

Academic Affairs Committee Minutes

Location: Zoom only

Date: September 16, 2020

Approved October 7, 2020

1. Roll Call

Peter Buchanan (English), Blanca Céspedes (Forestry), Kevin Ensor (Counseling & Guidance), Gloria Gadsden (Sociology, Anthropology, & Criminal Justice), Gil Gallegos (Computer & Mathematical Sciences), Sandra Gardner (Nursing), Katie Gray (Library), Edward Harrington (Visual & Performing Arts), Sheree Jederberg (Educational Leadership), Kathy Jenkins (Exercise & Sport Sciences), Arcadius Krivoshein (Chemistry), Beth Massaro (School of Social Work), Shirley Meckes (Teacher Education), Angela Meron (Media Arts & Technology), Daniel Olufemi (Curriculum & Instruction), David Pan (Psychology), Jim Peters (Business Administration), Michael Petronis (Natural Resources Management), Luke Ritter (History & Political Science), Eric Romero (Languages & Culture), Maureen Romine (Biology)

Vacant positions: Education – Special Education

Ex Officio Members: Roxanne Gonzales (VPAA), Henrietta Romero (Registrar)

Also Present: Heath Anderson (School of Business), Christina Durán (Dean, Social Work), Mary Earick (Dean, Business & Media Arts), Shipra Gupta (Chemistry), Brandon Kempner (Dean, CAS), Veena Parboteeah (Dean, Business & Media Arts), Jan Shepherd (Chemistry), Josh Sloan (Chair, Forestry), Patrick Wilson (Director, Online & Extended Learning)

2. Approval of the Agenda

Chair made an addition to the agenda. New item 6 will be a discussion of the charge from Faculty Senate to review the academic calendar.

MOTION to approve agenda as amended. Seconded. Motion approved by consensus.

3. Approval of Minutes – September 2, 2020

MOTION to approve minutes. Seconded. Motion approved by consensus.

4. Subcommittee Reports (see attached subcommittee list)

a. Undergraduate Appeals (Meron)

Nothing to report.

b. Graduate Appeals (Jenkins)

Nothing to report.

c. Ballen (Buchanan)

Scholars visits for Forestry and Media Arts were planned for this semester. Forestry plans to defer to spring. Media Arts will do a split schedule; virtual one week this semester, in person one week in the spring. The Foundation office indicates that they can be flexible. The subcommittee Chair asked Media Arts to submit a proposal for the revised schedule. The Chair will ask both departments for a contingency plan if the plans for spring don't work. The subcommittee does have enough money for another visit, but the subcommittee feels that would be a bad idea.

Question from a committee member. There was another proposal on the table from Geology. What about that? The subcommittee Chair stated that these are the proposals that were accepted from last year.

d. Ad Hoc: C19 Policy Review

No meeting yet. Provost Gonzales stated that Alicia did send out an invitation for a meeting.

5. Program Review Subcommittee Reports (see attached subcommittee list)

Chair stated that there are departments that have faculty out permanently throughout the semester, so there may be some program reviews that are postponed.

a. Health (Buchanan)

Nothing to report.

K. Jenkins stated that one of their department leaders will not be back this semester and there are a couple of others who are ill. We are formally requesting an extension until the spring

MOTION to postpone Health and HPS program reviews until spring 2021.
Seconded. Motion approved by consensus.

b. HPS Undergraduate (Gadsden)

Nothing to report. See motion above.

c. HPS Graduate (Gadsden)

Nothing to report. See motion above.

d. University Studies (Wolf)

Chair stated that she will follow up with Ann Wolf. E. Romero stated that according to the department's records the revisions to that report were completed in April 2019. They thought it was with the Provost. Provost Gonzales stated the Dr. Wolf will be out for the remainder of the semester.

MOTION to postpone this program review. Seconded.

Question from a committee member. If Dr. Romero has their report and it's finished, could it go to a new committee? Chair stated that there should be a chain of reports, and she would rather wait.

