

Summary of Committee Reports from Faculty Senate Minutes February 2014 through April 2019

General Standing Rule Changes

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, March 5, 2019

6. New Business

a. Proposed Changes to the Faculty Senate Bylaws – Thomas Engler Info

Dr. Engler stated that he has made some changes to our bylaws. One has to do with the student discipline committee will not be discussed today.

The other change is when we discuss student awards or GPAs, students are not allowed in the room to allow for confidentiality, but there is nothing in our bylaws that state that.

Dr. Engler moved to approve this amendment, seconded by Dr. Borchers. Motion approved.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, February 6, 2018

6. New Business

a. Standing Rules – Steve Simpson

Dr. Steve Simpson discussed some minor changes to the Standing Rules. In the first part of the discussion, he indicated that the current set of standing rules did not include any mention of the graduate council and council of chairs, even though motions are made from these committees during Faculty Senate meetings. Section E was added with a short description of these committees and their relationship to the faculty senate. Dr. Wesley Cook had noted in an email prior to the FS meeting that section III A. also needed an update since the date for the last FS meeting had recently changed. Other small editorial changes were made. Dr. Simpson moved to accept this first set of changes, where it was seconded, and passed unanimously.

In the second part of the discussion, Dr. Simpson drew attention to the "Student Learning Committee" in the Standing rules. Some confusion existed between the standing rules, which referred to it as the "Student Learning Committee," and the list of committee membership on the faculty senate website, which still referred to it as the Assessment committee. Dr. Simpson noted that in the meeting minutes, when the vote had gone forward to separate the "retention" and "assessment" committees, part of the vote had also been to rename the "assessment" committee as the "student learning committee." Aside from that, recent discussion had brought up the question of whether the Assessment Committee really needed to continue or whether these duties could be accomplished by the Assessment task force headed by Dr. Peter Mozley. It was noted that overlap already existed in some membership of the committee and the task force. Dr. Brian Borchers noted that the HLC had raised some concerns with assessment during the last site visit, and that this change would likely be welcomed by the HLC. The motioned was made, seconded, and approved by majority vote.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, February 3, 2015

Old Business

1. Updating Senate rules – Steve Simpson

Dr. Steve Simpson explained that while going back over the Faculty Senate Standing rules, over the past several years most of the changes we have been approving were not added to the

standing rules. Dr. Steve Simpson provided a copy of the word document with the markups. The Assessment Retention Committee and Student Learning Committee were added. EREC was approved at the last Faculty Senate meeting has been added. Most of this was things that were already voted on but not added to the standing rules. There were two changes that were mentioned at the last meeting. The Associate Dean for Student Success and the Community Education Director were added to the membership of the Faculty Senate. Also, adjuncts are listed in the standing rules as voting members of the Faculty Senate, but are not needed to make quorum. There was one additional change that was submitted by the incoming chair of the Academic Standards and Admission Committee. There was a vague line “all appeals from students relating to academic problems” that Dr. Lisa Young suggested be removed. Additionally it was suggested to add undergraduate so that is made clear. Also, the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs as an ex-officio member added. Kevin Wedeward seconded the motion to accept these changes. Motion passed unanimously.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, December 2, 2014

New Business

1. Updating standing rules (Steve Simpson)

Dr. Steve Simpson reported that the standing rules have not been keeping up with the changes that have been approved. He and Dr. Brian Borchers have tracked down all the changes over the years and put them in the current form. Dr. Steve Simpson noted that the Senate will not be voting on this today, but that he would like everyone to have some time to review and make sure everything is accurate.

Dr. Steve Simpson went over the types of things that they have been attending to. Roughly 95% are not changes but are things that have been approved but were not updated. There were three standing committees that were listed but not actually in the standing rules. These three were the Benefits Committee, Faculty Development Committee, and the Regents-Faculty Conference Committee. They need a description for the Benefits Committee. There were several different descriptions of committees but they were able to locate the correct version of what was approved by the Faculty Senate and updated the information. They will now add the Education and Research Efficiency Faculty Senate Committee. There were some discrepancies with Ex-Officio members that they corrected. The standing rules did not account for the split between the Assessment Committee, Retention Committee, and the Student Learning Committee. There were some changes that had to be made due to changes in offices. TCC and ISD formed ITC and some responsibilities were distributed to ACT.

Two new things were added that should be reviewed. The Associate Dean for Student Success and the Community Education Director were added to the list of members. Also, under meetings, a quorum for a regular or special meeting of the Faculty Senate was modified to be 25% of the membership excluding Emeritus, adjuncts, and faculty on leave. (Adjuncts were added to this list.) Let us know if we need to make any others changes if there is anything that still seems inconsistent. There will also be a copy with marked changes available.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, November 4, 2014

7. New Business

1. Updating standing rules; postponed until December.

The chair noted that the standing rules for Faculty Senate were not yet finished. There may be some additional issues that will need to be considered. This is postponed until the December faculty senate meeting.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, October 7, 2014

5. Committee Reports

Committee Rotation Document – Richard Sonnenfeld

The Chair noted the committee rotation list is online on the Faculty Senate web page. If you are a committee chair you can use this as a guideline for when you need to present a committee report.

7. New Business

Discussion/Confirmation of Faculty Senate Committees – Samuels/Rogelj

Hybrid Committee Proposal

Richard Sonnenfeld discussed a new proposal that would make better use of Faculty Senate Committees. We do not want to change the structure of the Faculty Senate Committees or rewrite the bylaws. However, we would like to create hybrid committees. Hybrid committees have members that are identical to (or a subset of) the equivalent faculty senate committee, but they have staff and/or administrative members as voting members. The chairs of the hybrid committee would be elected by the hybrid committee, and might or might not be the same as the chair of the faculty senate committee. The purpose to this proposal is to empower Faculty Senate Committees to make decisions that will actually be implemented to run Tech

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, February 4, 2014

-Faculty Senate Charter –moved from earlier.

The existing charter reads:

The Faculty Senate of the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology exists to set policy relating to academic matters, including admissions, academic standards, curricula and graduation requirements for both the undergraduate and graduate programs, and to recommend the conferral of earned degrees to the President. An additional role of the Faculty Senate is to promote communication among teaching faculty, researchers, and administrators. T

his is posted in the Standing Rules on the Academic Affairs website.

The chair asked for informal feedback on whether the charter should be modified to include specifically the creation or deletion of academic programs. One comment was to add “but not limited to” after the word “including”. Overall feedback was that responsibility for creation/deletion of program was implied already under “academic matters” and that NO CHANGE was needed.

Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 2, 2019

2. Reports of Senate Standing Committees Action

c. Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee – Mike Heagy

Dr. Heagy discussed two items from the Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee. This body approved the Tenure & Promotion Policy but it needed to be approved by legal counsel. There were several editorial comments, with clarifications.

(1) II. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor; Yes, service only at NMT.

(2) II E. Final tenure review August 15 of the same year the final review is initiated.

(3) Appendix A. Length of probationary period; 7 years maximum. Normally the tenure decision would not be made before the fifth year.

(4) Appendix C. Clarification of faculty probationary appraisal form. Friendly amendment made to change “ideally” to “normally” for the May 1 deadline.

(5) Appendix G. VAPA changed to VPAA throughout.

Dr. Heagy moved to accept these changes with friendly amendments. Motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Wells reminded faculty that the Regents also want an interim appeal process policy to be brought forward at the same time as the T&P Policy.

Dr. Heagy discussed the Promotion to Emeritus Status guidelines. Most every other college or university has something similar. It was brought forward in 2014 and did not pass, so the committee reviewed it and made some new edits. This guideline discusses the perks of becoming Emeriti. Dr. Heagy pointed out that nominations from the department should include the purpose of nomination and any initial considerations regarding office, lab, and faculty space and usage, as well as documenting the department votes. This guideline also discussed who is eligible and loss of privileges or status for Emeriti.

Dr. Heagy moved to accept this. Motion passed unanimously.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, December 4, 2018

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Academic Freedom and Tenure – Mike Heagy

Dr. Heagy stated that the goal of this committee was to review, update and approve an entire updated policy and procedure for appointment to promotion and tenure.

Previously Section II Policy for hiring faculty with tenure has been approved at the April 2018 Faculty Senate meeting. We also have approved the criteria for tenure, so the procedure section is what we will be discussing today.

Dr. Heagy discussed and highlighted several sections under Part E – Final Tenure Review: Part 3 Internal Review was added.

This involves letters from the tenured faculty as well as the campus will be invited. These are letters for internal review, but the committee is still excluding letters solicited by the candidate. Friendly amendment made was that the candidate can ask for letters but that they can't be collected by the candidate. Amendment was included and approved.

Part 4 External Review

From the previous meeting, the committee made some clarifications:

- Typically the requested review letters go to tenured faculty only. The committee added research staff and other professionals within this criteria.
- The last sentence states that the collected letters will include at least four outside reviewers.
- The committee chair needs to inform outside reviewers of the criteria and procedure for evaluating candidates.

Part 5 Committee Recommendation

Committee will meet with candidate before submitting the final recommendation by Dec. 15.

Friendly amendment was made to change the date from December 15 to January 15 for when the department chairs submit to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Amendment was included and approved.

Dr. Heagy moved to approve the entire policy. Motion passed unanimously.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, November 6, 2018

3. Senate Committee Reports

c. Academic Freedom and Tenure – Mike Heagy

Dr. Heagy reminded the senate that the committee has worked on:

- criteria sections B&C of Tenure & promotion Policy
- Research Professor
- Hiring of tenured faculty and status

Dr. Heagy stated that there are still several points to work on regarding the procedures of the tenure and promotion policy and the point of today is to work on some of the more contentious points and get them finalized.

Dr. Heagy discussed several procedures.

C Annual Tenure Review

The AFT committee proposes several modifications to the timing and distribution of the faculty appraisal form. The candidate and the entire tenure committee will receive a copy of the form by May 1st; thus providing feedback in time to adjust plans for the remainder of the year. In addition, the candidate may submit a memo in response to the committee's report to accompany the committee's report to the Department Chair and Vice President for Academic Affairs, by February 15.

E. Final Tenure Review

The AFT committee proposed adding: "Letters solicited by the candidate are not appropriate to be included." The committee is discouraging letters within the campus. The candidate should not solicit a faculty member on campus to submit a letter with their packet. It should come through to the committee directly. There is still the opportunity for all tenured faculty members within the department to comment on the faculty up for tenure.

