

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), Angela Meron (Media Arts & Technology), Daniel Olufemi (Curriculum & Instruction), David Pan (Psychology), Jim Peters (Business Administration), Luke Ritter (History & Political Science), Maureen Romine (Biology), Elisabeth Valenzuela (Teacher Education)

Absent: Robin Bartee (Social Work), Eric Romero (Languages & Culture)

Vacant positions: Education – Special Education, Natural Resource Management

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

Also present: Christina Durán (Dean, Social Work), Robert Karaba (Chair, Educational Leadership), Brandon Kempner (Dean, CAS), April Kent (Library, Faculty Senate Representative), Veena Parboteeah (Dean, Business & Media Arts), Ian Williamson (AVPAA), Patrick Wilson (Director, Online & Extended Learning)

2. Approval of the Agenda

Motion to approve agenda. Seconded. Approved by consensus.

3. Approval of Minutes – December 2, 2020

Motion to approve minutes. Seconded. Approved by consensus.

4. Subcommittee Reports (see attached subcommittee list)

a. Undergraduate Appeals (Meron)

The subcommittee reviewed three appeals over the break. One appeal was approved, the other two are still under discussion. The chair thanks the members of this subcommittee for their contributions during the Winter break.

b. Graduate Appeals (Jenkins)

Nothing to report.

c. Ballen (Buchanan)

Nothing to report.

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

a. Southwest Studies (Gallegos)

Nothing to report.

b. Native American Hispano Cultural Studies (Jenkins)

Nothing to report.

c. Education - Counseling and Guidance (Gadsden)

The subcommittee will be finishing the report soon. Feedback was received from the department.

d. Educational Leadership (Gardner)

The program review subcommittee Chair presented their report (see attached).

The subcommittee Chair stated that she believes that the review template should be revised to include assessment of students' needs and if they are being met. The subcommittee did not recommend changes to the program but suggested they collect data about student achievement outcomes and community involvement.

AAC Chair asked for clarification on whether the program collects information on student outcomes. The subcommittee Chair stated they do not. R. Karaba stated that they do have an outcomes assessment plan that is filed with OIER that covers key assessments. The subcommittee Chair stated that the program has never been reviewed so they had no past review to build on. S. Jederberg stated that the program went through PPSC [Professional Practices and Standards Commission] and revamped the entire program which included outcomes assessment. The department has the VIA software program now and has begun to assess data. This issue was mentioned by CAEP and is mentioned in the CAEP report.

The AAC Chair noted that the Chairs of the following program review subcommittees need to start the process with the departments.

e. Health (Buchanan) – Postponed to Spring 2021

- f. Human Performance and Sport, BA, Minor (Gadsden) – Postponed to Spring 2021
- g. Human Performance and Sport, MA (Gadsden) – Postponed to Spring 2021
- h. University Studies (Wolf) – Postponed to Spring 2021
- i. Education – Special Education (Harrington) – Postponed to Spring 2021

6. Marketing Needs and Proposal – discussion item (Harrington, Meron)

E. Harrington stated that recently the AAC has looked at the way programs are advertised and saw that some programs are getting more advertisement than others. There is also not an overall plan for fair PR. Prof. Harrington and A. Meron has been looking at the situation. They believe the university should have a global view, looking at the entire university and diversity of programs. We need a way to find equitable advertising and have a global process that involves faculty and administration.

Prof. Meron gave an overview of the needs assessment and recommendations, including the following possible solutions:

- Identify an equitable way to earmark marketing funds for all NMHU academic programs
- Identify faculty and student resources for marketing (Business, Media Arts, Music, etc.) and compensation plans for their efforts, if used
- Identify a marketing strategy that aligns with the University Brand and Voice
- Identify specific media opportunities to market programs that will reach audiences who are potential students (where do we reach each age demographic? Where do we reach social workers seeking a graduate degree? Where do we find the groups fitting other demographics by interest?) and stated that this would probably need to go before the Faculty Senate for action.

