

Assembly Meeting – Faculty Consortium

Minutes – August 29, 2014

The meeting began at 11:03 AM.

I. Present were:

- i Wayne McGowan (A), Rob Klinger (A), Erin O’Neill-Armendarez (A), Bill Lockhart (A), Noel Romero (A), Tammy Dodson, (A), Steve Holmes (A), Kim Lopez-Gallagher (A), Jeffrey Bacon, Sherrell Wheeler (A), Gloria Villaverde (A), James Gallagher, Pete Eidenbach (A), Carrie Baldwin (A), Beth Grundhoffer, John Haley, Colleen Bond, Laurie Joslin, and Kathy Roark-Diehl. [A = Assembly Member]

- i Minutes from the August 29, 2014, meeting were accepted.

II. Academic Council and APAC Reports

- i Rob has been e-mailing regular Academic Council and APAC reports to faculty. He added that APAC had discussed the Care Team at the Las Cruces Campus. The Care Team is a quick-response group to deal with student issues, such as depression, potential violence, anorexia, or other issues for students who are not addressing these problems on their own. Our campus is in the process of establishing a similar team.

III. Faculty Senate Report

- i Kathy discussed the mundane issues that go on at Faculty Senate, such as a recent move to reduce tuition of dependents of employees. An issue that is pertinent to us is an attempt to decrease the timeline for review of administrators from five to three years.

- i Because of a recent lawsuit, the Allocation of Effort (AOE) documents are under scrutiny of the administration at all branches. It was noted at the meeting that Division Heads are refusing to sign the AOE. This was disturbing to many of the members. It was noted that the old policy remains in place until a new one is instigated. We motioned to seek guidance about what faculty should expect if the AOE is not signed and how this reflects current policy. The measure passed with three abstentions.

IV. Committee Reports

- i The discussions about the Adjunct Faculty Committee and the Communications Committee somewhat merged into a single discussion. Some of our adjuncts reported

being uncomfortable with the term “part-timers” – preferring the title of adjuncts (which, I might add, I have always used in the minutes) – and that led to some discussion about terminology. The language of the actual contracts is “temporary part-time” faculty, and the term “TPT” rapidly became adopted by the TPTs, themselves.

- i The main communication issues were reported to the committee by TPTs, especially the fact that many TPTs are *not* receiving e-mails on the All-NMSUA list. Discussion about how to improve the situation included using a mailing list derived from Erin O’Neill-Armendarez. This led to a discussion about initiating a faculty forum of some sort, possibly a blog.

- i We had a lengthy discussion about the Division Head/Assistant Division Head assessment. It is our understanding that Dr. Carstens has asked us for questions for an informal assessment. Discussion centered around whether the purpose of the ADH evaluation is for the enlightenment of the assistants, themselves, or whether the results should be seen by the TPTs – the persons evaluated by the ADHs. The general consensus was that this evaluation should include accountability on the part of each ADH – thus, the TPTs involved should see the results. It was pointed out that Division Heads were not evaluated in the past until the Faculty Assembly discovered that was happening and pushed the issue. The committee will draft questions for the next meeting.

- i The discussion about the Hiring Freeze centered on how little we actually know about this decision and what it actually means. We unanimously passed a motion to ask the Academic Council and the administration clarify what policy is in place full-time and part-time faculty positions – including what happens after funding returns to normal.

V. New Items

- i It was noted that the new policy requiring instructor permission for registration after the second day of classes was creating problems for some students, especially students whose classes were canceled. Discussion included comments on the proposed new form that would allow faculty members to set a blanket permission for additions to their classes under conditions set by the individual faculty members. This would include such conditions as allowing new students until the course cap had been reached or allowing students to be admitted until Wednesday of the second week. Instructors could set the conditions that would be important for their specific classes. We concluded that it would all work itself out in a couple of semesters

- i We had much discussion about the multi-section review of Quality Matters courses. The issue is complex. Part of the problem concerns funding. The divisions must pay for QM reviewers – whether inhouse or external. This burden is apparently much heavier for one division than for the others. The issue revolves around whether one faculty member should design a course that would then be used by other instructors. The problem is that a faculty member using someone else’s course can only make minor changes – without calling for a new and expensive review. We need to collect data from each of the divisions. We unanimously motioned to ask the administration the current policy impacts students and how many students are enrolled in such classes. [need to clarify all this with Rob & Kim]

VI. Additional Items

- i We motioned to table the additional items on the agenda until the next meeting.

The next meeting will follow the faculty meeting on October 17, 2014.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:56 PM.

Minutes approved:

Rob Klinger, Incoming Chair

Bill Lockhart, Secretary