Further discussion was held and some clarification was suggested for this statement.

External Review

The AFT committee proposes no less than 5 letters from distinguished outside reviewers. The committee did research and five was common among other universities. This does raise the bar but the committee felt that it was appropriate. Distinguished can be (should be?) defined by the committee

The external reviewers should include appropriate balance of tenured faculty members, research staff, and other professionals. The committee felt that they should broaden the scope of the external reviewers such as the Bureau, PRRC, etc. There is not a limit on this, and it is up to the committee. The phrase “conflict of interest” between reviewer and candidate was suggested to be revised to different language.

The AFT committee proposes “Committees should include the names of the contacted reviewers, their respective departments, and information on acceptances, declines, non-response, along with any other pertinent information from potential reviewers.” Discussion was held that some people can just be busy and don’t have time to do a letter; it doesn’t mean they don’t want to help the candidate. The tenure committee purely just records and documents that the committee made effort and this can also protect the candidate. A strong suggestion was made to remove this sentence from the document.

Dr. Heagy stated that the committee will review the comments and will try to have an updated draft in time for the next Senate meeting.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, October 2, 2018

3. Senate Committee Reports

b. Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee – Mike Heagy

Dr. Heagy stated that several pieces of this policy have been approved at past meetings. This essentially is a shoring up of policy comments, mechanics, and more rigor in the overall procedure.

Part A has a change that asks that Department Chairs not be members within their respective department. However, in some circumstances it may be necessary for a Chair to serve.

Part C has some substantial changes including a meeting will be held prior to the first submission of the tenure candidates review. Committee meetings should be held well before Jan.15 so that there is time for the candidate to prepare.

Part E has a new statement which reads “Letters solicited by the candidate are not appropriate to be included.”

There were also substantial changes on the external review. We are now requiring no less than five outside reviewers. Some guidelines were given for conflicts of interest. Also, committees should indicate in their recommendation how many re-viewers were contacted and how many declined to review. If the committee has to contact twice as many potential reviewers as usual that may signal peer concern about quality of the candidate’s work and should be noted with an explanation.

Several changes were also made to the committee recommendation including that the committee should meet with the candidate before submitting their final recommendation.

Dr. Mike Hargather, who is on the committee, stated that these changes were made to enhance transparency and opportunities to the candidate.

The committee was asked to provide a template letter that can be sent to others to help get the outside letters. Also, to add language specifically that allows the candidate to provide a list of outside reviewers. It does state “may allow” and maybe we change it to should or will be asked. Another example was to have some of the reviewers from the candidate and some not. It was decided that we are not at the point where we are ready to make a motion for this. Send suggestions to the committee.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 3, 2018

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee – Mike Heagy

Dr. Mike Heagy first discussed the Hiring Policy. He stated that based on feed-back, the committee reconvened and made some minor changes. Under Associate Professor Rank, reference letters have been changed to recommendation letters. Under Full Professor Rank, “tenured faculty” has been changed to “full professor” and upon department approval, the hiring committee will compile all documentation, including the department’s “final decision” has been changed to “recommendation”.

Dr. Heagy moved to accept these changes. Motion passed.

Dr. Heagy discussed the policy on research faculty and staff. The idea is that the committee is stipulating three main categories.

1. Research Associate, Senior Research Associate. Research associates are generally post-doctoral students. They are hired solely at the discretion of their research sponsor. They would not vote in departments or faculty senate.

2. Research Scientists (Assistant, Associate, Full). These hires are those who are still dependent on external research funding. They are expected to have a 3-to-12 month soft-money salary. They are not expected to teach courses and they would not vote in departments or faculty senate.

3. Research Professor (Assistant, Associate, Full). Research Professors are independently funded researchers who are closely associated with an academic department. They are expected to obtain external research funding. They have obtained a 2/3 vote from the department. They are encouraged to teach and they have the right to vote within the department and at faculty senate. They can get promoted through the criteria stipulated throughout the document.

Dr. Heagy moved to approve this policy. Motion passed with one nay.

Friendly amendments were made. On the first page, “post-doctoral students” has been changed to “post-doctoral scholars”. Under “Duties and Responsibilities” on the first page, the last sentence dealing with Senate voting has been deleted. On p. 2 under “Duties and Responsibilities” for Research Scientists the last sentence, dealing with senate voting, has been removed. On p. 5 under “Duties and Responsibilities” for Research Professors the last sentence, dealing with senate voting, has been removed.

Dr. Wells stated that typically research faculty will often get paid more than tenure-track faculty. Dr. Wells stated that we have faculty on campus that are exceptional at research and we don’t want to lose them. A way to hold on to them would be to structure their contract, change their title, retain tenure in their department, but then issue a 12 month contract where we change their duties and they can earn more money funded by their grant or contract. Discussion was held that

this poli-cy does not have tenure track positions and it could create confusion if put into it. It should be discussed and possibly be put into the policy on tenure and promo-tion. We also need to discuss a different situation such as tenured faculty who steps into an administration role and then returns.

Dr. Heagy stated that faculty were requesting an extended tenure clock. If we do pursue this, we are finding that with longer tenure periods there is a significant mid-probationary review. At the end of three years, there is a serious review. If it's not going well, it would be a hard 3rd year and the candidate would know that they are not recommended for tenure. If it is going well, the committee can recommend an abbreviated tenure clock and recommend early tenure for the candidate.

The general sense is that we should keep doing the annual reviews and have the committees get more serious prior to the last review.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, March 6, 2018

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee – Mike Heagy

Dr. Heagy stated that the latest policy to come out of the Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee addresses hiring faculty with tenure at an Associate Professor rank or Full Professor Rank. The candidate would submit a CV and full tenure packet or professorship promotion packet. The hiring committee will review and provide a letter to the department for recommending tenure or Full Professor with tenure. Dr. Heagy stated that the committee did look over a number of other university policies regarding this.

Discussion was held that the hiring committees would often have assistant professors that would be making decisions for associate professors or a full professor with tenure. However, they would not be able to serve on internal tenure committees. It was stated that it isn't just the hiring committee, the Chair, Deans, and VPs are also reviewing this. Additionally, the hiring committee is not making the decision, they are making a recommendation. Dr. Sue Bilek suggested that the promotion committee would be another option to review before the final decision if they get the rank of full professor.

An additional comment was made that the policy should state that the status needs to be a full professor at their current institute to get the rank of full professor.

Dr. Sonnenfeld moved to refer back to the committee, seconded by Dr. Borchers. They need some time to take the comments into account. Motion passed.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, February 6, 2018

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee – Mike Heagy

Dr. Mike Heagy stated that primarily two issues came up at the Council of Chairs. The first, why doesn't our Tenure & Promotion policy match the PAR (teaching, research, and service with a 40:40:20 ratio) by being broken into the three similar categories? The Chairs decided to combine sections C&D under Service. This has been changed to C.1 and C.2.

The second issue was concerning CLASS and how faculty in this department have a different set of criteria for tenure. A statement has since been added to state “This evidence must be evaluated in the context of differing levels of external support in different disciplines and differing disciplinary expectations of scholarly activity.”

The committee will be looking at procedures next including if this new policy would apply to faculty currently in the tenure and promotion process.

Dr. Heagy moved to accept this change. Motion passed.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, December 5, 2017

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee – Mike Heagy

The committee received a number of comments and changes from Dr. Wells at Council of Chairs and from Dr. Tom Kieft. Dr. Heagy informed the Faculty Senate how the committee is tackling this. They have broken it down into policy and procedure. Next year, at the Council of Chairs, they will primarily be discussing sections B and C of Policy. Professional reputation and service will also be looked into more.

Discussion was held on the length of the tenure review process. Dr. Peter Mozley stated that Dr. Sue Bilek (Academic Freedom and Tenure Chair) had proposed changes to the timeline, which were approved by the Senate. These would be incorporated into the document if they are consistent with the other changes. Dr. Doug Wells stated that given the revisions underway, we are using the correctly published deadlines. Dr. Heagy stated the committee is considering lengthening the probation period. Dr. Wells stated that the intent of this change is to make it more favorable for the candidate. It would be up to the candidate if they want to come up later.

Dr. Heagy asked the Faculty Senate to review and send any additional comments to him.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Wednesday, December 6, 2016

3. Senate Committee Reports

b. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee – Sue Bilek

Dr. Bilek introduced two proposed changes to the policy on tenure and promotion: 1) A change of language regarding an annual meeting with a faculty member’s tenure committee, and 2) A suggestion for a more timely return of tenure candidate’s probation appraisal form to provide the individual with more time to address it. Dr. Bilek noted times the appraisal was made in January, but did not reach the candidate until November. Modifying the form’s appendix would make its language consistent with the proposed changes. (See attachment.) She then made a motion to adopt the changes. Several friendly amendments were introduced as to use of the verbs should, shall or will. Dr. Borchers moved to amend the original motion to substitute “should” for “will.” Dr. Michael Hargather seconded the motion, which failed on a 13 (yes), 15 (no) vote. A motion to table also failed. When called for the question, the original motion passed unanimously.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Thursday, September 1, 2016

2. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee – Susan Bilek

Dr. Susan Bilek announced that there were two recommendations that the committee wanted to bring forward. This would be some recommended changes in the language in the official document for procedures for appointment, promotion, and tenure. This would help faculty get feedback and recommendations back in a timely manner.

There currently is no language in the policy for when the form gets returned to the candidate.

The first recommendation is to put language in the policy that requests that this appraisal form gets returned to the candidate and committee chair by May 1st.

The second recommendation is regarding the meeting between the committee and the candidate. This recommendation is to change the language to strengthen this to each year instead of the first year.

Dr. Susan Bilek moved to approve this change, seconded by Dr. Hamdy Soliman.

Dr. Snezna Rogelj would like the committee to meet and not just the committee chair as stated in Section II-C. Dr. Snezna Rogelj moved to amend the statement, seconded by Dr. Hamdy Soliman.

Dr. Brian Borchers moved to refer this back to the committee to consider additional language changes, seconded by Dr. Hamdy Soliman. Motion passed with one no.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 7, 2015

3. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee – Michael Heagy

This committee was charged with the responsibility of looking over the Employee handbook. Dr. Tom Kieft posted some of the hot button issues last month that were addressed and approved by the Faculty Senate. The approvals were submitted to Human Resources, where JoAnn Salome is working on incorporating those into the handbook. The committee has now been working on comments that were put into this handbook. The Parental Leave policy is being discussed, the Benefits committee is looking into that. We still need improvements and updates. An Intellectual Property ad hoc committee is being set up.

