

# Faculty Assembly Meeting

## MINUTES

APRIL 21, 2017

12:31 PM

CALVIN HALL 248

**MEETING CALLED BY:** Dr. Lora Stone, Faculty Assembly

Rob

Winter, Tom Kaus, Joe Kee Jr.

2. Dr. Stone reported that no formal response was received from the administration regarding the memo that was sent out that requested a campus-wide budget committee, but there is general support for it. There is some confusion about the committee, but we will continue to move forward with this move to establish a campus-wide budget committee in the next academic year.

3. The branch Campus Task Force that has been re-writing Section F of the Faculty Handbook is still working on section F90. There is more information available in the Dean's report that was sent out prior to today's meeting. Dr. Stone will go through that report a little later on today, highlighting a few of the important points in the report just so everyone has all the information.

4. Faculty Assembly Elections will take place later in our meeting today. We have representation from all areas and divisions on campus.

5. Dr. Stone finished her report by thanking the faculty for the opportunity to serve as Faculty Assembly president for the past two years. She thanked all the committees and operations committee members for all of their continued work and professionalizing our Faculty Assembly. She also thanked the UNMG administrators, student services director and staff who attended the meetings, and for all who helped us make quorum for all of the meetings these past two years.

Dr. Stone then turned the floor over to Jayme McMahon, Director of Students Services.

**INFORMATION**

**STUDENT SERVICES REPORT**

**JAYME MCMAHON**

Jayne presented the following report to faculty in attendance:

**1. Dates and Deadlines:** Jayme reminded faculty that final grade entry for spring semester 2017 opens on May 5, 2017 at 5:00p.m. and closes May 18, 2017 at 5:00p.m. She asked that faculty please enter final grades before the final deadline. Graduation is scheduled for May 13, 2017 at the Gallup Public School Stadium. Jayme will send out more detailed information to faculty as the date draws nearer because the staging area is going to be in different location. It will be in the playground at Roosevelt Elementary. All students and faculty participating in commencement and all those who will be on the stage will line up there in the playground to the north of the stadium. There will be no VIP room this year and so faculty should come dressed in their regalia and ready to go. Jayme asked that faculty park on Logan and Cliff in front of the school so that they have easy access to the staging area. Faculty and special guests will process in from the opposite side from last year. Jayme will send out a PowerPoint with schematics showing how the procession will move. She asked that faculty please arrive by 10:30a.m. at the latest. Dr. Buggie will be the Grand Marshall this year in honor of his retirement. More detailed information on commencement is forthcoming.

**2. Mandatory Student Training for Sexual Misconduct Prevention:** The training schedule is liv 9no

Another question was raised regarding whether students graduating in May 2017 would have to complete the Grey Area training. Jayme responded that it depends. If students are graduating in May with a certificate or Associate's degree and they have no plans to continue with UNM, then they do not have to participate in the training. If they are earning a certificate and continuing on to an Associate's degree, they do have to participate in the training. If students are going to continue their 4-year degree with UNM after earning an Associate's degree at UNMG or they are transferring to main campus in general, then they can take the training here or at main campus, but they will have to complete the training regardless. If they plan to continue or transfer to any other campus or institution, they can take the training there.

A question was asked regarding how Jayme's team monitors who completes the training. Jayme responded that it is tricky and the Department of Justice expects a 100% completion rate of UNMG students by December 2017. Jayme doesn't know that the 100% goal will happen. Right now students pre-register online and it goes into a secure spreadsheet. Students check in at the training session and then afterwards an attribute is linked to their Banner account, which students don't see on their end. O BDC1

Instead of requiring teaching excellence every single year, there are also effective and excellent categories. Faculty attention may shift to research or other areas, so the task force wants to avoid problems and losing excellent teachers who may not earn an excellence in teaching rating every single year. The task force is working on that issue and Ken is concerned that for technical lecturers who were getting lost in policies that we have language regarding Technical Lecturers 1, 2, and 3 in Section F instead of being eliminated. Technical lecturers were being forced into the instructor area, so Ken is working on that. Dr. Stone pointed out a few other items of the report and again, encouraged faculty to read the Dean's report carefully and to ask Dean Roberts directly any questions they may have or if they simply want to share some thoughts on these issues.