Prof. Meron also recommended the implementation of a SWOT analysis, identifying strengths and weaknesses of the current marketing plan, opportunities and threats. Prof. Meron stated that a social media marketing strategy should be considered that encompasses various platforms, including Instagram, Pinterest, YouTube, etc. Prof. Meron stated that this issue would probably need to go before the Faculty Senate for action.

Comment from a committee member that there is still a video on YouTube being used for recruitment that features faculty from 15 years ago. They believe that there is a disconnect with this plan we currently have. They appreciate the fact that Prof. Harrington and Prof. Meron put this together and have the expertise in this area of reaching young students. This is a big part of program review. If a program needs more resources, they need to have a place to get guidance.

AAC Chair asked about the need for an actual office dedicated to marketing, which was not in the proposal. Prof. Meron stated that they did not include a recommendation for the creation of that position but did point out that the university

currently does not have one. Chair stated that that is a critical component and should be included. Prof. Meron agreed that this type of marketing is a full-time job.

Comment from a committee member that we also need to discuss fulfillment. We can put all the effort into marketing, but that has to translate into actual enrollment. We need to examine the fulfillment. We need to have follow up with the students. It would be a more powerful proposal if we had a stronger action plan. Committee member asked about the creation of an ad-hoc faculty-admin working group. AAC Chair agreed that a working group sounds like a good idea. Prof. Meron stated that they discussed that as part of the goal.

Comment from a committee member that we also want to include Admissions. They asked if there is someone in Admissions who specifically looks at marketing. One office coordinating efforts would help.

Comment from a committee member that part of the issue is whether we can afford a marketing faculty member. We should also empower the School of Business to hire some people so that we have people with the needed expertise. AAC Chair agreed and stated that should be added to the proposal.

Prof. Harrington mentioned that he was Chair of an internet technology committee about 5 years ago. There were members from different areas of the university and faculty. We have a lot of committees, but to keep the fire under the initiative it might be helpful to have an ad hoc committee with people from across the university. That way we can pull on expertise from different areas.

AAC Chair suggested that we could identify who is already working on marketing to serve on the committee. It might take a couple of years realistically. We need a collective to move along with it and keep it going.

P. Wilson stated that one of the main advantages to partnering with Wiley was their investment in marketing. We need to consider how what we do will complement what they are doing.

7. Academic Petitions - Grade Appeals – discussion item (Gadsden, Williamson)

AAC Chair noted that it was brought to her attention that the first round of grade appeals is in the hands of Deans. She served on the subcommittee that helped rewrite the appeals process. At that time, they were talking about grade appeals being entirely in the hands of faculty. That part of the discussion was somehow lost. Chair asked the committee for their opinion on the current policy and for ideas and suggestions.

Comment from a committee member that the grade appeal process has always been about dialog. A student needs to go to the faculty member to try to resolve it. The Dean has always been involved. The Dean is just there to help resolve the issue, not determine a grade. They stated that in the past, the AAC always had appeals to the whole committee. The student had a right to come to the subcommittee face to face to make their case and present a final appeal to the whole AAC but only if there was a process violation at any step of the way. They feel there was more due process in the past and are uncomfortable with the change.

AAC Chair stated that students can still ask for a hearing once the subcommittee makes the recommendations. I. Williamson stated that is his understanding as well.

Dr. Williamson stated that the thing the Deans and he have noted on policy is that there is some looseness around what the Dean is supposed to do. Dr. Williamson agreed with the committee member, but the policy doesn't state that definitely. It should say that the Dean is able to settle it with both parties, and there needs to be a clause that defines what "resolved" means. AAC Chair agreed and stated that it is possible that the Dean could pressure faculty to change a grade (though there is no evidence that that has happened).

Dr. Williamson asked what happens if the student doesn't feel the appeal is resolved.

