metamajor works better at comprehensives.

Comment from the review subcommittee chair that this is the third program review he's completed, and no other reviews required a vote from the AAC. AAC chair responded that, in which case, the subcommittee should just submit the report and it will be entered into the minutes.

Previous MOTION revoked.

Chair of review subcommittee asked for clarification on bringing this program up as an AAC item. Should it be an agenda item? Committee member suggested submitting a proposal for change in the program. Mr. Bustos stated that he wants to continue developing LCs based on the current plan. This can be a discussion for next year. The program needs to be working with faculty and AAC. Committee member stated that the university needs to get the permanent director in this position immediately. We can't know next steps until we know who will lead.

MOTION to make the following recommendation:

The Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) recommends that a new director of Highlands Undergraduate Experience (HUE) be hired immediately.

Seconded. Unanimous vote. Motion passes.

- f. Forestry -review after accreditation (Buchanan)

Review is almost complete.

- g. Native American Hispano Cultural Studies (Jenkins)

No communication from department yet.

h. General Engineering AA (Jenkins)

Department is working on review.

6. Department of Special Education – 2) Change is program- Delete a course, 3) Delete Option 1 in MA – (Rock and Phillips) – vote item

Dr. Rod Rock stated that a question arose at the previous AAC meeting concerning the option elimination. He reached out the Psychology Department, and the Department Head offered their support for the change.

Comment from the committee that the discipline vote on the form is only checked. Please provide a faculty vote tally. Dr. Rock stated that the faculty vote was 2-0.

Request from the committee for an overview of each proposed change.

Dr. Rock stated that the course revision proposal will remove the thesis option so that students do only the comprehensive exam.

Question from the committee: Would this impact people going on to get a PhD? Is it not important? Dr. Rock stated that, in speaking with other programs, it is not something that PhD programs are looking for.

Committee member expressed concern about eliminating the thesis option. Dr. Rock stated that having them take the thesis doesn't allow them to meet PED (Public Education Department) requirements. Committee member stated that the 6 credits could just be added. Dr. Williamson expressed concern that students were not being given choices.

Dr. Rock stated that PED requires students to have these courses. Dr. Williamson asked if students could take courses and do a thesis. Dr. Rock stated that would be redundant.

Comment from the committee that if the competencies change, the department could add extra credits. Dr. Rock stated that wouldn't be in alignment with other programs.

Question from the committee: does this cause other students to take more unnecessary classes? How many students have done the thesis in recent years? Dr. Rock stated that none have.

Comment from the committee that maintaining the thesis option wouldn't increase the overall credit requirement, it would just give students the opportunity to do research if they want to.

Dr. Williamson stated that there are programs that don't have a terminal project and that it is becoming common in practice fields not to have terminal thesis requirement. It's not a question of requirement, but options. No one takes it, so why offer it? But should you offer it in case someone DOES want it?

Comment from the committee that education PhD programs don't expect students to have a thesis, but rather practical experience.

Question from the committee: do other universities have thesis option? Dr. Rock stated that he doesn't know. The change is just for this one program.

Comment from a committee member that they defer to the department's judgment.

Comment from the committee that comprehensive institutes should have a capstone experience for every program.

Comment from the committee noting that UNM doesn't have a thesis. And that the NMSU scholarly route requires no thesis.

Dr. Williamson noted that this is a statewide and nationwide trend.

Dr. Jederberg noted that this recommendation comes from a faculty member (since retired) whose expertise is gifted/talented. Many students wanted to move forward and couldn't. This comes from years of examining the issue. This only applies to the gifted/talented program.

Question from the committee: if you remove the option, wouldn't you also have to have a proposal to add the other classes to the curriculum? Dr. Rock stated they were already accepted in 2013. Many things in Special Ed are outdated. The paperwork and advising is arduous.

Question from the committee: if the thesis option were maintained, are advisors will to take on these students? Dr. Rock stated that the department is in the process of adding Special Ed faculty, but they are short right now. Comment from the committee that the thesis option is a huge expenditure of faculty time, with substitutions and audits.

MOTION made to approve course revision. Seconded. 13 ayes, 2 abstentions. Motion passes.

Dr. Rock stated that the second change is a major source of contention. No students in years have taken the courses in question. This change is supported by the Registrar, because they are aware of the number of course substitutions the department goes through. To remove the confusion for students and advisors, the department is recommending eliminating the non-licensure option.

Question from the committee: does this mean you are no longer accepting students who are not licensed? Dr. Rock stated that there is another option for licensure that has been put on hold. C&I is offering a different route to the Masters and licensure. This is just for students who are Masters-degree only.

MOTION to approve deletion of non-licensure option. Seconded. 12 ayes, 1 nay, 1 abstention. Motion passes.

7. Department of Curriculum and Instruction – Addition of new area of concentration – Alternative Licensure Program (Wolf) – vote item

Chair ceded control of meeting to Secretary. Floor opened for questions and discussion.

MOTION to approve. Seconded. Unanimous vote. Motion passes.

Secretary ceded control of meeting back to Chair.

8. Department of Nursing – RN-BSN Nursing Program (Gardner) – discussion item

Dr. Sandra Gardner stated that New Mexico has developed their own consortium for nursing education, NMNEC. This has been around since 2009, but NMHU has been slow to join. Students have a choice about where to go within NM. 12 schools in NM already have this agreement. Monies collected from state government are used for this program. NMHU is forging affiliations with Luna and Santa Fe. This would help bring students with Associates' degrees into the BSN program.

Dr. Jeanie Flood stated that community colleges are partnering with universities. The pool of AS to BSN students available to transfer into NMHU is shrinking. The nursing program wants to accept 3 specific NMNEC courses to transfer into NMHU nursing core. This will allow students from NMNEC schools (Luna, SFCC...) to seamlessly transfer into NMHU instead of (UNM, NMSU...). They are working on an articulation agreement with Luna and Santa Fe. They are only asking these three courses for NMNEC students.