The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee received some recommendations on our guidelines. There are a few other points on disciplinary actions that are getting sent to Human Resources. A revised version will be coming out this week and will be published for everyone to review before the next Board of Regents meeting.

Academic Standards and Admissions Committee

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 3, 2018

3. Senate Committee Reports

Every semester, the committee reviews appeals for students who have been denied admissions. In addition, the committee had cause to look at a proposed catalog change. The strategic plan requires us to look at our admissions criteria so that we can focus on students. The retention committee did a study and recommended raising the admissions criteria basically to deny entrance to students who would place into Math 101. They have formulated a specify change to the wording of the catalog. Incoming first time undergraduates would place into at least Math 103. Incoming students who don't meet the criteria have a low graduation rate roughly 12% compared to 50% for those who do meet the new criteria. The committee worries that we may be harming these students as they leave on suspension and have lost the lottery scholarship.

President Wells stated that we need to be careful as we are a public entity. Therefore, we have an obligation to the citizens of this state. There are many universities that admit these students into a general science/studies program and then mentor them to see if they can move on. It was also stated that this change will impact the dual credit students as they have to meet the entrance requirements of the class.

On behalf of the committee, Dr. Lisa Young moved to accept this change. Motion passed with several nays.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, November 1, 2016

6. Old Business

a. Withdrawal without Prejudice – Lisa Young/Melissa Jaramillo-Fleming ASAC brought a proposal forward last month that was deferred back to this meeting.

Dr. Lisa Young discussed the issue in which students will take the final exam and then submit a Withdrawal without Prejudice. The language in the catalog is vague regarding when these submissions should be sent. The recommendation is the catalog language should be more precise. The proposed changes were the petitions should have a deadline of Friday prior to the final exam.

Melissa Jaramillo-Fleming discussed that she makes the final decision but will work with Academic Affairs on unique cases. Grade extension can also be given in these cases. Melissa stated she has roughly five to ten students per semester submit a request. The student needs to write a petition letter, provide official documents for funeral or medical documentation, or supporting documents. The reason could be due to a tragedy or hardship.

A friendly amendment was accepted by the committee chair. It will state “In rare cases, the Dean of Students will consider petitions submitted past the deadline.”

Motion passed after calling a vote by show of hands. 12 were against.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, October 4, 2016

Report of Council of chairs

d. Withdrawal Policy – Dr. Lisa Young

Dr. Lisa Young reported that the intention of this policy is for cases such as a death in the family, the student can then request for Melissa Jaramillo-Fleming to issue a Withdrawal without Prejudice (WO). However, students are staying in the class even up to the point of taking the final exam and then requesting a WO. The catalog wording for the deadline is vague. The committee has proposed to add the Friday before the start of final exams to the catalog. If the student is doing fine up until the very end, the student can do a grade extension.

Dr. Lisa Young noted that Melissa was looking for guidance from the faculty. After a spirited discussion, faculty thought it would be best to have Melissa come to the next meeting to provide more information.

Dr. Brian Borchers moved to table to a time certain, the next meeting and have Melissa Jaramillo-Fleming invited to give statistics, seconded by Dr. Hamdy Soliman. Motion passed with two no's.

ADA Committee

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, February 4, 2014

c. ADA- Dave Westpfahl

Reported at the beginning of the year that the door actuators being turned off, this has stopped. By acclamation, Dr. Westpfahl was given an informal award for the most succinct committee report of all time.

Ad Hoc Calendar Committee

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 2, 2019

3. Reports of Senate Special Committees

a. Calendar Committee Report – Bill Stone

Dr. Stone discussed the academic calendar. He stated that it is one week shorter during the spring semester than it is in the fall semester. At this point, the committee is not recommending the full week off for Thanksgiving. The committee needs to look into if they can keep the food service for those in the dorms open during this break.

Dr. Stone moved to approve the schedule. Motion passed with one nay.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, February 5, 2019

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Calendar Committee Report – William Stone

D. Bill Stone stated the Committee took the current calendar and moved it forward as a starting point. In the fall semester there are 16 weeks of class with a Monday, Thursday, and two Friday's off (35 days for MWF and 31 for TTR). During the spring semester there are also 16 weeks of class with one week off for Spring Break. Additionally, there is a Monday, Thursday and two Friday's off. Fall semester has exactly one more week of classes. There have been various suggestions with the most popular decision to take off a week for Thanksgiving.

Email feedback to Bill Stone, Kevin Wedeward, or Samantha Nelson. The Committee hopes to come back and be ready to adopt next time.

Ad Hoc Student Evaluation Committee

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 2, 2019

3. Reports of Senate Special Committees

b. Evaluations Committee Report – Michelle Creech-Eakman/Peter Mozley

Dr. Mozley discussed the Teaching Evaluation Policies and Procedure.

Dr. Mozley discussed Item 4. He stated that in exceptional circumstances we may need to identify a student. An example may be if there are threats of violence.

Dr. Mozley proposed that we change this sentence to read “Instructors shall not have access to student identities even after final grades have been posted, nor will department chairs. However, in exceptional circumstances, such as a threat of violence, a student’s identity may be revealed.”

Dr. Mozley moved to accept this policy. Motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Creech-Eakman discussed the course evaluation proposed questions. She stated that many hours were spent on these questions. The only old question that was kept is question number one. The other seven questions are what the committee is proposing that we do in the future. These will be the standard questions that every class gets with three optional additional comments. The first question was discussed in length. It reads “Think about what the instructor has done to plan and deliver this course. Please rate the overall quality of instruction in this course.” Dr. Taffeta Elliott stated that as a committee they wanted to put context in there because quality can be interpreted in a variety of ways by students. This was trying to be an accessible way of expressing this.

Friendly amendment was made and seconded to delete the first sentence and change it to read “Please rate the overall quality of course and instruction.” The amendment failed to pass. The committee stated that double-barreled questions should not be used. This question really needs to focus on instruction.

After further discussion, and realization that the words in blue font will not be shown to the students, a vote was called.

Dr. Creech-Eakman moved to accept these questions and start using them in the summer. Motion passed with one nay.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, December 4, 2018

7. New Business

c. Revised Course Evaluation Policy - Michelle Creech-Eakman/Peter Mozley

Dr. Mozley stated that the current policy is out of date as it focuses on paper evaluations and needs to be revised. The plan is to have the committee continue to work on this policy as there will be further revision as we work things out. However, Dr. Mozley would like to vote on this policy today as our current policy is out of date.

Dr. Mozley made some changes to the currently policy. He removed the wording of paper files. He added a section indicating that instructors may add course specific questions. Faculty can

come up with less than three questions related to their course contact. Also, Dr. Mozley added that these evaluations will be made available during the last two weeks for classes.

Several friendly amendments were made:

- Change during intersession courses, the forms should be made available the last two days of class.
- Add after each teaching instructor “including teaching assistants” as appropriate.
- Add tenure & promotion committee will also be given the summary information as part of the general evaluation of courses and performances.

Peter moved to accept these changes to the policy, seconded by Dr. Sonnenfeld. Quorum was no longer reached and unable to vote.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, October 3, 2017

3. Senate Committee Reports

b. Electronic Evaluations Ad Hoc Committee – Michelle Creech-Eakman

Dr. Michelle Creech-Eakman stated that the committee was asked to look at the evaluations earlier this year in March. They were specifically charged with three questions. 1. Should NMT move from paper course evaluation to electronic evaluations? 2. Is there a need to change the type and content of the course evaluation questions being asked? 3. Could the committee recommend one or more tools to consider if we do recommend changing the current system?

The committee came up with a series of recommendations. The first recommendation which was unanimous by the committee is to move to an electronic evaluation system. The second recommendation is to extend the time. The committee recommends a second ad-hoc committee (with some membership in common with the current committee, but most membership derived from people uniquely interested in the evaluation question content) be developed to study the types of new questions to be implemented. Implementation of new questions should be attempted after an initial roll-out of a new evaluation system has been reasonably debugged. The third recommendation from the committee is to consider products from Evaluation Kit and Smart Evaluations to determine which one will work better for the Institute. Once an initial determination has been made, the committee can work with NMT’s Purchasing Office to put a contract into place for an initial period of a few to several semesters, at which point in time we recommend reevaluation of the product to determine if it meets all the needs of the Institute.

Dr. Michelle Creech-Eakman moved to accept these three recommendations. Motion passed with 2 nays.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, March 7, 2017

4. Report of Council of Chairs – Douglas Wells

c. Course Evaluations – Tom Kieft

Dr. Kieft stated that an ad hoc senate committee has been initiated with Dr. Michelle Creech-Eakman as Chair. The committee will revisit the paper versus online course evaluations. The committee was also be evaluating the wording.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, October 6, 2015

2. Ad hoc committee on course evaluations report – Wes Cook

Dr. Wes Cook announced that the Ad Hoc Committee took a look at the existing course evaluations. The committee's findings were to maintain the current paper and pencil forms during instructional time in the final week of classes. The committee looked at the security to go to an electronic form and the committee feels the paper method is still the most secure. Also, changes to the existing survey are: Rewording of the second prompt from "appropriateness of course content (coverage, breadth, depth) to "Course content reflects course description (coverage, breadth, depth)". Delete eighth prompt "Quality of the textbook". Add prompt in the eighth position "The instructor displayed interest in student learning. The Ad-Hoc committee disbands.

Dr. Sally Pias noted that the paper format requires the administrative secretary to spend many hours typing the comments. If the privacy is somewhat compromised by going to an electronic system, we might have a much higher degree of usefulness. Dr. Cook noted that the response rate significantly decreases and results are also polarized if the evaluation is given outside of class. Dr. Lorie Liebrock noted that NMT does not require students to have a laptop for class and therefore cannot ask for evaluations to be administrated online while in class.

Dr. Michelle Creech-Eakman noted the idea that students cannot get their final grades until they completed the survey. Dr. Cook explained that the committee discussed this and was against the idea.

