1. Roll Call

Present: Rebecca Alvarez (Sociology, Anthropology, & Criminal Justice), Peter Buchanan (English), Blanca Cespedes (Natural Resources Management), Gil Gallegos (Computer & Mathematical Sciences), Sandra Gardner (Nursing), Katie Gray (Library), 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), Jim Peters (Business Administration), Rod Rock (Educational Leadership), Elaine Rodriguez (History & Political Science), Tatiana Timofeeva (Chemistry), Ann Wolf (Curriculum & Instruction); Vacant positions: Languages & Culture, Education – Special Education

Absent: Sarah Corey-Rivas (Biology), Sarah Santillanes (Teacher Education),

Also in Attendance: Inca Crespin (Registrar), Gloria Gadsden (Sociology, Anthropology, & Criminal Justice), Brandon Kempner (Interim Dean, CAS), Benito Pacheco (Director, Academic Support),

2. Approval of the Agenda

AAC Chair noted a change to item 5. Sub-item “o” will be program review for Curriculum and Instruction.

MOTION to accept agenda as amended. Seconded. Unanimous vote. Motion passes.

3. Approval of Minutes – January 15, 2019

MOTION to accept agenda. 12 ayes. 1 abstention. Motion passes.

4. Subcommittee Reports

a. Undergraduate appeals (Heflin)

Subcommittee has had 3 appeals, 2 of which have been decided. Final votes should be in on 3rd appeal by tomorrow [2/6/2020].
b. Graduate appeals (Jenkins)

   No appeals/

c. Ballen (Heflin)

   The subcommittee will release a CFP for Fall 2020 scholars.

5. Program Review Schedule and Procedures

   a. Health/HPS (Buchanan)

      Nothing to report.

   b. University Studies (Wolf)

      Nothing to report.

   c. Southwest Studies (Gallegos)

      Nothing to report.

   d. Computer Science (Heflin)

      Subcommittee Chair will be meeting with the Department Chair before the
      next AAC meeting.

   e. Forestry -review after accreditation (Buchanan)

      Department chair has indicated that they must complete one final
      component before submitting the review.

   f. Native American Hispano Cultural Studies (Jenkins)

      Emails from the Subcommittee Chair have not been returned. AAC Chair
      has reached out and received a response from the Department Chair. The
      department will hopefully submit documentation by Friday 2/7/2020.

   g. General Engineering AA (Jenkins)

      The Subcommittee Chair reported that the program would prefer not to do a
      review at this time. The program only has 1-2 students at any given time.
      They are currently working with Administration to determine how they want
      to proceed. This is currently an Associate’s program. It is a small cohort,
and generally students are taken out of the Engineering track on transferred to Computer Science. The department does not want to eliminate the Associate’s degree, but would prefer to keep the program in limbo while details are worked out with Administration. G. Gallegos stated that there is no budget for this program; it is a line item under the Computer Science budget. There is no way to support the infrastructure for lab equipment, and physical space is utilized by other programs.

MOTION to allow the General Engineering program to defer its program review. Seconded.

The following discussion ensued:

- Comment from a committee member that the product of the program review does end up with the VPAA, so maybe this a good opportunity to show Administration all the specific problems. It could force the issue to a resolution. Additionally, programs can get in trouble for going semester to semester without an evaluation.
- Comment from a committee member that part of the review is where the program is going, but part of it is also assessing where it’s been. Maybe the program could have one that’s shorter and more open that could lead to a discussion. Some sort of document could be useful.
- Dr. Gallegos agreed that those are good ideas. The department does not have a lot of data on the program. In the last 3 years, there’s been perhaps 3 students per semester, and they end up transferring. Dr. Gallegos is the only faculty member that can teach courses in Engineering, and all his time is dedicated to Computer Science. There has been no support from Administration.

Previous MOTION withdrawn by committee member.

- Comment from a committee member that the downside of not doing a review is that there is no way for the department to supply feedback.
- Comment from a committee member that Dr. Gallegos is currently overwhelmed with responsibilities. What would be the upside of turning in a review? That it forces the issue with Administration.
- Comment from the committee that not completing the review may give Administration the excuse to not act. Perhaps we can delay the review instead.
- Comment from the committee that there has been a problem at NMHU of eliminating STEM programs.
- Comment from the committee that this program has had problematic review and self-studies for 20 years. They have never had the resources they need, and that will probably not change. Instead of the standard
structure for review, maybe we could do a spot analysis of pros, cons, strengths, weakness, etc.