Question from the committee. UNM is already involved. Do they have a residency requirement? Dr. Flood stated that they have a different requirement. NMNEC believes waiving residency is more equitable for minorities, etc.

Comment from the committee that this is a great idea. NMHU will lose out on recruiting if we don't move forward with this. Is there any other instance in which we accept 1000 level course as a 3000 course? Dr. Flood stated that the entire curriculum is the same and have common course numbering. Question from the committee that the students would meet the requirement. Dr. Flood stated that they are automatically getting credit in recognition of license.

Dr. Kempner stated that NMHU has already lost out on recruitment due to our lack of NMNEC alignment. We require the students to work in local hospitals, which is in the spirit of the residency requirement.

Question from the committee concerning residency. Residency means that you took classes at NMHU. Do we think someone who only takes 23 credits from Highlands has residency?

Dr. Williamson stated that the state is forcing our hands in a number of ways. If we're being asked to articulate 100 levels with 300 levels. Community colleges have been poaching students due to the forced articulation. Upper division courses will become more problematic.

Comment from the committee that we currently have articulation agreements that allow 200 level to count as 300 level. Upper division requirement is often waived anyway.

Comment from the committee that on the future agenda, perhaps with need to discuss the upper level requirement.

Comment from a committee member that they have had students graduate who go into the program in Santa Fe or UNM and knows that we have lost these students.

Request from the committee that the forms be updated to reflect actual faculty vote tally.

Dr. Gardner stated that this is the first of many changes for the nursing program. A lot of NM students want to stay here. They are working toward a nurse practitioner program.

9. School of Education – Initial Licensure Program Revision (Santillanes & Park) – discussion item

Dr. Sarah Santillanes stated this is a request for revision for undergraduate program. The department received a memorandum from the state that we no longer need a test or GPA as limiting factor. Students currently cannot progress, because they have not passed this test. The state no longer requires it. We do have a large number of students wanting to enter in the spring, so we would like to have a vote today.

Dr. Jederberg stated that this memorandum came in May making it optional. Many institutions are no longer requiring the test. Some of the other Deans are also going to drop the requirement. Students are still required to get the license, but not the degree in Teacher Education. They go through the coursework and take a test

to get their license. There are 30-40 students a year who do not pass the test and must transfer to University Studies. The department will continue to provide Praxis support and diagnostics.

Comment from a committee member that they support this change, but are concerned. NMHU is targeted each year that the teacher education programs aren't successful, which is tied to the number of students who don't pass the exams. Passing the tests at the gateways ensures that the pass rate is 100%. What will we do if there are reports that our students are failing? We start farther behind anyway because we have open enrollment. We have to have a game plan for how to address this. Dr. Jederberg stated that this discussion has come up. All the institutions are taking away the gateway. We have to ensure we give the students the support they need. Those students that don't pass will get the support they need on the diagnostic. The department is going to build in support mechanisms.

The AAC Chair stated that this issue is time-sensitive, so the department is requesting a vote on this item immediately.

Comment from a committee member that this is listed as a discussion item. We need to make sure the agenda reflects that, since they take action items to their department for discussion.

Chair stated that this is contrary to policy, so they are asking for a one-time exemption.

Question from the committee: is this a state test? Dr. Santillanes stated that it is.

Question from the committee: do the students have to re-take the test at some point? Dr. Santillanes stated that they have to take the test until they pass it. They must wait at least a month before taking it again. And the tests are expensive, so some students have to wait until they get the funds.

Question from the committee: Are there efforts being made to help these students pass? Dr. Jederberg stated that faculty provide assistance.

Question from the committee: this memorandum is from May. How many universities have adopted this recommendation? Dr. Jederberg stated that UNM, Northern, Eastern, and State are moving that way.

Comment from a committee member that since this has been a discussion across the state, they are comfortable voting today. NMHU is open enrollment, and we might be missing out on underrepresented students.

Dr. Rock stated that he appreciates the way Dr. Jederberg facilitated the committee discussion. There were some divergent viewpoints and it was something that needed to be talked through.

Dr. Santillanes stated that we are a Hispanic-serving institution, and those are the ones who fail the most.

MOTION to change to discussion item to action item. Seconded. Unanimous vote. Motion passes.

Question from the committee: if you've been talking about this item since May, could you have gotten it to the AAC sooner? Dr. Jederberg stated that the faculty meeting in August was partially dedicated to this issue. The committee met three times and came back to the faculty.

Question from the committee: the proposal states "Teacher Education." Is this being asked for all departments? Are you getting rid of the gateway for Special Ed? Dr. Jederberg stated this includes all programs.

Comment from the committee that the programs are listed by major, so this should be listed correctly. Dr. Wolf stated that the Registrar is not involved with the gateway. Committee member stated that this info has to go into the catalog, so it must be clear to the Registrar.

MOTION to approve course revision. Seconded. Unanimous vote. Motion passes.

10. Communication from the Chair (Wolf)

Meeting time elapsed. No discussion.

11. Communication from the Registrar (Crespin)

Meeting time elapsed. No discussion.

12. Communication from the Faculty Senate (Gardner)

Meeting time elapsed. No discussion.

13. Communication from the Graduate Council (Buchanan)

Meeting time elapsed. No discussion.

14. Communication from the Administration (Gonzales)

Meeting time elapsed. No discussion.

15. Late Additions to the Agenda (minor items only)

Executive Session added.

Meeting time elapsed. No discussion.

16. Next meeting – January 15, 2020

January 15, 2020, Lora Shields 329

17. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Draft submitted by K. Gray, 13 January 2020.