Dr. Cook motioned that the procedure for the course evaluations be approved. Dr. Hamdy Soliman motioned to refer back to the Ad Hoc Committee. Dr. Michelle Creech-Eakman seconded. Few opposed. Motion passed

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, February 3, 2015

Senate committee reports

1. Ad hoc committee to revise student evaluation form – Wesley Cook

Dr. Wesley Cook reported that the teaching coffee hour came across some issues regarding evaluations that were better suited for an ad hoc committee. This would be a proposed ad hoc committee that would evaluate the existing evaluations and update them to the way things are now. Some suggestions have been to include some form of technology rather than doing it through Scantron. The nomination committee has submitted the following member/individuals for approval:

Elizabeth Kramer-Simpson (CLASS Department)

Kevin Kirk (Biology)

Tie Wei (Mechanical Engineering)

Wesley Cook (Civil and Environmental Engineering)

Ex-Officio Members:

Associate VP for Academic Affairs (Mary Dezember)

Dean of Students (Melissa Jaramillo-Fleming)

Director of the Office for Student Learning (Lisa Majkowski)

Dr. Wesley Cook proposed that Dr. Iver Davidson (ACT) also be added to the committee to be included on any type of technology assessment that is employed through the new evaluations.

Dr. Fred Phillips seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

George Becker asked if the committee is just looking at the content of the evaluation or at the process. Surely, other schools have an automated system where a student can log on and evaluate. Dr. Wesley Cook stated that our Distance Education does have a form that is sent out via email where they are asked to respond to it. Dr. Iver Davidson stated that most schools use some electronic form. The problem is trouble that the level of feedback for responses is low. One thing we can look at is continuing to have the evaluations filled out in class by using an iPad or smart phone that we can provide. Dr. Wesley Cook noted that the intent of the committee is to more broadly look at the evaluations of the teaching. Dr. Mary Dezember noted that they are also looking at how the students can be taught to take this seriously. There is a policy and the committee is reviewing it. Dr. Lorie Liebrock stated that 25% of our students are Graduate students and should be included as ex-officio members. Dr. Wesley Cook noted that Dr. Bob Cormack has been consulted as he was the original creator of the survey.

Ad hoc General Education Committee

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, September 5, 2017

3. Senate Committee Reports

b. General Education Ad Hoc Committee – Steve Simpson

Dr. Steve Simpson gave an update on some matters pertaining to the statewide General Education overhaul. Dr. Simpson showed the most recent version of a general education model that was put out by the committee. Dr. Simpson has 3 recommendations of what he would like to send on behalf of the NMT faculty senate to Dan Howard and members of the Statewide General Education Committee. The 3 things that they saw as potential problems were: undistributed credits, lack of integration of meta majors, and student perception of the general education skills. The NMT Ad Hoc General Education committee, with the approval of the NMT Faculty Senate, recommends three changes/actions:

1. Integrate the meta major concept into the general education model.
2. Include the remaining 9 credits as part of the meta majors, rather than leaving these credits to be distributed at the discretion of individual institutions.
3. Solicit more feedback from student groups at colleges and universities around New Mexico to discern whether these changes are appropriately addressing problems with transferring credits (rather than exacerbating them), and whether the rationale for the skills is understandable to students.

Dr. Steve Simpson moved to have approval to send this as a message from NMT, seconded by Dr. Richard Sonnenfeld. Motion passed.

Dr. Sally Pias made a friendly amendment in addition to soliciting more feedback from students, to add feedback from advising or registrar personnel.

Dr. Simpson also announced that Dan Howard will be coming to NMT next month.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 4, 2017

3. Senate Committee Reports

b. Gen Ed Committee – Steve Simpson

Dr. Simpson gave an update on what is going on with Gen Ed. As a reminder at the February Faculty Senate meeting, we discussed with President Wells about taking what had been a task force and making it an ad hoc faculty senate committee. There was a Senate Bill 103 that did pass the House and the Senate and signed by the Governor. Dr. Simpson noted that he provided two versions of it as additions were made to it. President Wells stated that Secretary Damron is well aware of the concerns and the implementation process of this. We will have great input and opportunity to do that. Dr. Doug Wells has already sent out a memo to this committee stating that we need to have faculty senate involvement and we need to start moving along this line. President Wells stated that we will have a major voice in making sure that the implementation does what we need it to do.

Dr. Simpson stated that the major points in this bill were kept general with the idea that the particulars would be dealt with through the rules and not written in the law. We still have the ability to work on these. The bill calls for the creation of 15 credit-hour “meta majors”, though it does not provide details for how this will happen. The bill requires that equivalent courses given a common course number be accepted by receiving institutions in the state and that “courses

taken as part of an approved meta-major or transfer module [...] be accepted to meet lower division graduation requirements of a degree-granting program to which the metamajor or transfer module articulate”. There were some red flags, particularly as it pertains to math. Also, they set the required General Education credits at no less than 15 credits for an associate’s degree and no less than 30 credits for a bachelor’s degree.

Dr. Simpson stated that something the committee was charged with was responding to the Gen Ed Model that was on the NMSU website. They haven’t responded yet because they are waiting for a different model that was recently voted on to become available. Once it is available, they have added a specific place for faculty senates to respond and give an institutional response.

Dr. Simpson stated that the ad hoc committee was formed, but faculty senate didn’t approve the charge:

To review proposals for the revision of statewide General Education requirements and provide an institutional response representing the position of New Mexico Tech’s Faculty Senate and Administration. To oversee the implementation of changes to statewide General Education at New Mexico Tech in consultation with Department Chairs, Deans, the Faculty Senate, and the VPAA and AVPAA.

This committee reports to both the New Mexico Tech Faculty Senate and the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Dr. Simpson moved to approve these as the charges, seconded by Dr. Borchers. Motion passed.

Benefits Committee

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, October 3, 2017

3. Senate Committee Reports

c. Benefits Committee – Bruce Harrison

Dr. Bruce Harrison discussed the benefit package in general. About five or six years ago, the administration started looking around at different health coverage options. It was a complicated process as each plan was vastly different. The key thing that the committee felt at that time was that whichever company we chose, we would still be the NMT plan within that group. We need better pools. The current administration is looking into alternatives. It is something that cannot happen overnight.

NMT pays on average about 60% of the health care costs. The number of people in the plan has gone down over the past five years. The plan costs have also gone down. This year there will be no increase in premiums for employees. More information will be available online.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, November 1, 2016

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Benefits Committee – Bruce Harrison

Dr. Bruce Harrison announced the premium increase for next year will be 1%. Overall the trust funds are in good shape. We have started to develop a reserve to help weather these fluctuations. A Benefits Fair is coming up in November. Meritain representatives will be available to answer questions.

There have been questions in the past if we should remain as a self-funded organization. We will remain for the next year at the very least. In terms of controlling cost of our health care, one thing we have control of is our own health. Interactive healthcare will be available by appointment to give a blood test. They can provide information to us on our individual health. The main idea is to find any conditions at an early stage. This of course will reduce the cost of any long term care. Dr. Harrison urged everyone to register for a blood test

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, October 6, 2015

3. Benefits committee – Bruce Harrison

Dr. Bruce Harrison gave an update on Meritain who gave a presentation at NMT several weeks ago. Plan costs charts were shown. Plan costs for 2015 were better this year than the last three years for the cost per individual. The biggest item is that we paid off the two millions dollars that we owed. Wellness health evaluations are continuing. For the first time we are changing the credit that you receive whether or not you make the health goals or not. First time participation in 2015 results in \$250.00 credit per person on the plan deductible for the 2015 calendar year. If you meet your health goals, this will result in \$500.00 credit. If you do not meet your health goals, this will result in \$100.00 credit.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, November 4, 2014

Benefits (Bruce Harrison)

Dr. Bruce Harrison reported on the benefits committee. He noted one thing that has changed is that we now have an Institute-wide benefits committee. There are more representatives from the staff. The committee has been meeting with the leadership team on a regular basis. The Benefits Fair will be November 12th. The current proposed changes to the health plan will be to discontinue plan 1, which had the smallest enrollment. It cost more to run than it was bringing in.

Plan 2 and Plan 3 will have an 8 percent premium increase. Maximum out of pocket has been increased to the Federal maximum - \$6,600 individual / \$13,200 family. Implement a separate Out of Pocket maximum for Prescription Drug co-pays at \$3,000 individual /\$ 6,000 family. There are changes to the NMT contribution vs. Employee contribution, previous percentages are in parentheses:

Salary Brackets	% NMT Contribution	% Employee Contribution
\$15,000 – 19,999	80% (70%)	20% (30%)
\$20,000 – 24,999	70% (65%)	30% (35%)
\$25,000 and greater	60% (60%)	40% (40%)

Dr. Bruce Harrison encouraged the senate to attend the Wellness Health evaluation. November 5th is the last day to register for a blood test at NM Tech. Employees and their spouses participating in the wellness program will receive \$250 each as credit on the plan deductible for calendar year. Dr. Bruce Harrison noted that they would like to catch illnesses at an early stage to help with the cost. Presentations will be at the benefits fair.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 1, 2014

b. Benefits Committee – J.B.. Harrison – Bruce Harrison gave a presentation on the update of Meritain, tech’s health insurance program plan costs. The number of members, the number of medical claims, and the cost per member has decreased in the last year. Healthiest people made up the largest numberof the sample. Healthy people will be rewarded with reduced cost. He mentioned that there will be webinars available on the website, monthly presentations at the library and e-mails to staff and faculty.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, March 4, 2014

b. Benefits Committee – Dr. Harrison. Postponed.

Budget and Research Committee

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, March 7, 2017

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Budget and Research Committee – Ken Minschwaner

Dr. Minschwaner stated that the committee is looking into the overhead budget, the revenue streams coming in by unit and the expenditures going out. They are working on this with Emma Aafloy but it is complicated. The committee is also looking at the I&G budget. At the end of the semester, they would like to have this information posted with some explanation to it.

There have also been several requests for the committee to look into the benefits for research staff. They seem to vary month to month and they seem to be high. Most likely, the committee will be working on this on a parallel track. The hope is to come up with recommendations on where resources could be applied to different areas. The purpose isn't to nitpick but to get an overall picture and then possibly make broad recommendations

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Friday, May 13, 2016

2. Short announcements

2. Budget & Research Committee - Ken Minschwaner

Dr. Ken Minschwaner reported that the budget and research committee were looking into how the endowment accounts were managed and how the investment income was distributed last year. All the accounts have been correctly adjusted and there is now a mechanism in place for continuing fiscal management of the endowment accounts

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, February 3, 2015

3. Budget and Research Committee – Ken Minschwaner

Dr. Ken Minschwaner noted that this report is mostly informational.