**INFORMATION**

**CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER REPORT**

**RICHARD GOSHORN**

Dr. Stone next noted the CFO Rick Goshorn would not be in attendance at today's meeting, but he sent a report to Dr. Stone yesterday and she emailed it to faculty earlier today prior to the meeting (it is also attached to these minutes below). She briefly summarized the report, but

**DISCUSSION**

Dr. Matt Mingus, chair of the Curricula Committee, presented Form C for a Certificate in New Mexico Core. This is a 32-credit certificate that is built off of the core requirements for the State of New Mexico. All of these courses transfer to all other degree programs and institutions. This certificate was proposed by Jayme McMahon, Director of Student Services, because of difficulties students have had with transferring credits and making it to graduation. Most students working on their AA in Liberal Arts or AS in Science will be completing these requirements along the way anyway, so they would then get as certificate on their way to an AA or AS. Other community colleges have done the same thing, thus Jayme proposed it for our campus.

**DISCUSSION**

Dr. Mingus next presented a final Form C for a change in the Medical Laboratory Technology program that is an AS program that was originally 71 credits, which is far too many for an Associate’s degree. The credit requirements have been dropped to 61 credits and they have changed some of the requirements for general education and have cut back on some of the other credit requirements such as cutting the Social Sciences requirements from 6 credits to now only 3 credits. They have done the same with Humanities credits, dropping them from 6 to 3 credits and they dropped the Physical Education credits and changed one credit in their MLT core. All 61 credits articulate into a Bachelor’s degree program on main campus and the AS degree helps students get jobs here in the community, which they have clearly demonstrated.

**I move to approve the Form C for the Medical Laboratory Technology program.**

**Motion:** Matt Mingus  
**Seconded:** Yes  
**Discussion:** None  
**Voice Vote:** Unanimously approved  
**Motion carried:** Yes

**DISCUSSION**

Dr. Mingus continued his presentation of curricula forms for faculty approval by presenting the Form B for Sustainability Studies 250, which is part of the Construction Technology program, but had been paused. This form brings back SSUT250 to the program.

**I move to approve the Form B for Sustainability Studies 250.**

**Motion:** Matt Mingus 2025-05-29 2:30 (271) 265 (6) 2 (275) 476 4.16 9 (25.7) 11a a sub (10) -18) 0.818 (270) J86702 T

DISCUSSION

Professor Robert Galin, chair of the Constitution and By-Laws Committee of the UNMG Faculty Assembly, noted that the committee has started to update the Constitution and By-Laws. At this time, there was one change in the constitution itself and that is I-B (Rights and Responsibilities). The committee added language to point (a) under I-B to reflect shared governance. Any other changes to the By-Laws came from Faculty Assembly committee chairs. Rob sent out the updated by-laws earlier this week asking for any additional changes or comments. Nobody responded, so the version Rob presented at today's meeting is the most current version. However, a faculty member pointed out that the version handed out today may not be the updated one. After reviewing the handout, Rob concurred that this is not the current version and consequently, asked that the approval of the updated UNMG Faculty Assembly Constitution and By-Laws be tabled for an approval vote until the September 2017 Faculty Assembly meeting. John Zimmerman also noted that this language committee by changes are not reflected in those documents. John will send out a definition of shared governance so that we have it in print for our constitution.

**I move to table the vote to approve the updated UNMG Faculty Assembly Constitution and By-Laws until the September 2017 UNMG Faculty Assembly meeting.**

- Motion:** Matt Mingus
- Seconded:** Yes
- Discussion:** None
- Voice Vote:** Unanimously approved
- Motion carried:** Yes

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

GENERAL ISSUES

EMC BT /P <<

Another faculty member shared disappointment in Dean Roberts, who emails written reports and always seems to have an excuse to be on main campus when we have our Faculty Assembly meetings. It seems there have never been so many Deans' meetings on main campus in the past. The faculty member opined that while the Dean is likely doing good work, trying to get a meeting with him at UNMG is difficult. This faculty member has tried to meet with the Dean several times, but the meetings keep being cancelled by Dean. This seems to be a concern across the board.

A concern was raised next regarding budget issues. The faculty member asked if any other information about the childcare center has been provided. Dr. Stone noted that the information that Dr. Dyer sent out to everyone is all that was sent and provided. The information confirmed that the childcare center is costing \$100,000 per year to operate. We need to think about that. A faculty member asked if Dr. Stone heard from Dr. Dyer about the campus-wide budget committee and she responded that she did not receive a response from him. Dr. Stone assured faculty that she will work with the incoming Faculty Assembly pres.8 ( t)12.6 (n(14.6 ( s)12 (a)13.8 (n )1s)J.4 (he)1.8 (d 17 (d n6.1 )J)0.027 Tc -0.012 Tw 4.t)0.5 6h)-2.2 3e









up who are not consulting the vo-tech faculty. John also reiterated that the committee had a long discussion on shared governance and he will send out the best definition of shared governance that they found and it can perhaps be further discussed in fall and added to the UNMG Faculty Assembly Constitution.