Comment from a committee member that this is where experience is important. We know that deans don't have the ability to overturn a grade. That would be grounds for a faculty grievance. That is why it comes to a committee of their peers. Dr. Williamson stated that that is how it is currently being handled.

AAC Chair stated that it is not necessarily that a Dean would overturn a grade, but there could be pressure put on junior or contingent faculty to change a grade, which is worrisome.

Comment from a committee member that when we look at appeals, a lot falls into issues of process, such as missed deadlines. They feel like there's not much space for disciplinary knowledge in the appeals process.

Comment from a committee member that their department struggles with serial grade appealers. Their fear is that the people above them may not understand that. This is a conversation they've had for 20 years. They suggested the need for the Registrar to record the history of a student's interactions, including how many appeals they've filed. Serial petitioners do affect the process.

AAC Chair stated that there is a way to track dishonesty, but not the record of appeals.

Comment from a committee member that they would be worried about someone else reviewing a paper they've graded and judging their grading. That's an issue of academic freedom. We have to be careful with that kind of peer review.

AAC Chair related that the only time she was on a committee with an appeal based on content, they approached the department. But that is not part of the process as written.

C. Durán related that she's had a couple of grade appeals that went to AAC after she tried to resolve the issue. She noted that sometimes she has encouraged a contingent faculty member to reconsider a grade. Dr. Duran stated that it seems like we're talking about two different things, an assignment grade vs. the overall final grade. Dr. Duran also stated that there are two separate forms available that look very different. This creates confusion. One form makes it look like it always goes to AAC.

Comment from a committee member that in the year and half they have served on the Undergraduate Appeals Subcommittee, the majority of appeals aren't about grades; they're about credits toward graduation. They recently received two grade appeals, but the deliberation has been difficult. They've been evaluating based on documents. One form did not have the faculty member's response. Additionally, students do not fill out enough information. It's important to have the paperwork complete. The committee member doesn't think it's clear that the student and professor have the right to come back to the AAC after the decision.

AAC Chair noted that in the past it was in the letter that went to the student about the subcommittee's decision.

Dr. Williamson stated he does not see that anywhere on the form and it is not included in the aforementioned letter.

Comment from a committee member that they were copied on two denied appeals and that the next step wasn't listed. In the past, there was an explanation of next steps in the due process. They believe that information needs to be added back to the documentation. They mentioned that many things have been cut out of the catalog, and that perhaps that is what happened here.

AAC Chair stated that this needs to be part of the policy.

Dr. Williamson suggested that it makes more sense to have the opportunity for a hearing before the AAC makes their determination.

Comment from a committee member that we do have to judge student on the materials they submit. The professor is always going to have better materials than

the student. They want to be cautious that a student that doesn't have a perfect submission will still have a shot at due process.

AAC Chair stated that appears the AAC may need to reactive the policies subcommittee. There should be two opportunities for hearings.

Comment from a committee member that they see logistical issues. The committee has no ability to communicate directly to the student and shouldn't do so, which is why it goes to the AVPAA's office first. The AAC has the responsibility of making sure the faculty followed the syllabus. This is about academic freedom. No one can change a grade but the professor.

8. Communication from the Chair (Gadsden)

Reactivating Policy Subcommittee for Audits, Incompletes and Reactivation of Courses

- Auditing & Incomplete Policies
- Reactivation of Courses

Chair stated that there are a few policies that were left hanging from previous semesters that were never resolved. Chair asked for input from the committee concerning the possibility of reactivating the Policy Subcommittee and, if yes, for volunteers to serve.

Question from a committee member about what issues we're having that would require the subcommittee's reactivation.

Chair stated that the issue with auditing came up recently. At HU, the student gets to decide if they want to audit a class, not the faculty.

Question from a committee member. Do the faculty at HU have an issue with that? Chair stated that they did a few years ago.

Comment from a committee member that they're not sure we need another subcommittee. We do many things at HU that they don't do at other universities.