The committee has worked out the part-time pay guidelines. It was presented to the Faculty Senate last spring where it was defeated. It is streamlined now. There is no summer salary for faculty. This was presented to Council of Chairs where for the most part everyone liked it. The committee did have to add one sentence, “We recognize that the state funding formula provides for variations in funding between disciplines, and that these differences are important for providing the resources necessary to offer courses over the spectrum of degree programs; nevertheless, these guidelines for part-time instructor compensation are designed for fairness and simplicity of implementation.”

There is a new code of Federal Regulations that is coming out. Most of this will not impact us. They are trying to make the guidelines for the administration with the proposal process uniform with all the agencies. Requirements for prior approval are increasing. For example, if you are asking for a 12 month no cost extension. Some of the requirements may change. The committee worked on overhead funds and the breakdown of sources of revenue and expenditures. Looking at the endowment accounts is ongoing. The committee just met with Lonnie Marque and he believes things will be straightened out within a month or two. Research infrastructure and support is the highest priority. The committee is looking at ways to improve the support infrastructure for finding grant opportunities, proposal preparation and submission, and overall support for research through appropriate staffing of personnel and research equipment. Contact the committee with any questions.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, November 4, 2014

Committee report

Dr. Ken Minschwaner noted this is a preliminary report. The committee was asked to review and report on budget allocations. They are currently in the process of reviewing the structuring and administration of endowment accounts as they have been approached with questions.

Lonnie Marquez has provided support. It is important to understand what the return is on endowment accounts. Endowment funds can either be set up publicly through the State Investment Council, or privately through the NMT Research Foundation. The donor, in conjunction with the NMT Advancement Office, makes the decision of whether to use the State or the Foundation. To date, no funds have ever been transferred from the State to the Foundation, or vice versa. The Langmuir Endowment is an exception to the above policy; it is managed by Smith-Barney. NM Tech and the Foundation do not assess service fees for managing account, however, the SIC and brokerage firms do. Investments will be managed on a total return basis with 4.5 percent of the average five year market value.

The committee is continuing to review these specific issues. Dr. Ken Minschwaner explained that they are working with Lonnie Marquez, but it may take several months to sort this out. Dr. Tom Engler asked if it was possible to accelerate this in any way. Dr. Richard Sonnenfeld noted that the committee has been working really well with Lonnie Marquez. He noted that Lonnie Marquez likes written questions. If there is something specific that you would like to know send an email to the committee. They will make a request to Lonnie Marquez to expedite this.

New Business

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, February 4, 2014

a. Proposed Salary Schedule for Non-Tenured and Summer Faculty -Budget Committee

Budget and research committee met in Mid-December and over the break, to address the proposed change to the part-time salary issue. Gathered supporting documentation in response, and a resolution was drafted. Then the President withdrew the proposed change, to have the budget committee- or other representatives, work with Shari on the concerns.

Mary Dezember spoke saying that the people who are working already would be grandfathered in and not have their pay cut regardless of new salary schedule adopted.

Issue with the schedule that is addressed in the resolution: when and how the schedule was presented. I.e.: at the end-of-semester, when there was not time to respond.

Mary Dezember addressed this by saying that business is being conducted differently now; there will be time for discussion. It was suggested a document be produced as to what the objective of the new pay schedule is seeking to address.

Dr. Dezember again stated that the Council of Chairs meetings would be much more discussion oriented, so that when things are in the works they will be brought forward at that point.

Discussion is going to be more inclusive under current Academic Affairs leadership.

Computing on Campus

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, December 1, 2015

2. Computing on Campus Committee – Brian Borchers

Dr. Brian Borchers reported on the computing on campus committee. Estimated conversion to Google email is now set for Spring Break 2016. Degree Works will be functional by the end of this semester for faculty. ITC advises to hold off with update to Windows 10 until software and functions have been tested under Windows 10. We are working with ITC and ACT to see if we can get it to where there is only one number that you have to call that will deal with a problem and correctly route the problem to who can help fix it. They are working on a single sign-on so you won't have to have multiple usernames and passwords. A potential move of the TCC to Gold from Speare has not been fully approved due to budget for all of the remodeling. Work is ongoing with Workflow and plagiarism detection software. We are doing that now for Master's Thesis and PhD dissertations. The goal is to also make it available for checking student term papers and study papers

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, September 1, 2015

3. Senate Committee Reports

1. Computing on Campus/CTC Committee – Joe Franklin

Joe Franklin gave an update on the conversion of email. The email on campus is being consolidated into the Google environment. The status of this is that there is a compliance issue by the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR). The essence of this is that you can't have ITAR regulated email on the server outside of the United States. Google servers are not guaranteed to be in the United States. A separate on-campus email server will be created for ITAR-related business. A training program will also be created on how to handle ITAR-related issues

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Senate committee reports

1. Computing on Campus Committee (Jun Zheng)

Dr. Jun Zheng reported that the committee has status updates of the new email system. Google Apps for Education has been chosen as the new email system. The conversion will be tested out on the PRRC first. If the testing on the PRRC goes well, the TCC email will be converted sometime during the spring semester or during the break after the spring semester. The admin.nmt.edu conversion would be done after the TCC conversion. For end user, you should point your email software at one of the Google's servers instead of mailhost.nmt.edu. All of the emails that users have on mailhost.nmt.edu will be automatically moved over to the new server. If you have local copies of email in your PC or smart phone, you will be able to upload it to Google Apps for Education or leave it where it is. If you use the web interface, it will look like Gmail. When the conversion happens you will gain access to the Google calendar

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, November 4, 2014

Computing on Campus report (Jun Zheng)

Dr. Jun Zheng reported on the following items:

A campus-wide technology committee consisting of both faculty and staff has been formed to prioritize and solve important technology issues.

The system Moodle will be terminated at the end of Spring 2015.

The subscription of Starfish will be over by the end of this year. VPAA will make a decision to continue it or not.

Argos has been purchased and the installation date to begin has been set for February 2, 2015.

ITC is collecting feedback from SGA and GSA about email service. The faculty voted for Google last Spring.

Dr. Brian Borchers indicated that the cost of Starfish is: \$20,000 for undergraduate and \$30,000 for both graduate and undergraduate.

Dr. Iver Davidson noted that ACT will handle the transition from Moodle to Canvas.

Dr. Lorie Liebrock made a brief announcement that tomorrow (5 November) is the last day for grade changes.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 1, 2014

5. Committee Reports :

a. Computing on Campus (new mail systems) – J. Zheng – Jun Zheng presented two options on software for tech. Google Apps and MS365. Google Apps integrates with Canvas, which is what Distance Ed is switching to in the coming months. The committee produced a resolution recommending to use Google Apps. In discussion that followed, Dr. Zagrai thought the MS 365 might end up being cheaper because Microsoft 365 will give each faculty 5 free copies of MS Office for personal use that they might otherwise have to buy. Dr. Borchers reminded us that NM Tech has a site license for MS Office so that everyone can use it on their business computers at no charge, and questioned whether it was Tech's business to pay for personal copies of MS products. Dr. Zagrai raised a concern that Google cannot guarantee US based servers and that this might be an issue with using Google Apps for those needing federal security clearance. The CC Committee agreed that MS Office applications running locally provide more functionality than Google Apps running in the cloud. However, when comparing MS-365 in the cloud to Google Apps, Google Apps has better performance and more capability. Dr. Raymond stood and stated that he had reviewed the options and that Google was operating system agnostic, whereas Microsoft always tended to promote their own products, causing problems in particular for Macintosh and Linux users. Dr. Wilson supported Dr. Raymond's comments, pointing out that EES was heavily reliant on Apple computers. The CC Committee is trying to establish a single email/communication platform for the campus. They want to collect faculty input to make sure they have not overlooked something in their deciding which option to choose. The campus could retire the 23 mail servers used now and have just 1. This will remove blacklists, prevent hacking, and allow everyone to share calendars. It was suggested that the faculty senate vote on a decision at the May meeting. Meanwhile, faculty input should be sent to Joe Franklin Jfranklin@admin.nmt.edu, with a copy to Dr. Zheng (zheng@cs.nmt.edu).

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, March 4, 2014

5. Committee Reports

a. Computing on Campus – Dr. Zheng, Dr. Topliff. Mike Topliff first addressed an audit finding regarding lack of disaster recovery sites, and stated that there is now a backup plan in place for the business and payroll offices. Academic departments are encouraged to evaluate their backup plans He then moved on to. recent security breaches. Several computers owned by departments were compromised, forcing the University to take down the entire network and attracting government attention. This prompted V.P. Lonnie Marquez to have Max Planck, Alan Roes, Lorie Liebrock and Topliff review computer security on campus. The committee is seeking input for a straw man proposal on potential solutions. Mr. Planck said the problem will be addressed not with equipment, but with people and training, using people whose job it is to find system vulnerabilities “before the bad guys do,” which is why costs are so high (up to \$200,000 a year). The President said he hopes efforts to consolidate campus

computing needs will result in some savings which can be applied to solving these problems.

Distance Education Committee

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 7, 2015

Senate Committee Reports

1. Distance Education Committee survey – Dan Cadol

In collaboration with the ACT, the Distance Education Committee put together a short survey. It asks about what technology you use and what you need. The main points that the committee is trying to get from the survey are to evaluate the demands to be able to forecast the needs and address them. Dr. Dan Cadol will be sending out another email blast for faculty to take the survey.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, November 4, 2014

Distance Education (Dan Cadol)

Dr. Dan Cadol briefly reported on the Moodle phase-out. There is support from ACT to transfer your contents from Moodle to Canvas.

EREC Committee

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, February 3, 2015

2. EREC report – Richard Sonnenfeld

Dr. Richard Sonnenfeld reported that EREC met by email where a question was asked regarding payroll for undergraduate students, particularly graders. Some found it painful for their students to have to enter their hours. It was suggested that all students who work should have a contract and then they wouldn't have to enter their hours. He suggested to Lonnie Marquez about doing both but he thought it was too complicated. Departments need the flexibility to pay their students both hourly and by using a contract. If the option to use both is not available, then using the current system where students enter their hours on an hourly basis would be best.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 1, 2014

c. EREC – G. Axen – Delayed to next meeting

Faculty Development Committee

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, November 6, 2018

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Faculty Development Committee – Kip Carrico

Dr. Carrico announced that the committee would like to discuss some upcoming events. There will be a faculty mentor-mentee breakfast on November 9 in the CITL starting at 8:00 am. Make your own burritos (vegetarian and non-) will be available as well as coffee and stimulating conversation.