INFORMATION	ANNOUNCEMENTS	FACULTY MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE
DISCUSSION		
<p>Rob asked current Arts &amp; Sciences Division Chair Kathy Head to share some announcements she made in the Arts &amp; Sciences Division meeting earlier this morning. Kathy first shared that the faculty of A&amp;S overwhelmingly voted to confer emeritus status to Dr. Stephen Buggie, who is retiring after this semester. She also announced that she is re-retiring and that the new incoming Arts &amp; Sciences chair will be professor Joe Kee.</p> <p>Rob thanked all of the outgoing officers and committee members and asked for a round of applause to recognize their service.</p> <p>Rob closed the meeting by thanking Dr. Lora Stone for her two years of service as Faculty Assembly President and presented her with a gift of pottery that was painted by UNMG student Alyssa Gchachu from Zuni Pueblo.</p>		

ACTION ITEM	ADJOURNMENT
DISCUSSION	
<p><b>Motion to adjourn.</b></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Matt Mingus  <b>Second:</b> Yes  <b>Voice Vote:</b> Unanimously approved.  <b>Motion carried:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Meeting Adjourned at 2:29pm. by Faculty Assembly President Dr. Lora Stone.</b></p> <p><b>Recorded by:</b> Shirley Heying, Faculty Assembly</p>	

#1 above was the main topic of debate (without resolution) at the previous AF+T meeting, and #4 and 5 are to be presented to the AF+T on April 21.

I would like your thoughts on the following.

Until recently I was in favor of the above changes but I am no longer sure they are necessary. There has often been confusion as to what is expected at the branches, but the cause

*C. For evaluation of faculty for retention, branch community colleges will use the categories described in*

will be the basis of all future Faculty/Chair Agreements. At the beginning of each year, a faculty member could identify their priorities/goals in either teaching or scholarship, declaring either *effective* or *excellence* as targets. The key to a defensible evaluation system is to have such targets against which to later measure annual performance.

A great deal of work is needed in defining what is *effective* and what is *excellent* in both areas of performance. To begin the process, I would suggest that every faculty member write two lists for their own discipline. It has been suggested that the branches all adopt the same standards for *effective* and *excellent* so we should be prepared to share. Perhaps there is a way forward without asking for major changes to the Faculty Handbook.

## # 6. Technical Lecturers.

Since 2001 we have been laboring under the impression that there is a category and promotion track for Technical (Technology) Lecturers. The recent promotion application by one of our Technical Lecturers brought to light that there is no such classification. The Faculty Handbook lists only one category for Lecturer which, at first reading, seems only suitable for those holding traditional academic qualifications, a possible promotion *road block* for worthy Technical Lecturers (for clarity I continue to use the term Technical Lecturer as opposed to Academic Lecturer, the tenure track Technical Instructor ranks listed in Section F have fallen into disuse.) The Section F Task Force intends to request the ranks of Technical Lecturer I, II, III, be recognized and added to Section F.

There may be a more immediate and economical way forward: The Higher Learning Commission guidelines allow for *equivalent qualifications based on breadth and depth of experience outside of the classroom in real world situations relevant to the discipline in which the faculty member would be teaching*. When deciding qualifications and appropriate professional standards and accountability for promotion in the technical fields there are national credentialing organizations which can be referenced. For example in Welding there is the American Welding Society (AWS) and the National Center for Construction Education and Research (NCCER).

In Faculty Handbook C190:2 there are two categories of promotion within the rank of Lecturer I, that of Senior Lecturer and Principal Lecturer. Most importantly Senior Lecturer emphasizes *demonstrated professional excellence*. The university already recognizes, therefore, the need for flexibility when assessing valuable industry credentials. In addition, when making promotion decisions, departments are trusted to make judgements as to which faculty have made, and will continue to make, sound judgments in their professional areas.

Senior Lecturers:

(a) *Lecturers with at least five years of continuous service to the University at 0.5 FTE or greater who have demonstrated professional excellence and shown a conscientious interest in improving their professional skills.*

(b) *Appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of Senior Lecturer represents a judgment on the part of the department, School or College, and University that the individual has made and will continue to make sound contributions in their professional areas. The appointment should be made only after careful investigation of the candidate's professional and leadership accomplishments and promise.*

As the emphasis for Senior Lecturer is on service and professional excellence, I believe it is a suitable track for our Technical Lecturer promotions. I have forwarded to the Provost a letter of support for the promotion to Senior Lecturer of one of our technical faculty. If the argument outlined above is accepted by the Provost, a promotion route will be established for our Technical Lecturers without the need to change the Faculty Handbook.