Comment from a committee member that they have had issues with auditing. It is not a problem from them when enrollment numbers are down. However, sometimes when students need a course to graduate, they can't get in if it's full with auditing students. They believe faculty should be able to determine priority.

Chair stated that was a problem in the past in the Schools of Business and Social Work.

Comment from a committee member that it would be a serious problem for labs or arts classes with limited enrollment.

The Registrar commented that she doesn't have an issue with faculty making determinations like that. But the Registrar's office doesn't have a way to control that when the enrollment is open to everyone. There is no way to balance that unless you only allowed declared degree-seeking students.

Comment from a committee member that one of the benefits of working at HU is taking classes. Many students who are auditing are staff. They want to be careful about our conversation. Degree seeking is important, but we also need to celebrate others that are working on continuing education.

The Provost stated that the three universities she's worked at have priority seating, with degree seeking students at top.

A. Kent stated that she believes there is a need for a subcommittee. We're all overextended, but there's an issue with things getting dropped. That there's this much discussion on one topic means there's an issue. AAC Chair agreed.

Chair also stated that incompletes have to be approved by the Dean and wondered why this is necessary.

Comment from a committee member that it's because faculty leave. Therefore, there has to be a form on file that is signed. It's a two-part process.

Chair asked why that could not be done only if the faculty leaves.

Chair next covered the issue of course reactivation. There is currently no policy governing this action. The minutes of previous AAC meetings state that the committee would resolve this issue, but the AAC never did.

MOTION to set up the Policy Subcommittee. Seconded.

Comment from a committee member that they want limits on what the subcommittee will address. Chair stated that they would only discuss the issues brought forward in this discussion.

Moving member amended motion to include this provision. Seconding member agreed.

MOTION approved by consensus.

Members volunteering for the Policy Subcommittee: Gloria Gadsden, Kathy Jenkins, Henrietta Romero, Angela Meron, Sheree Jederberg, Katie Gray.

Chair also welcomed back all members and thanked them for serving.

Chair mentioned that a Brightspace shell has been created to make accessing meeting information easier for members and to facilitate adding and removing members. Chair asked members if there had been issues or problems, and none were identified.

9. Communication from the Registrar (Romero)

The Registrar reported that 80% of Fall graduates were awarded their degrees before the break. As of January 15, Fall degree awarding is complete.

Chair asked about students being given their degrees when they still owe a balance. Registrar stated that they are not given their degrees in that instance. Chair reported that that had been happening. Registrar asked to be notified of any known instances.

Enrollment for Spring semester is currently 2380 (combined Undergraduate and Graduate). It was 2352 this time last year. This constitutes a 1% increase.

Undergraduate: 1394 (1427 last year)

Graduate: 986 (925 last year)

The last day to register for Spring semester, full semester courses is January 29. Students are still eligible for 100% refund for full semester courses until January 29.

The submission deadline for changes to the catalog to come before the AAC is March 15.

We have no intersession scheduled for Spring 2021. Fall intersession was successful. That might be something for department chairs and deans to think about. Intersession for summer is ready.

Chair asked what difference is between Spring intersession and Summer intersession. Registrar stated that it is just the term with which it is associated.

Question from a committee member about intersession dates.

Registrar responded that there is not a special formula for each intersession. To keep from over burdening faculty, we didn't have one before Spring. We're going to look to see if intersession will be part of the calendar long-term.

Question from the Chair. If a department decides to offer a spring intersession, would the student's degree be awarded in spring? Registrar stated that it would. Chair stated that she didn't know this was an option, and the Registrar may want to notify the Deans of this possibility. Registrar stated that she would send out the options. We can look at transitioning the way intersession occur.

Comment from a committee member that they believe this is part of the bigger initiative about retention. We need to talk about this and do it with purpose. The purpose of the spring intersession would be to help students graduate in spring. 2nd 8 week classes are also part of retention.

Registrar reported that registration for summer classes opens March 1. There will be a call for Fall 2021 courses shortly. Registration for Fall 2021 begins April 5.