A lunch-time tenure panel will be held on November 14 in the CITL from 12:00 – 1:00 pm. Several faculty will share their experiences on the tenure process.

Also, there is a faculty development committee survey that has been sent out. Dr. Carrico encouraged faculty to respond to the survey to integrate future planning.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, March 7, 2017

3. Senate Committee Reports

c. Faculty Development Committee – Claudia Wilson

Dr. Wilson announced that the committee held a Research Opportunities and Grant Preparation workshop this past Saturday at Sevilleta sponsored by R&ED. There were thirty-four participants. During the workshop, a panel of experienced faculty members shared their experience and gave valuable advice. Mike Stanley discussed possible collaborations between professors and EMRTC. There were representatives from Sandia and Los Alamos National Labs. Also, Elmira Israilova and Lindsay Candelaria came and discussed budget preparations and export control.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, May 8, 2015

2. Short announcements

1. Faculty Development – Bill Stone

The faculty development committee will be sponsoring workshops on proposal writing. The first meeting will be June 10, 2015 with a formal invitation to follow.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, October 7, 2014

5. Committee Reports

Faculty Development Committee – Bill Stone

Dr. Stone explained that one activity this committee takes on is mentoring. Please contact a committee member if you are interested in having a mentor or being a mentor.

Honorary Degree and Awards Committee

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 2, 2019

2. Reports of Senate Standing Committees Action

b. Honorary Degree & Awards Committee – Bhaskar Majumdar

Dr. Majumdar stated that there are no nominations for the Honorary Degree.

He discussed the Langmuir, Founders, and Brown award. April 26 will be the last day for nominations for the Langmuir Award. The Founders and the Brown award will be nominated the day of our Faculty Senate meeting in May.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, November 6, 2018

3. Senate Committee Reports

b. Honorary Degree and Awards Committee – Rodolfo Tello-Aburto

Dr. Tello-Aburto stated that the committee is opening nominations for honorary degrees until December 1. He asked that any nominations be sent to the committee.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 3, 2018

3. Senate Committee Reports

c. Honorary Awards and Degrees Committee – Bhaskar Majumdar

Dr. Majumdar stated that an email was sent out to the faculty senate. Nominations for the Langmuir and Founders award should be sent to Lyndsey Lewis prior to the May Faculty Senate meeting.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, March 6, 2018

3. Senate Committee Reports

b. Honorary Degree & Awards Committee – Bhaskar Majumdar/Mingji Zhang

Dr. Majumdar discussed the policy as it recognizes individuals by awarding special honors to persons who have contributed significantly to the culture, educational, or scientific development of programs or services at NMT, as well as those eminent individuals and scholars whose contributions are of more general significance and transcend geographic limitations.

The committee believes that neither of the two candidates meet the minimum degree requirements set forth by the policy stated above. Nevertheless, both candidates made contributions that enhance the value of NMT as a premier education and research institution. A suggestion was made that the Alumni Association has two awards, one being service where this might be appropriate.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 4, 2017

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Honorary Awards & Degrees Committee – Tom Engler

Dr. Engler announced that the Honorary Awards and Degrees Committee have received no nominations for the Founders Award. This is their last appeal for nominations. Additionally, they have only one nomination for the Langmuir Award. Our next meeting we will discuss the recipients. Dr. Engler agreed to give one week for additional nominations.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, March 7, 2017

3. Senate Committee Reports

b. Honorary Degrees & Awards Committee – Tom Engler

Dr. Engler reminded faculty there are two commencement awards, the Founders Award and the Langmuir Award that are chosen by faculty nomination and the Faculty Senate election. March 15 is the deadline for nominations for the Langmuir Award and the information must be posted by April 1st.

Dr. Kieft announced that President Wells has asked this senate to come up with criteria for selecting honorary degree recipients. This was tasked to Dr. Engler and the Honorary Degree & Awards Committee.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, February 7, 2017

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Honorary Degrees and Awards Committee – Tom Engler

Dr. Tom Engler announced that the Honorary Degrees and Awards Committee is presenting the nomination of John Dowdle for an honorary doctorate degree. Dr. Engler discussed Mr. Dowdle's background and stated that he has been very active with NM Tech and is instrumental in working with alumni. The committee received many letters of support and all were quite positive. Dr. Tom Engler stated that the committee supports the recommendation of the honorary doctorate for John Dowdle and moved for approval. Motion passed unanimously

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Wednesday, December 6, 2016

3. Senate Committee Reports

c. Honorary Degrees and Awards Committee – Tom Engler

Dr. Engler issued the first call for nominations for the Founder's and Langmuir awards for 2017. He announced that the committee has received a nomination for an honorary degree not yet ready to present to the Senate.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, October 6, 2015

4. Honorary degrees and awards committee seeks nominations – Snezna Rogelj

Dr. Snezna Rogelj announced that the nomination for honorary degrees is conferred by the Board of Regents for recognition of outstanding merit or achievement without reference to the fulfillment of academic course requirements. Email nominations to Dr. Rogelj, Dr. Tom Engler, or Dr. Frank Huang before November 1st

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 7, 2015

2. Honorary Degrees and Awards – Snezna Rogelj/Michael Heagy

Dr. Michael Heagy announced that it's that time again as we approach commencement to think about awards for our students. The Langmuir Award for Excellence in Research is given for an outstanding scientific research paper by any student or graduate of New Mexico Tech. The paper must have been submitted to or published by a recognized journal during the preceding year. The recipient is selected by the Faculty Senate's Honorary Degrees and Awards Committee. The award is named in honor of Irving Langmuir (Nobel Laureate, 1932) who conducted extensive research with NM Tech staff. The award consists of a plaque and a \$200 cash prize. In the coming weeks, if you have a student who has written an exceptional paper, let Dr. Dave Raymond know and we will post this information on the NMT Faculty Senate website so you can review.

A Founders' Award was created to honor the persons responsible for establishing the New Mexico School of Mines in Socorro in 1889, especially J. J. Baca and Ethan Eaton. The award is presented to the recipient of an advanced degree who has made an outstanding contribution to NM Tech through scholarship, research, and involvement in campus affairs. The recipient is chosen by faculty nomination and Faculty Senate election. The award consists of a plaque and a \$400 cash prize.

The other responsibility of the committee is the honorary degrees. We have not received any of those. We will try to put the word out for next year. If there are any pressing honorary degrees, we may still consider them. The criteria is listed on the Academic Affairs webpage.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 1, 2014

4. Brief announcements

b. Michael Heagy spoke on the Honorary Degree Award Committee. He mentioned that the deadline to submit papers was April 30th for the Langmuir Award. Any NMT student or grad student can receive this award. Student's paper must have been submitted/published the previous year

Nominating Committee

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, October 2, 2018

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Nominating Committee – Raul Morales-Juberias

Eligible faculty senate members filled out paper ballots. The Nominating Committee counted the ballots with the results showing:

Chair, Tom Engler

Vice-Chair, Mike Hargather

Parliamentarian, Sally Pias

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, September 4, 2018

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Nominating Committee - Raul Morales Juberias

Dr. Morales Juberias stated that the Nominating Committee met before the semester started and updated the list of names for the faculty senate committees. The election will be held at the next faculty senate meeting.

Dr. Morales Juberias moved to approve the slate of candidates, seconded by Dr. Brian Borchers. Motion passed.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, October 3, 2017

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Nominating Committee – Mark Samuels

Eligible faculty senate members filled out paper ballots. The Nominating Committee counted the ballots with the results showing:

Tom Kieft, Chair

Steve Simpson, Vice-Chair

Dave Burleigh, Parliamentarian

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, September 5, 2017

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Nominating Committee – Mark Samuels

Dr. Mark Samuels moved to accept the slate of committee assignments other than officers, seconded by Dr. Richard Sonnenfeld. Motion passed.

Dr. Samuels stated that a vote on officers will be held in the next meeting.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, October 4, 2016

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Nominating committee – Mark Samuels

Eligible faculty senate members filled out paper ballots. The Nominating Committee counted the ballots with the results showing:

Tom Kieft, Chair

Steve Simpson, Vice-Chair

Brian Borchers, Parliamentarian

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Thursday, September 1, 2016

1. Nominating Committee – Mark Samuels, Snezna Rogelj

Dr. Mark Samuels presented the list of committee nominations. These nominations were moved and approved by the Senate. Asterisks designate the chair of the committee. Elections will take place at the next meeting.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Friday, May 13, 2016

2. Short announcements

1. Nominating Committee - Mark Samuels

Dr. Mark Samuels announced that the Nominating Committee is looking for volunteers for committees. If you are terming out and would like to stay on a committee or if you would like to run as an officer, let Dr. Samuels know.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, October 6, 2015

3. Senate Committee Reports

1. Nominating committee (vote on Senate officers) – Mark Samuels and Snezna Rogelj

Eligible faculty senate members filled out paper ballots. The Nominating Committee counted the ballots with the results showing:

Dave Raymond, Chair

Steve Simpson, Vice-Chair

Brian Borchers, Parliamentarian

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, September 1, 2015

2. Nominating Committee – Mark Samuels, Snezna Rogelj

Dr. Mark Samuels presented the list of committee nominations. These nominations were moved and approved by the Senate. The first person on the list for each committee should organize the first meeting and let Dr. Dave Raymond know who is elected chair. Nominations were announced for Senate officers: David Raymond as Chair, Steve Simpson as Vice-Chair, and Brian Borchers as Parliamentarian. No additional nominations from the floor were received. Voting will take place at the October meeting.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 28, 2015

3. Senate Committee Reports

1. Nomination Committee – replacement for Bob Cormack on Academic Freedom and Tenure – Snezna Rogelj

Dr. Snezna Rogelj reported that with the passing of Dr. Bob Cormack, an opening was left open on the committee. This position would last until the fall and be refilled by the same person or another person. Dr. Sue Bilek was nominated. On behalf of the committee, Snezna moved that Dr. Sue Bilek be a member of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee. Motion passed unanimously

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, December 2, 2014

3. EREC standing committee – Nominating Committee (Snezna Rogelj)

O behalf of the Nominating Committee, Dr. Snezna Rogelj proposed establishment of a new standing Education and Research Efficiency Faculty Senate Committee. Dr. Snezna Rogelj read the resolution and explanation that was prepared by Dr. Richard Sonnenfeld:

Resolution:

Be it resolved, that the Nomination Committee of the Faculty Senate commends to the faculty senate that the Education and Research Efficiency Committee (EREC) be given the charter described and explained below, and also be promoted from its current ad hoc status to a standing committee, subject to all rules and procedures of standing committees.