*educator position but who do not yet qualify for an Assistant Professor rank because they have not yet completed their academic programs or have not yet obtained the requisite professional certifications ... Instructors may be appointed with an understanding that they will be advanced to a rank of Assistant Professor contingent upon fulfilling specified goals such as timely completion of the individual's academic program.*

If we assume that the authors of the Faculty Handbook were acting with sound reason when writing B 2.2.2., and knowing that the Provost has the authority to decide on *Minimum* and *Preferred* qualifications, should the Section F Task Force attempt to change the Faculty Handbook to allow branches to continue to hire faculty onto tenure track with a Master's Degree?

## **#2. Professional Development or Scholarly work?**

*Faculty Handbook Section F: The four bases (teaching; scholarship, research, or other creative work; service; and personal characteristics) for appointment, promotion, and tenure used on the main campus shall apply also at the branch campuses. The University recognizes, however, that conditions of employment, such as heavy teaching loads, travel requirements, budget limitations, and a lack of research facilities may require that the implementation of traditional requirements and criteria of research and publication used on main campus need to be applied differently. While emphasis shall be placed on academic qualifications and excellence in teaching and service, research, and publications will still be considered.*

The phrase... *implementation of traditional requirements and criteria of research and publication used at main campus need to be applied differently*, has been confusing and open to interpretation. In an effort to clarify the *differences*, the term Professional Development has often been substituted for Scholarly Work at branch campuses.

Section F Task Force proposed language: *C. For evaluation of faculty for retention, branch community colleges will use the categories described in Faculty Handbook Section B1 except that ... professional development may be used in lieu of scholarly work.*

The Section F Task Force feels that the term Professional Development needs to be formalized in the Faculty Handbook. But is this necessary given that, as for # 1 and 3, the Faculty Handbook already allows each department to determine their own performance criteria and benchmarks for both annual evaluations and tenure?

Again:

4.3.1 Departmental Review and Recommendations

(a) ... The criteria (for review) are presented in this Policy **and in any supplemental policies within academic units.**

And

4.9.4 Performance Criteria

Deans shall require **each department or division to file a statement of criteria** and procedures for annual evaluation of the performance of tenured faculty members.

|

continue to be refined. Work needs to be done now to define in detail what is *effective* and *excellent* in every discipline. In the near future these different documents need to be formalized as **supplementary division policies**, approved by faculty, filed in the Dean's office, and published.

I would be grateful for your thoughts on these issues.

Regards,  
Professor Kenneth Roberts. Dean of Instruction.

Report to Faculty Senate  
Director of Business Operations  
April 21, 2017

Please accept my apology for not attending today. My father continues to have some health challenges and I need to assist him with appointments.

The fiscal picture for 2017-2018 is continuing to unfold, however its clear the news is not good. There are a few facts we can work with currently:

1. Revenue outlooks continue to be troublesome for 2017-2018. Currently there is an expectation for a reduction in state funding of approximately \$622,000 from 2016-2017 levels. How the legislature and governor sorts out the current position with revenue expectations, this figure will likely increase anywhere from 2%-10% increase this figure. This translates into additional cuts of \$180,000 to \$900,000. The faculty budget committee will be asked to help find the bulk of this final figure, as this current budget we have in place has us running on fumes in most non-academic areas. I am rapidly approaching a point where academic funding is at risk, as is my ability to keep buildings open.
2. A few details on the current budget are as follows:
  - a. CE expenses are now 100% isolated into an organization that is considered self-supporting I&G. Its revenues must cover its expenditures.
  - b. Two advisors are being added to assist in retention/completion efforts and get our advisor to student ratios down.

4. Mandatory expenditure increases for 2017-

~\$775M. The legislature is ~\$100M. All other budgets were signed into law. \$350M/\$875M =40%. The situation is stunning.

Please let me say that I have enjoyed my interaction with individual faculty, Dean Roberts, faculty assembly, and Lora Stone this past year. I think the future is clearly going to be challenging, but my commitment to this campus' fiscal health has been solid and will remain so. I look forward to some very interesting conversations over the next few months, and I remain dedicated to the shared governance that is vital in times such as these. Have a great summer.