- Question from the committee. Where does the Dean stand on this issue? B. Kempner replied that there is currently no faculty and no budget. It is not viable to advertise for students and not be able to offer the program to them. We need to force a decision. It’s not tenable for our students. Having something written makes it more likely a decision will be made.
- Comment from the committee agreeing that we should have a position that lays out what needs to be done if we want to keep the Associate’s in Engineering. Here’s what we should be supporting or prioritizing.
- Comment from the committee that the #1 checked degree for incoming students is Engineering, and they get changed into other departments. It’s a great recruiting tool.
- Dr. Gallegos stated that before the Associate’s degree, there was an engineering articulation program. Courses were offered within CAS. They wanted an Associate’s degree because of funding. The university had to show we were graduating students to get funding, but the program has never seen any funding. The articulation agreement was criticized because they had no way of measuring success. We’re at a point where the university has to decide. We don’t want to bring in students in a dishonest manner.

2020 Spring Program Reviews

h. Early Childhood Multicultural Ed BA, CAEP Accredited, Minor

i. Elementary Education BA/CAEP Accredited, Minor, AA/CAEP Accredited

j. General Science for Secondary Teachers BA, Minor

k. Counseling and Guidance MA, Certificates

l. Math/Computer Science for Secondary School Teachers BA, Minor

m. Special Education BA, CAEP Accredited, Minor, Certificate, MA

n. Educational Leadership/ Bilingual Education/ TESOL/ Reading Education/ Advance Program/Secondary Education Certificates

o. Curriculum and Instruction

Comment from the committee that Counseling is currently writing their accreditation. Shouldn’t we hold off on the review until it is complete? AAC Chair agreed.
Please let AAC Chair know if you want to volunteer to serve on or be Chair of a subcommittee.

6. School of Education - Alternative Licensure Program revisions EDUC 5500 – Seminar/Internship and EDUC 5430 – Effective Teaching II (Wolf) -vote item

A. Wolf stated that Lexi Miles has been asked to become Director of Field Experience for the Alternative Licensure program. The Dean has asked Dr. Wolf to direct the Program on Alternative Licensure, with a contract until the end of May.

Dr. Wolf ceded control of the meeting to the Secretary.

Dr. Wolf reviewed the proposed changes. The department would like to eliminate the prerequisite for EDUC 5430. The department would like to renumber EDUC 5500 courses so that they’re consecutive. This will allow Alternative Licensure students to register for seminar 1 and 2 in the same semester and not have to wait.

Comment from a committee member that they are glad to hear faculty is in charge of the program. Programs are supposed to be under departments. Who voted for this change? They are uncomfortable with the program not being under a department. There’s not necessarily any continuity. Dr. Wolf stated that she has just started and has encountered some major issues. Alternative Licensure is now considered a program under C&I. Dr. Wolf stated that they are doing a search for a new literacy person and some projects will finish this summer, which will free up time. Dr. Wolf hopes to continue as the graduate coordinator for the program in the fall.

Question from a committee member that they thought this program was under the School of Education. Dr. Wolf clarified that it is, but it didn’t previously fall under a department.

Question from the committee. How many faculty members are associated with this program? Dr. Wolf stated there are 2 full-time, tenured faculty members and 4 contingent per course. And a total of 20 students currently.

MOTION to accept revisions to EDUC 5500. Seconded. 12 ayes, 2 abstentions. Motion passes.

MOTION to accept revisions to EDUC 5430. Seconded. 13 ayes. Motion passes.

Secretary ceded control back to Dr. Wolf.
7. Department of Biology – Biol 4910 – Senior Project and Biol 5940 – Field Zoology; the comparison from old to new program is posted in Sharepoint (Rivas) – vote item

Comment from the committee that this is a very interesting proposal in light of what will be discussed later [item 8].

Question from the committee. Was there a discussion concerning lowering the necessary number of elective credits to compensate? Dr. Kempner stated that most students will not be taking more credits because they have numerous 2, 3, and 4 credit electives to choose from.

Question from the committee. When a program has this many credits it doesn’t require a minor, correct? Dr. Kempner affirmed.

Further questions from committee members concerning credit requirements for Biology students.

MOTION made to table item until Biology faculty are available to answer questions. Seconded. 12 ayes, 1 nay, 2 abstentions. Motion passes.

8. New Discussion - The potential wisdom of decreasing the number of upper-division credit hours required for undergraduates to complete their bachelor’s degrees. With the common course numbering changes having changed several 300- or 400-level courses to 200-level courses, I anticipate that undergrads will begin having an increasingly hard time meeting the 45-credit upper division requirement. (Heflin, Chair of Undergraduate Appeals Committee)

L. Heflin outlined the issue as stated above.

Dr. Kempner stated that he has discussed this issue with I. Williamson. Academic Affairs is in favor of a reduction. This is particularly difficult for transfer students. If we go there, we would need to draw a harder line in the petition process. And then only in extreme cases.