Statement from a committee member that we should honor the job that Dr. Wolf has been doing.

Question from a committee member. Will this impact HLC? Chair stated that she thinks we will have wiggle room. Provost Gonzales agreed that there will be wiggle room. It's out of the faculty's control. B. Kempner said that even if we postpone, we are still following our established policy for program reviews.

Motion approved by consensus.

e. Southwest Studies (Gallegos)

Subcommittee Chair will be contacting the department next week. It looks to be almost done.

f. Forestry (Buchanan)

Subcommittee Chair emailed the complete report to the committee. There are a few small edits requested by subcommittee members that he will send to the department.

g. Native American Hispano Cultural Studies (Jenkins)

Nothing to report. Dr. Romero stated that the report just needs a little editing.

h. General Engineering (Jenkins)

Subcommittee Chair reported that the department Chair is still working on it.

Dean M. Earick stated that the School of Education has a faculty member out and would like to postpone the reviews for Math/Computer Science for Secondary

School Teachers (item 5.m) and General Science for Secondary Teachers (item 5.k) to spring 2021.

MOTION to postpone these two program reviews to spring 2021. Seconded.
Motion approved by consensus.

i. Education - Early Childhood Multicultural Ed (Jenkins)

Nothing to report. The department has asked that it be postponed, because they have a new chair last semester.

j. Education - Elementary Education (Peters)

Nothing to report.

k. Education - General Science for Secondary Teachers (Céspedes)

Nothing to report. See motion above.

l. Education - Counseling and Guidance (Gadsden)

Nothing to report.

m. Education - Math/Computer Science for Secondary School Teachers (Gray)

Nothing to report. See motion above.

n. Education - Special Education (Harrington)

Subcommittee Chair contacted Dr. Wolf to see who is in charge of the program and PJ Sedillo, but hasn't heard back. Chair sent it on to Dean.

o. Educational Leadership (Gardner)

Subcommittee Chair reported that she looked for the last review in Sharepoint. R. Karaba is starting the process.

p. Curriculum & Instruction - Bilingual Education/TESOL/ Reading Education/Advance Program/Secondary Education (Buchanan)

Nothing to report.

Provost Gonzales stated that the next Board meeting is going to be on the 9th. The Board wants to know about program reviews and what we do with them. She stated that she will send the slides for the presentation to this group for review.

6. Faculty Senate Charge: Review Academic Calendar

Chair asked the Registrar if the calendar has been vetted by Financial Aid and the Business office. Registrar stated it had.

Dr. Jenkins stated that this is a CBA issue. In her role as President, she has received a number of complaints about spring semester. 8-week courses only get 6 out of 8 sessions because of the MLK, Jr. holiday. There are a variety of ways that the schedule can be adjusted. So, there are issues.

MOTION to create an ad hoc subcommittee to quickly review the calendar and bring their findings to the AAC.

Provost Gonzales stated it must also align with payroll schedule.

Question from a committee member. A lot of universities have short-term courses. Is there a way that they have a template from another university to consult?

Provost Gonzales stated that the Registrar met with the Deans. We need a lot of parts of term all the way through the semester. Registrar stated that they've been thinking about this. We schedule courses the way you [faculty] want them. For spring 21 we created a parts of term calendar. We looked at historical submission for short-term and identified all the parts of term for spring in advance.

Comment from a committee member that this sounds like a block plan, which they have at Colorado college. It works but I don't know if it will work here. You take one class in 3 weeks. It's a really big discussion. How do you smash everything into 3 weeks? Chair stated that we're just talking about flexibility, not forcing faculty to squash their course into 3 weeks. Registrar stated that they created the parts of term based on what had been submitted the last 2 years.