Explanation:

Purpose: The purpose of the committee is to represent the educational and research missions of New Mexico Tech to assure that business processes are supportive of these missions and balance business needs against faculty/staff time and attention. The committee will accept requests from other committees or individual faculty regarding business procedures (or more rarely, policies) that seem more burdensome than necessary. The committee will also seek out such procedures on its own initiative. The committee will propose adjustments to procedures such that they accomplish business/legal goals while allowing maximum freedom of action and minimum time investment by those involved in advancing Tech's primary missions. Past areas tackled by the ad-hoc committee involve property, travel, and purchasing.

Membership: EREC consists of four faculty senate members on staggered four year rotations. (For a committee like this, improved institutional memory is important.)

Language for Bylaws: Education and Research Efficiency Committee (EREC) –

The committee will represent the educational and research missions of New Mexico Tech to assure that business processes are supportive of these missions and balance business needs against faculty/staff time and attention. EREC consists of four members (4-year terms, with a 1/1/1/1 rotation).

Proposed Membership for 2014-2015: Gary Axen, Richard Sonnenfeld, Rebecca Reiss, Tom Kieft.

Dr. Reiss drops off in 2015-16, Dr. Axen drops off in 2016-17, Dr. Sonnenfeld drops off in 2017-18. Dr. Kieft drops off in 2018-19.

The committee addressed issues that they have helped out with including an issue involving student travel. There was a policy that blindsided them and were able to get it changed. There were various problems that evolved from the audit. The business office did not consult with the faculty in terms of how new procedures would affect faculty. The committee worked with the business office to assist faculty. If approved, it will be a “super committee” like many other committees that are working with faculty and administrators.

Dr. Snezna Rogelj made a motion to establish this committee. Motion passed unanimously.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, September 2, 2014

6. Committee Reports

b. Nominating Committee – Presenting slate of candidates

The Slate of Nominations was reviewed. There were changes made to the committees. New members were added to:

ADA Committee - Student member

Assessment and Retention Committee - Office for Student Learning

Computing on Campus Committee - Temporary extra member

Distance Education, Computing, and Assessment Committee – Graduate Dean

Mark Samuels made a move to amend the policy and accept the changes to the committees.

Friendly amendment was made to include Associate VP Academic Affairs, Academic Standard and Admission Committee, and ADA as ex-officio members.

The motion to approve changes to the bylaws and ex-officio members passed unanimously.

Motion to approve the slate of nominees for the committees by Mark Samuels, as Chair of Nominating Committee. Approved unanimously.

Voting for the officers will happen at the next meeting

Regents-Faculty Conference Committee

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 2, 2019

7. Announcements

c. Regents Faculty Conference Committee - Michelle Creech-Eakman

Dr. Creech-Eakman stated that the committee sent out a survey, which 25% of faculty answered.

The committee is going through the SWOT analysis that Dr. Engler will take it to the Regents.

The majority of faculty voted to have this survey sent out yearly.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, March 5, 2019

7. Announcements

d. Regents-Faculty Conference Committee – Michelle Creech-Eakman

Dr. Wedeward announced that there is a committee required to give a report the Regents every

year. An email with some quick questions will be sent out to the faculty soon to provide anonymous feedback.

Student Retention Committee

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 2, 2019

2. Reports of Senate Standing Committees Action

a. Retention Committee Report – Brian Borchers

Dr. Borchers stated that the Retention Committee has been recently discussing advising and the coordination of moving this to the Registrar's office. Dr. Wells sent out an email that addressed questions that the committee had.

New academic rules. Dr. Borchers stated that we had statewide general education requirements, statewide course renumbering, and HED rules regarding Advanced Placement. The Gen Ed requirements and the new course numbers are being delayed a year. The AP courses still need to be addressed. The Registrar's office is trying to get clarification from HED regarding if this is a rule or a suggestion. Dr. Steve Simpson stated that these are in effect this fall according to Bridgette Noonan from HED.

Information technology. We still do not have Degree Works, but it is Academic Affairs top priority in terms of software. Discussion was held to reconsider having a hybrid committee to address our advising system.

Dr. Michelle Creech-Eakman moved to form this committee that would make recommendations on improving our advising systems, seconded by Dr. Sally Pias. Motion passed with several nays.

Intrusive Advising is a widely used "best practice" to help intervene with students before they fail classes. The committee feels that we can do better and this is something that we should be working on.

Assessment. Academic advising is not addressed in the assessment report. Luz Barreras stated that the OSL has been doing assessment reports. They were late this year as they were waiting on IRB

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, March 5, 2019

2. Reports of Senate Standing Committees

a. Retention Committee Report – Brian Borchers Action

Dr. Borchers stated that the Retention Committee was asked by Dr. Mozley last year to make recommendations for goals for retention and graduation rates for freshman. However, the Higher Learning Commission has asked that we make goals for retention, persistence, and graduation rates for transfer students. In its 2010-2015 strategic plan, NMT had goals of 80% for fall-to-fall retention of freshmen and 50% for the six-year graduation rate for freshmen. Those goals have also been incorporated into the current 2015-2020 strategic plan. In anticipation of submitting our 4-year assurance update to HLC in the summer of 2019, the committee is proposing added goals for freshmen persistence to the third year and for the persistence and graduation rates of transfer students.

For first-time full-time bachelor's degree-seeking freshman entering in the fall semester,

- Fall-to-fall retention: 80%
- Fall-to-fall-of-third year persistence: 67%

- Six-Year graduation 50%

For full-time bachelor's degree-seeking transfer students entering the fall semester,

- Fall to fall persistence: 80%
- Fall to fall third year persistence: 67%
- Six year graduation: 50%

On behalf of the Retention Committee, Dr. Borchers moved that we adopt these aspirational goals. Motion passed unanimously.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, November 7, 2017

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Retention Committee – Michelle Creech-Eakman

Dr. Creech-Eakman gave an update from the Retention Committee. We have had a drop in the number of incoming students. One main reason is the Lottery Scholarship support was decreased from 90% to 60%. The retention rate for first-time student from 2016 to 2017 was not a large drop compared to previous years. If we look back at the 4-year rate, we will see that we are going up. The 2013 cohort data for 4-year graduation rate is significantly higher than past years and strongly suggests an upward trend in 6-year graduation rates can be anticipated.

Both our accreditors and the strategic plan have suggested that we make recommendations for both retention and graduation rates. We should be able to attain higher percentages based on performance at other schools in the State (who have fewer high-performing students based on ACTs) and sister schools (with similar student ACT performance) across the Nation. Goals adopted that we should strive to achieve within the next 5 years are: 80% retention rate, 4-year graduation rate should be above 22%, and 6-year graduation rate above 50%.

There were many suggestions given but one in particular was the Retention and Graduation Committee officially voted to recommend to the Academic Standards Committee to raise the ACT Math score to 21. There is presently no ACT Math requirement, just a requirement on the Composite ACT of 21. This will on average result in 30 fewer students entering NMT each year, however currently only 3 of those 30 students graduate after 6 years. The net affect will be to raise graduation rates for NMT and allow students who do not typically complete a degree at NMT to pursue a degree elsewhere with less harm to GPA and thus eligibility for financial aid.

The Retention and Graduation Committee is recommending that the Academic Standards and Admission Committee examine this suggestion and come back with a recommendation in the future. One suggestion was to look into dual credit students as this is a population that might be affected.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 4, 2017

3. Senate Committee Reports

c. Retention Committee – Brian Borchers

Dr. Borchers stated the retention committee proposes to have the Director of Financial Aid and the Director of Residential Life added to the Retention Committee as ex officio members.

On behalf of the committee, Dr. Borchers moved to accept these changes. Motion passed.

Dr. Borchers stated the previous Vice President had formed an administrative advising committee that was headed by Patrick Lopez to deal with academic advising issues. The members of that committee, the members of the retention committee, and the Vice President believe this should be a faculty senate committee. The Retention Committee is proposing that a new standing committee of the faculty senate be created, an academic advising committee.

This committee will review NMT's academic advising system and make recommendations to the senate and the administration on how academic advising can be structured to contribute to enhanced student success. Membership will include: 5 faculty members with two year terms and a 3/2 rotation. 3 student representatives including an undergraduate student, an undergraduate transfer student, and a graduate student. Ex officio members: Associate VP for Academic Affairs, Registrar, Director of Admissions, Director of the OSL, Associate Dean for Student Success.

On behalf of the committee, Dr. Borchers moved to accept these changes, seconded by Dr. Soliman. Motion passed with 2 nays.

Friendly Amendment to remove the Graduate student member, change the name of this committee to "Undergraduate" Academic Advising Committee, and add the Director of Student Affairs and Director of Veterans Affairs as ex officio members

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Wednesday, December 6, 2016

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Retention Committee – Brian Borchers

Dr. Borchers referred to slides from a Power Point presentation as he delivered the committee report. He reported the rise in student retention over the past four years as "statistically significant" and the highest ever. The fall 2012 entering class posted a 24.3 percent four-year graduation rate, which is the best ever reported. The Strategic Plan includes tasks to consider changing admissions standards by requiring new students to at least place into Math 103, and raising the minimum GPA to 2.9. Dr. Borchers outlined possible consequences of the two proposed changes and made a motion to refer the proposal to the Senate's Academic Standards and Admissions Committee. Dr. Liebrock seconded the motion. Dr. Lisa Young, chair of the aforementioned committee, cast the single no vote.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, December 1, 2015

3. Retention Committee – Brian Borchers

Dr. Brian Borchers reported that the retention rate dropped last year to this year. We did try to investigate to see if there were causes that we could determine. The only factor that seemed significant was the change in the lottery scholarship requirements. We identified 13 students who did not receive lottery scholarship in fall 2014 who would have under the old rule. Out of the 13 students, 4 were not retained. We believe these counts for 1% of the drop in retention rate but certainly not all of it. When you start to look at the numbers 1% drop of the retention rate responds to 3 students. All kinds of minor influences could result in changes in the retention rate. The graduation rate was 49%. This is back up from 44% in the previous year and is the highest in the last nine years.