There will be communication coming out that we will be holding a virtual commencement including graduates from last year.

10. Communication from the Faculty Senate (Kent)

Ms. Kent reported on the Faculty Senate meeting of 12/9/2020. See attached report.

11. Communication from the Graduate Council (Gadsden)

Nothing to report.

12. Communication from the Administration (Gonzales)

The Provost welcomed everyone back.

Will be using Ad Astra for Fall 2021. A reminder will go out about this soon. Chairs have already received training.

The Covid MOA was sent out.

The Provost reported that she is now on the New Mexico Academic Advisory Committee. HED is trying to wrap up their functions, including common course renumbering. They want to look at Gen Ed in general and dual credit.

The Provost stated that the Associate VPAA is organizing faculty buyout forms and then forwarding them to the Registrar's office.

AAC Chair stated that this is only for fall 2020. Dr. Williamson stated that this year we start a new form.

Comment from a committee member that, starting last fall, faculty get more credit for their work. So, we had to change the form to show that a proper buyout was taking place.

Question from a committee member. Is there an update about people who submitted a past buyout? Dr. Williamson responded that they just received everything from the Deans, and it will go to the Registrar shortly.

Question from a committee member. When will faculty get paid for earlier buy out credits? The Provost responded this would be ASAP. They should be clean and ready to go once they get a degree audit check.

The Registrar stated she will get them back as quickly as she can.

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

14. Next meeting – February 3, 2021

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

15. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned, 4:53.

**Educational Leadership Program Review
Academic Affairs Sub-committee Evaluation & Report
December, 2020**

*Prepared by the Educational Leadership Program Review Subcommittee
Dr. Sandra Gardner and Dr. Edward Harrington*

Program Review Report

The Educational Leadership Program is a small department, yet offers three different options for Master's Degrees and an Administrative License for those who already hold a MA or MS degree. The program has a reasonable number of students entering the program and those who have taken the State Administrative Licensure exam, have all been successful on the exam. There are no major changes projected within the department at this time, but faculty is leaning towards an EdD program in the future.

There are 3 highly qualified and accomplished faculty currently involved in the MA program. Each faculty member has collectively published a book, a chapter in a book and several journal articles. Each faculty member has a background in Educational Leadership and are able to teach a variety of courses within their program. The faculty has the expertise to develop the curriculum and implement the curriculum as well.

The Educational Leadership Program's mission, vision and values are clearly articulated and align with that of the University. The faculty is active within the university and also professionally prepared to continue to offer their Educational Leadership Program. The Program is accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) until 2026. There were areas of improvement that must be addressed within the next two years to retain accreditation. One area that we noted when performing this review was also mentioned in the (CAEP) evaluation is that we did not see/note how students are evaluated for the competencies noted in the Section V: Appendix A: Power Standards/Rubric. The table addresses areas such as Ethical Leaders on a scale from 4-1 ranking on the attributes presented, but not the measures used to assess each student. There was no evidence to support that any of the expectations ranked, were met by the student. There were 9 major areas that faculty evaluate student performance on presented within a table over 6 pages long. **Methods** to evaluate/measure the **attributes** listed in the "rubrics" were not included making this review sometimes confusing. No syllabus, grading rubrics, mention of assignments or other measurable examples were given (but they were also not required within the 2018 Program format review making it difficult for the evaluator's to clear areas of confusion in order to connect the attributes listed in the table addressing the Power Standards/Table). On reexamination of Appendix C on page 17, there was one project noted that was developed as a method to determine specific student attributes; The School Report Card Project consisting of a two page APA paper.

It is also noted that our assessment mirrors the CAEP report on Tables 3,5, and A.5 that student assessments be clearer and not based on anecdotes. I will include the references (attachment 1 and 2) of the CAEP's criticisms for the purpose of program improvement and that our analysis of findings includes areas of improvement is also noted by EDL's Accreditation body (CAEP).