Comment from a committee member that they appreciate what their colleague said. They think departments get to decide how they offer classes. We're still looking at the semester as a whole. Control has to be given to the programs. Also, we're going to have to make academic policy concerning mid-term grades. Provost Gonzales stated that academic policies related to going online and condensed courses should be considered. We're not changing the semesters, it's how we fit courses into it. It's providing flexibility. We should have parameters already set. When a student finishes in the first half of the semester, their degree should end then and not at the end of the full semester. We have to think about the students. Chair agreed that students would like to graduate sooner.

Question from a committee member. Why do we put first and second 8-week on the calendar? Do we have to? The Registrar stated it's how you identify it in the system. So that the students know which block they'll be taking. It helps financial aid in particular. It's more a tracking issue.

Question from a committee member. How do we prevent overloading students? You should only take 1 3-week course? How will that be factored in?

Motion seconded. Motion approved by consensus.

Volunteers for Ad Hoc committee to review the academic calendar: H. Romero, G. Gadsden (Subcommittee Chair), B. Céspedes, S. Jederberg, K. Gray

7. School of Business – Certificate in Emerging Business Markets Entrepreneurship – discussion/action item (Peters, Anderson, Tucker)

Chair opened the floor for discussion or questions.

Comment from a committee member that their concerns were not addressed. What is the market value? Current programs are not getting \$15k support, so why is this one getting support? How is it justified? The committee member supports the greenhouse renovation; it's been 16 years. Question from committee member for the Forestry Department. How does this fit into the wildlife fire program? Does SAF support the new courses being proposed?

Provost Gonzales stated that what they're planning to do is hopefully present the new Masters programs tomorrow [9/17/2020]. It is a marketing blast for these new programs. The market for the hemp piece is taking off nationally. There are entire degree programs, and there is a void here in NM. We're starting out with a certificate, because it's easier.

Chair stated that Administration is not necessarily pledging \$15k to this one program. It is for marketing on a larger scale. Provost Gonzales confirmed this and stated that we'll be showing the state that we're moving forward.

J. Sloan answered the committee member's questions concerning the Forestry Department. The proposed courses would fit into the broader forestry curriculum. The department would submit them to SAF as curriculum revision as restricted electives. With regard to accreditation, they would be neutral. SAF would be happy to see us add restricted electives. The courses would help address reforestation issues in the Southwest.

Question from a committee member about marketing. They have 3 new certificate courses in Pro-tools. What marketing has been put forward for new courses? Could we get some kind of report about what programs are being marketed across the university? Is it possible to get an idea what marketing is going on and how it's being distributed across existing programs? Chair stated the committee could ask Sean Weaver to come to the committee and discuss the marketing plan. Several committee members agreed this would be a good idea.

Question from a committee member. Do we have any programs in mainstream production? This might draw more students and would avoid the moral ambiguity associated with cannabis. Chair stated that the program before us is hemp production and this wording was intentional.

H. Anderson stated that it's more than hemp production. It's also entrepreneurship. Concerning the equitability of marketing budget, the School of Business built an oil and gas program a few years ago, and it did not attract students because it had no marketing. They created the entrepreneurship program, but no one knows about it. This time the School insisted on including the marketing budget, because it must be there to succeed. It's a great precedent to set for future programs.

Statement from a committee member that we cannot penalize this proposal because of a failure to include marketing in other proposals.

Chair stated that asking why we earmark marketing money for this program and not others is a legitimate question.

Statement from a committee member that they were part of the oil and gas proposal. It was never put together the proper way and did not do enough on the science side. Committee member also asked why this particular program gets funding when others don't. Why isn't there equity? Who is making that decision and where is that decision occurring?

Statement from a committee member that they support this program, but these comments are appropriate for this discussion. From program reviews, we see that many programs need a little help. This sort of thing creates favoritism and allows some programs to succeed and others not. We just approved two new programs that are going through the final approval, and we don't see the same thing in those proposals. So, should this be in every program proposal going forward? We should standardize it. There are a lot of programs that could use some help.