Suspensions basically have continued in the same pattern since we implemented the academic warning procedure. The suspension rate was 3.6% for students in the spring semester of 2015. Dr. Borchers noted that we should see better data once Argos is implemented.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, November 4, 2014

Retention committee report (Brian Borchers)

Dr. Brian Borchers reported that the Retention Committee report is online. There is good news and bad news. The good news is regarding our retention rate. It has risen every year for the last seven years. Our retention rate for fall 2013 to fall 2014 is 78 percent. This is an all-time record going back to the 1980's. This is for full time first time freshman who entered NM Tech in the fall semester of 2013. This report does not list transfer students. Dr. Brian Borchers stated that it is pretty clear that this is a real trend. The bad news is the six year graduation rate for those students who entered in the fall semester of 2008 was 44 percent compared to last year's 47.3 percent. There is good news on suspensions. In the fall of 2009 we implemented a new policy. This allows students who aren't doing well to meet with their advisor and come up with a plan to do better. The percentage of students suspended for the Spring semester has gone from 5.7 percent to 2.4 percent between 2007 and 2014.

Dr. Brian Borchers made a plea for more data for the committee. The committee has had very limited access to data on retention, persistence, and graduation. The process now is to ask the registrar but it's a long wait to receive the data. His hope is that with the new Argos reporting software it will make it possible to access Banner data more readily.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, February 4, 2014

b. Student Retention- Brian Borchers

Retention committee description provided.

Retention Committee (2-year term, with a 2/3 rotation):

Ex-Officio Members: Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Director of the Office for Student Learning, the Director of Admission, the Registrar (who is also the Higher Ed Coordinator), the Associate Dean for Student Success, the Director of the Office of Counseling and Disabilities Services, and a Student Representative.

The Retention Committee investigates the localized phenomena that contribute to student retention, persistence, and completion (e.g., graduation rates.) Motion to accept the statement of purpose and membership by Brian Borchers.

Discussion followed stating that this is for Undergraduates only, implicitly defined and that Admissions will be considered. Committee interaction with ASAC when appropriate is assumed. Unanimously approved.

Space Utilization and Campus Planning Committee

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, November 1, 2016

Senate Committee Reports

b. Space Utilization Committee – Mahsa Karamy

Mahsa Karamy gave a brief update on what is going on around campus. The construction for the new chemistry building is scheduled to be complete in February 2017. Chemistry will move in over the summer and the building will be ready for classes in the fall. Jones Hall is still in planning stages, hopefully the bid will go out in late spring. Construction will be slower than usual as the building will be occupied. They are planning for 12 to 18 months of construction. After chemistry moves out of Jones Hall, chemical engineering will move into the second floor. There are 3 labs that materials will be taking over on the second floor. Mechanical engineering is currently scattered in six buildings. They are planning on consolidating them into two buildings, Weir and Workman West. Also, HSI STEM's grant is responsible for a space in Weir for undergraduate engineering students. Mahsa noted there were some health concerns in the basement of Brown Hall. People are temporarily being moved out of the basement and into Speare while it is tested for mold.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, December 1, 2015

3. Senate Committee Reports

1. Space Committee - Oliver Wingenter/Paul Arendt

Dr. Oliver Wingenter reported on behalf of the Space Committee which is a new hybrid committee. The committee's main focus is to try to find new faculty members offices along with having a space crunch, which they are trying to alleviate. Dr. Wingenter discussed recent and ongoing actions. ITC will consolidate into Gold. ACT plans to move near OSL in Speare. They would like to give the chemical engineering department its own identity. The Space Committee also needs help. Despite having space created by construction of the new Bureau building, much of the vacated space is unavailable until the old building is demolished, and the new Chemistry building is built in its place. Then when Chemistry is finally out of Jones, Jones will be receiving a new roof. We need to know how to use this space. We need one or more large department to move into there. The committee would like the faculty here to talk to their department chairs regarding this. Architects need to start drafting plans for the remodel. A new questionnaire will be sent out in January. Also, please consider loaning out any space which can be shared. Talk to Dr. Dale Henneke if interested in a shared campus clean room or a shared a hazardous vapors lab.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, December 2, 2014

2. Space Utilization and Campus Planning (Dave Westpfahl)

Dr. Dave Westpfahl read a statement explaining the space committee questionnaire to the Faculty Senate:

The useable square footage of the campus will increase significantly with the Bureau of Geology moving into its new building in the Spring of 2015, and with the addition of the new Chemistry Building, planned for move-in during 2016. The Space Utilization Committee has been tasked with formulating a plan to distribute this space to academic and non-academic departments on campus. A principal goal of the Space Committee is to try to consolidate, or defragment, departmental space. We would like to identify faster-growing departments, with the goal of trying to provide these departments with sufficient space to meet their growing faculty and

student populations. As it stands, we are also short on laboratory space for recently hired professors. To work towards this goal, we plan to meet individually with all departments to assess their existing space, and future space needs.

We need your departmental input to help with these issues. A Space Usage Questionnaire (separate from the Space Survey made for Finance) was emailed to all departments on Friday, November 21, by Juliann Ulibarri from the Chemistry Department, and copies are available in the back as well. Your response to this by December 10 will be your department's primary initial input to our committee for review and recommendations to the Administration; therefore your timely response will be much appreciated as all departments need to be considered as a whole.

Dr. Tom Engler asked that he as Dean of Engineering and Dr. Bill Stone as Dean of Arts and Sciences be included in this discussion.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, October 7, 2014

Facilities Utilization Committee – Paul Arendt

Dr. Arendt reported on an item they were asked to move onto quickly. This was the planning of the new building and the determination of which department or departments should move into this building. It was recommended that the best option would be to move one department (probably chemistry) into the new building and let the other departments take over Jones and Jones annex. Let the committee know of any issues.

Student Discipline Committee

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 2, 2019

2. Reports of Senate Standing Committees Action

d. Student Discipline Committee –Stewart Thompson

Dr. Thompson discussed several proposed changes to the Student Discipline Committee. The Student Discipline Committee will now be called the Student Conduct Committee. The committee proposes to add four staff members (one being appointed by each campus vice president). The Committee will assign a Committee Chair. At the moment, there are no tenured faculty, but they are welcome. The hearing panels will be based on who is the respondent and will consist of seven adjudicators; maintaining a quorum of five. Lastly, the committee needs to have annual training.

Discussion was held regarding that in the past, half of the hearing panel had to be faculty members and this should continue. (The committee currently is proposing that at least one faculty member be on this panel). Suggestion was made that at least four faculty members should be on the hearing committee with issues involving academic honesty or research integrity problems.

Dr. Stone moved to refer this back to committee, seconded by Dr. Borchers. Motion passed unanimously.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Thursday, May 10, 2018

7. Committee Reports

a. Student Discipline Committee and Faculty Senate Title IX Review Team

Dr. Doug Wells stated that Dr. Peter Phaiah is looking for an endorsement for four propositions that deal with Title IX issues. This is internally supported by the committee.

1. Change the name of the student discipline committee to the student conduct committee. The goal is to have one process and one pool that deals with all disciplinary matters.

2. Add four staff members to the student discipline committee. The idea is that each VP would put somebody on it.

3. Due process for faculty in cases of gender based discrimination would be resolved by same process for all employees. There is a policy coming out of the Academic Tenure & Freedom Committee on how to deal with faculty cases dealing with tenure in some circumstances. Dr. Wells argues that this should stay and this is not the intention of this proposition. The reasons for tenure are primarily so faculty can say provocative things particularly for humanities and social sciences. We become vulnerable if we don't treat them differently. This is part of our job to challenge people and say provocative things.

4. Lastly, the student conduct committee would change to the NMT conduct committee so it is broader than just students.

Dr. Wells stated that this will be a long hard process to get this right. Peter Phaiah would like to know if we agree with these principles first before we vote on any policies. Discussion was held that it is premature to vote even on principle until we know more about the process and see more in depth information.

Dr. Borchers moved to send this back to the committee and come back to us in the fall. Additionally, we need to see something in writing and it is too premature right now. This was seconded by Dr. Ken Minschwaner. Motion passed.

Student Learning Committee (originally Assessment Committee) Deleted February 2018

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, February 4, 2014

4. Committee Reports

a. Student Learning Committee- Sally Pias

Purpose: Contribute to the institution's evaluation of student learning according to the NMT Mission and Institute-Wide Student Learning Outcomes (attached) and to foster a culture of student learning at New Mexico Tech.

Role: On behalf of the Faculty Senate of New Mexico Tech, contribute to faculty involvement in evaluation of student learning and the internal review of academic and co-curricular reporting.

Responsibilities:

- Review any proposed changes to the institution's student learning objectives as they arise.
- Contribute to the review of department evaluations of student learning according to the departments' missions and student learning outcomes for their Undergraduate major programs, Graduate programs and General Education Core courses.
- Report evidence of support of the NMT Mission and Institute-Wide Student Learning Outcomes and departmental Missions and Student Learning Outcomes, best-practices for assessment and suggestions for improvement found in the evaluations above to Academic Affairs and the departments annually.
- Participate in the Institutional Student Learning Team.
- Report findings to the Faculty Senate as requested.

Member list of Student Learning Committee, 2014-2015. Lynda Ballou, Annette LaRussa, Sally Pias, Steve Schaffer, Hamdy Soliman, Dave Westpfahl Ex-Oficio members Vice President of Academic Affairs, SES Project Director, Registrar, Director of Admissions, Student Representative.

A Motion to accept the committee mission and membership was made by Sally Pias and was unanimously approved.

Student Advising Committee (NOT: FS)

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Tuesday, April 7, 2015

Short Announcements

3. Student Advising Committee – Patrick Lopez

Patrick Lopez reported that the Student Advising Committee is looking at all aspects of the advising process. They are looking at how they work with new students, continuing students and at risk students. Patrick Lopez is the chair with five faculty members, key staff members, two undergraduate students and one graduate student. The faculty members include: Dr. Jeff Altig, Dr. David Grow, Dr. Hamdy Soliman, Dr. Corey Leclerc, and Dr. Snezna Rogelj. The committee plans to have a draft on December 31, 2015. The committee is currently working on an analysis of the current system such as the strengths and weaknesses and how we can move forward. The results of that will come up in the training this summer. In June they will be working with NACADA. Also, this summer we should have degree works working to plan the four year or longer program or how long it takes to get through NMT so the students can have a plan in place of where they are going.