Comment from a committee member that their department is unanimously against this. The upper-division requirement has already been decreased recently. One of the side effects of articulation is dumbing down the 4-year colleges to the community college level. We shouldn’t make policy to fix a legislative SNAFU. It makes more sense to make a case that your upper division courses shouldn’t be articulated, as Dr. Williamson has said departments could do. If we get rid of depth of knowledge, we’re becoming more like a community college. The mission of NMHU is a 4-year institution, and we need to protect these distinctions.
G. Gadsden stated that we did start this process 2 years ago. We have one of the highest requirements of our comparable schools. Most require 42, many require 39.

Comment from a committee member that some programs are affected by the process more than others. Students in Education won’t have a problem. For some Liberal Arts programs, it can become an issue where students can complete a major and minor and not hit their mark.

Comment from a committee member that it is healthy for faculty to have these discussions. It’s important to recognize this is a slippery slope. Is it a good thing to let credits go out of the programs?

Comment from a committee member that we do have a number of transfer students that come in and have to take lower level courses, because we require the most proficiency in the core of any comprehensive.

Question from the committee. What is the process to explore this further?

The AAC Chair suggested that committee members go back to their departments and discuss this issue. The AAC will have a deeper discussion at the next meeting.

Dr. Heflin offered just a couple more things to consider. Some students describe difficulty registering for upper levels because they lack prerequisites. That’s not usually a barrier. A number of students try to graduate who are asking waivers for upper divisions but are barely meeting the residency requirements. We need to maintain the rigors of a 4-year university.

Comment from a committee member that they support going back to departments for discussion. They further hope that this is not pushed through quickly. We need a fruitful discussion. We might need to set up a subcommittee and will probably have to write a report. This will take some time.

I. Crespin stated that course substitutions are also something that needs to be examined. A lot of times there is a lower division for upper division substitution. The number of residency petitions we get is also high.

Comment from a committee member that the Student Affairs Committee was looking at requiring 15 credits in the semester that you graduate. Most universities in the state frame their final course requirement as 12 out of 18 of their last credits at the institution.

Comment from a committee member stating that the Business Department has already done this analysis. Not one of their concentrations will enable a student to
graduate if they take all their courses. If we can finesse this by doing something to get out from under these 200 level courses that would optimal.

Dr. Kempner stated that if you move back to 300-level you would not transfer statewide. There are multiple ways to solve this problem. Maybe we need to offer more courses at 300 level without prerequisites. Some could be asynchronous online, some during summer. We could offer more options to our students.

Observation from a committee member that that is communicating what we already do.

Comment from a committee member that they would resist students taking upper division courses just for the sake of taking them.

AAC Chair again asked all members to go back and talk about this at your next department meeting and bring results back to the next AAC meeting.

9. Communication from the Chair (Wolf)

Nothing further to report.

10. Communication from the Registrar (Crespin)

   I. Crespin reported as a follow-up from the last meeting, student Change of Grade forms are now in online docs. There is a work order in place to change the student Change of Grade workflow.

   Information was sent to IT about the courses where grades didn’t go through.

   There is a report on repeatable courses.

   Comment from the committee thanking Ms. Crespin for looking into the grade issue.

   Question from Dr. Kempner concerning due date for Fall schedules. Secretary noted that per the Dr. Gonzales’ statement at the previous AAC meeting, it is due February 25.

11. Communication from the Faculty Senate (Gardner)

   Nothing to report.

12. Communication from the Graduate Council (Buchanan)

   Committee has not met since last AAC meeting.
13. Communication from the Administration (Gonzales)

Dr. Kempner reported on behalf of R. Gonzales and I. Williamson. Leon Bustos has reconstituted the Learning Commons committee to include I. Crespin, B. Pacheco, K. Rose, D. Evans, and B. Villarreal. Mr. Bustos’ contract has been extended to June.

The Board of Regents met on Friday [1/31/2020]. The Contingent Faculty Handbook, Graduate Handbook, and Nursing degrees were all passed. There was a long conversation pertaining to Wiley. The issue needs to go to Faculty Senate for vetting.

Comment from a member of the committee reminding Dr. Kempner that Dr. Gonzales was going to investigate the MFA fee mentioned at the previous AAC meeting.

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

15. Next meeting

February 19, 2020, Lora Shields Room 329

16. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

Draft submitted by K. Gray, 17 February 2020