The Review did note that faculty does not recommend any changes to their program, but that they do need to develop a way to collect data regarding the student outcomes and community involvement. Indeed, in the assessment of the review that was returned, it was noted that the

program is currently working to connect assessments to each identified “Power” standard. It was also noted that faculty use their professional judgement in applying their attribute rubric to their participants and their work. The reviewer also noted that student learning outcomes were measured by mentors in the field, university supervisors and by self-evaluations. We also asked if their program was 8 or 16 weeks and if online education will continue after COVID and the response was that this was not required information for the review.

Editor’s note: The Template used for the Review assessment must be revised, as there should be a way/method to understand if the attribute expectations are being met.

Our final analysis of findings and based on the response of the EDL department, is that the faculty has structured student assignments as project-based using the theories and knowledge provided in their courses and presented in their attribute rubrics.

It has also been noted that the department will engage in post-graduation data collection to ensure that their graduates meets the expectations of the educational community that they serve. Although we lacked specific information needed for some parts of the evaluation, we believe that having other faculty serving as colleagues to assist and collaborate with, can only serve to make a great program, even better.

December 9, 2021 meeting of the FS

5. **Communication from the President (S. Minner).**
 - a. University presidents are recommending to legislators that this year funds don't get redistributed.
 - b. Interest in our new hemp program
 - c. Wildlife major to go before the board before break.
 - d. Extended winter break with pay for staff.
6. **Communication from the Administration (R. Gonzales)**
 - a. Working on reappointments
 - b. Meeting with CTE board. Have a job description for director.
 - c. Plan for fall 2021 as if it will be a regular semester.
7. **Communication from the Chair (O. Tamir).**
 - a. Will ask for volunteers for the KPI committee. Will send an email about this before and after break. Will include contingent faculty in the call for volunteers.
 - b. Working on virtual commencement. More details in General Faculty meeting.
8. **Communication from the Staff Senate (I. Crespin/D. Gallegos).**
 - a. Veronica Black reported that the Staff Senate is working with the diversity council.
 - b. Staff Senate will be involved with KPI committee.
 - c. Staff Senate is helping with the campus climate survey.
 - d. Working on virtual employee recognition event in April
 - e. Update on the recruit one initiative.
9. **Old Business.**
 - a. **NMHU Webpage Discussion (S. Weaver, A. Maclachlan).**
 - i. Answered questions about the website from the faculty senate.
 - ii. Focusing on market trends including plain language marketing
 - iii. Now working on ways of recruiting graduate students which wasn't part of the initial 2019 website language.
 - iv. University Relations uses website analytics to inform changes.
 - v. University Relations researches university website trends and find that sites vary greatly
 - vi. University website are a challenge as they serve many different audiences.
 - vii. Academics as a term doesn't mean anything to prospective students.
 - viii. University relations reports that services like the library are better for the intranet.
 - ix. Anne McLaughlin and Sean Weaver can present a heat map of the university webpage which show what most get used.
 - b. **CAEL Adult 360 (Gonzales).**
 - i. Request for faculty volunteer to work on results of CAEL survey.
 - ii. Roxanne Gonzales will send an email with a description.
10. **New Business. Tabled**
 - a. **Implementation of Quality Matters as the NMHU Standard Quality LMS Rubric (Gonzales).**
 - b. **Prior Learning Assessment for Evaluation of Sponsored Training Programs Policy (Gonzales).**
11. **Executive Session. Tabled**
12. **Public Action as Necessary on Other Closed Session Discussions. Tabled**

13. Adjournment.

December 9, 2021 meeting of the General Faculty

Note: General Faculty following Faculty Senate did not have a quorum so there were no action items. Information items and discussion below.

1. Virtual Commencement
 - a. Commencement will be pre-recorded and then beamed.
 - b. An outside vendor is producing this.
 - c. Students may request a print program.
 - d. Retiring faculty can be recognized as marshals.
 - e. Discussion about faculty roll in virtual commencement.
2. Discussion of the CTE director search