Provost Gonzales stated that as we put these new programs forward, there should be a pro forma with budget for course development, faculty, and it needs to have what kind of marketing money you will put toward it. At some institutions, when a program brings in revenue, it gets a piece of that revenue back.

Chair stated that she agrees with what's being said but is leery of money going back to programs that generate money. We need to look at the merits of the program.

Comment from a committee member that they support the entrepreneur side of the proposal and stated that other committee member has a point about whether this is a flash in the pan. Is this a product that's achievable by some other method?

MOTION to approve the proposal. Seconded.

Comment from a committee member that they don't think hemp production should be on site of NMHU.

Comment from a committee member that the courses are plant production, but these are about the techniques and plant productivity. Other products can be developed. It's not exclusive to hemp.

12 ayes, 1 nay, 5 abstentions. Motion passes.

8. Chemistry Department – New course, Survey of Organic Chemistry and Laboratory; New course, 1-term General Chemistry Survey – discussion item (Krivoshein, Sammeth)

A. Krivoshein provided an overview of the course proposals.

- First is a Survey of General Chemistry. Almost every Chemistry Department offers a 2-semester sequence of Chemistry 1 & 2, but we do realize that some programs don't have space for 2 semesters of General Chemistry. Forestry, Geology, and Wildlife Biology would benefit from 1-semester Survey of General Chemistry.
- Second is a Survey of Organic Chemistry. This is extremely common in many courses across the country. It was developed in response to feedback from Biology faculty. It is possible it will be used in other programs. Some programs require just 1 semester of Organic Chemistry, and it is not a good idea because it is not a self-contained course. It makes more sense to require one semester of an abbreviated Organic Chemistry course. No additional resources will be needed for these courses.

Question from a committee member. Did you work with the Biology Department on this? Do Biology faculty members support this change? Member stated they are hesitant to approve a change in one program that would be forced on another program.

Dr. Krivoshein stated that the students are not required to take these courses. This is not for students going into med school. He stated he understands this started in collaboration with the Biology Department. There has recently been a lot of confrontation, but he is not in a good position to answer the first question.

M. Romine stated that the Biology Department saw the details recently. There has been no interaction or collaboration with Biology faculty. The majority of students would be Biology majors. The Biology Department does not currently support this as part of the Bio curriculum (departmental stance). The department has not had interactions on these specific courses with the Chemistry Department.

Chair recommended that the Chemistry Department go back and talk to the departments that will be impacted.

Dr. Krivoshein stated that Forestry and Geology were consulted. He asked if Biology has specific objections. Chair stated that this is not the venue for that discussion.

Comment from a committee member that they are not saying they don't support the proposal. But the justification says this is good for biology students, but Biology says that's not so. It feels like a knee jerk reaction to what happened in the previous semester. The committee member stated they don't support any program telling another program what it should have in a major. The department is in charge of their program, even if they use courses from another department. They recommend Chemistry redo the justification. Member also stated that the committee usually sees a letter of support from other departments, and they would like to see cooperation.

M. Petronis stated that Environmental Geology discussed the Survey of Chemistry class and thought it was a good idea. He doesn't want it to replace Chemistry 1 & 2 if students want to take that. Geology has Chemistry classes and needs them, but he doesn't like the idea that we're watering stuff down. Who's going to take it and why? Geologists don't use Organic Chemistry at the undergraduate level, so the department is not part of that discussion. He doesn't know how this will benefit majors.

Chair reiterated that she thinks it would be good idea for Chemistry to check in with the other departments.

J. Shepherd stated that Biology and Chemistry had a discussion about these courses in April. He thinks the Dean brokered this agreement. The department spent the summer developing these courses.

Dr. Romine stated that these two courses were not part of the wildlife program. The department just found out about it a couple of weeks ago.

Dr. Shepherd stated they are listed in the Biology proposal.

Dr. Romine stated that the department has not discussed these specific courses.

S. Gupta stated that these two courses are not part of the program yet, but they were part of the proposal that was submitted. Dr. Kempner brokered this and was present.

Dr. Kempner stated that a lot of discussion has happened since that original discussion. Faculty Senate is sending the Biology proposal back to the AAC. There needs to be a whole other discussion.

Comment from a committee member that these courses are not part of the program, because they are new. So, there hasn't been a discussion. But they are

putting these forward as an alternative. We need to think about the number of credits.

Comment from a committee member that they have a right to create the courses. This hasn't been incorporated into the degree program. The proposals got kicked back. It's up to the department if they want to incorporate them into the program.

Comment from a committee member that they would like to see if this is going to be folded into the Biology proposal, which would be fine. The departments can present it as a united front, but they can also present it individually. If Chemistry wants to create these new courses, what is their use? Right now, the committee member doesn't see a use unless those other programs say they will incorporate them. At this point, it's about the justification. There are needs across the university for innovative courses like this. Where is it being integrated? We shouldn't see standalone courses that aren't implemented.

MOTION that the department includes a discussion about where these courses fit into the overall curriculum. Seconded.

Comment from a committee member that Chemistry should also show support from those other programs.

Comment from a committee member that the expectation is that you have a letter of support from the departments.

Moving member amended MOTION to include letters of support from the impacted departments. Seconding member agreed to amended motion.

Dr. Krivoshein stated that these are service courses. He was told Forestry and Geology were consulted.

Dr. Kempner stated that these courses are part of the approved state-wide core.

Comment from a committee member that they are curious if the courses can be used as part of combined science program.

Motion approved by consensus.

9. Communication from the Chair

Chair stated she will type up her comments and supply them to the committee. [The following was submitted by the Chair via email.]

- Please remind your department members to use the most updated forms when submitting materials to the AAC. These forms are posted on the Faculty Senate page under "AAC Documents."

- I have submitted all names to ITS to update SharePoint.
 - o Please check your access to SharePoint ASAP.
 - o Katie will not be attaching documents to the next email reminder unless we find a number of members still cannot access SharePoint.

- Biology Program Revision
 - o Katie and I plan to send these materials to everyone, via email today or tomorrow (although we are now waiting for the minutes from the Senate's meeting last week).
 - o ***Please take the time to review the materials carefully before the next meeting.***
 - o Biology and Chemistry will be invited to attend our next meeting.

10. Communication from the Registrar

The Registrar provided an unofficial enrollment report. There was a 4.2% drop overall: 2780 students compared to 2902 last year.

An unofficial report from L. Allard states that Fall-to-Fall retention of first-year freshmen is 63.6%, which is the highest in at least 10 years. Retention of Transfer students with an Associate's degree is 58.3%.

Early registration will begin 11/16/2020.

Call for intersession courses will go out next week.

[Chair's microphone cut out, so control was ceded to Secretary for remainder of meeting.]

11. Communication from the Faculty Senate

No representative assigned by Faculty Senate yet.

12. Communication from the Graduate Council

Nothing to report. There will be a meeting on Friday [9/18/2020].

13. Communication from the Administration

Provost Gonzales reported she will be meeting with O. Tamir tomorrow [9/17/2020] to put issues forward. Provost would like to address Provost's List vs. Deans' List.

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

Question from a committee member. The stats for enrollment reported, is that year by year? Or over a period of time? Provost Gonzales stated that we calculate it from a specific point from last year.

Secretary stated that the Faculty Senate decided at their previous meeting to send the proposals from the Biology Department back to the AAC for reconsideration. This item will be on the next meeting's agenda.

Comment from a committee member that the AAC should request the Faculty Senate minutes. The reason they have a liaison is to discuss these things. We need to know why they were sending it back.

Comment from a committee member that the Senate issue had to do with the number of abstentions on the vote.

15. Next meeting – October 7, 2020

Zoom only, <https://nmhu.zoom.us/j/5054543209>

16. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned.