



**The
Faculty Assembly Meeting**

MINUTES **September 18th, 2020 12:30 PM ZOOM/Remote**

MEETING CALLED BY:	Professor John Zimmerman, Faculty Assembly President
MINUTES ASSEMBLED BY:	Keri Stevenson, Faculty Assembly Secretary
FACULTY ATTENDEES:	Antoinette Abeyta, Jordan Balaban, John Burke, Chris Chavez, Lilia Cuciuc, Neysa Cox, Sonya Damon, Alok Dhital, Sabrina Ezzell, Jim Fisk, Bruce Gjeltema, Yi-Wen Huang, Hasani Jayasinghe, Ann Jarvis, Joe Kee, Jr., Carolyn Kuchera, Jacob LaCroix, Carmela Lanza, Tracy Lassiter, Sarah Llanque, Jonathan Lumibao, Aretha Matt, Andrew McFeaters, Arun Muthaiyan, Jon Saatvedt, Kelley Schukar, Kamala Sharma, Kristian Simcox, Cecilia Stafford, Keri Stevenson, Rachael Stewart, Lora Stone, Gayle Woodcock, and John Zimmerman.
GUESTS:	None

ACTION	APPROVAL OF AGENDA	PROFESSOR JOHN ZIMMERMAN
DISCUSSION		
<p>I move to approve the agenda.</p> <p>Motion: Lora Stone Seconded: Yes Discussion: None Vote: Unanimous Motion Carried: Yes</p>		

ACTION	APPROVAL OF MINUTES	PROFESSOR JOHN ZIMMERMAN
DISCUSSION		
<p>I move to approve the minutes from the August 21st, 2020 UNMG Faculty Assembly meeting.</p> <p>Motion: John Burke Seconded: Yes Discussion: None Vote: Unanimous Motion Carried: Yes</p>		

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Faculty Assembly President Professor John Zimmerman reported on the following:

First, Professor Zimmerman asked new faculty members present at the meeting to introduce themselves. Dr. Andrew McFeaters, a new Assistant Professor of English, introduced himself and said that he will be teaching literature and composition courses and that he enjoys being at UNM-Gallup so far.

Professor Zimmerman also asked for tolerance and patience among the faculty as we work together during the pandemic, and discussed the Ops Committee's meeting with the administration team this morning. Dr. Malm, Director Jayme McMahan, Dean Primozic, Mr. Lee Lamb, and Mr. Robert Griego were present. The Dean of Instruction will give the report for the executive team at the Assembly meeting. Mr. Lamb asked for faculty or student accomplishments to be sent to him at lambc@unm.edu so that he could publicize them.

Finally, Professor Zimmerman asked for volunteers to run for election to fill a gap on the Operations Committee. Anyone who is interested should tell the Nominations Committee, especially if they are from the Health Careers and Education Area, as there are currently no members from that division on the Ops Committee.

As there were no questions, Professor Zimmerman invited Dr. Dan Primozic, Dean of Instruction for UNM-Gallup, to speak.

INFORMATION

DEAN'S REPORT

DEAN DR. DANIEL PRIMOZIC

DISCUSSION

Dean Primozic praised the UNM-Gallup faculty for the hard work that we are doing to offer the highest-quality education for our students, before moving on to a short discussion of rank and tenure. He noted that the Faculty Handbook says that for rank and tenure expectations, faculty should be excellent in either teaching or scholarship, while the other three categories should be at least effective. The Dean asked that faculty up for promotion work closely with their chairs on management of these categories and expectations.

The Dean then reported on program prioritization, and said that he is proud to be part of the ad hoc program prioritization committee. They are looking at the general quality and relevance of all degrees and certificates with professionalism and without bias. The committee is reaching the end of its scoring, and gearing up to make recommendations to senior management and other agencies on needed adjustments to all programs, and their overall quality. This is not based on costs. They are also waiting on a proposal sent into the state for monies that will help them in training all faculty for best practices on online delivery. It would involve faculty taking the training at either no cost or perhaps being offered a stipend to do so.

Dean Primozic asked if the Assembly had any questions. Professor Zimmerman brought up one question that had been missed at the last Assembly meeting, as to what the committee was looking at. Actual academic programs that grant degrees are the subject of the program prioritization process.

As no other faculty members had questions, Dean Primozic finished his report, and the executive team departed.

ACTION ITEM**ONLINE TEACHING PROFESSOR JOHN
EVALUATION PROPOSAL ZIMMERMAN**

DISCUSSION	
<p>Professor Zimmerman pulled up the observation form for online teaching on a shared screen and asked faculty to let him or chairs know if they needed a copy. This form is highly similar to the face-to-face peer evaluation form, with the same sections, but shorter. It has already been approved by the Assembly.</p> <p>Professor Zimmerman then showed the Assembly the proposal form on-screen (see Appendix). He noted that it had been e-mailed to Assembly members, and that it is addressed to the Dean of Instruction and the division chairs since they are responsible for annual reviews. It has an introduction to point out the difference between normal face-to-face interactions during the observation process and the structure for doing this online.</p> <p>The Operations Committee worked on drafts of the proposal, and it was sent to the Distance Learning Committee for revisions. Professor Zimmerman stated that the goal is to maintain fairness and equity. Faculty can still decide which course will be evaluated and in which semester it will be evaluated. Observers added to classes will need to adhere to FERPA guidelines and disclose conflicts of interest. This applies to all observations in AY 20-21. The form mandates faculty choice and their freedom to choose how they should be evaluated based on online teaching methodology.</p> <p>The first choice on the proposal form is to invite an observer to a synchronous remote session. However, this does not make sense for everyone, although it would for classes with demonstrations, such as in Welding or the Fine Arts. Therefore, there are other options available. The second is to screen-share the class at an arranged remote meeting. The third is to add an observer to the course in one of three roles (student, course builder, or TA). There are no technical barriers to adding anyone in any of these roles. Those in a student role cannot alter the content of the course, but those in the TA and course builder roles can. Professor Zimmerman said that he felt sure this would be accidental, but that it might make sense to add the observer in a student role only.</p> <p>The proposal form also contains instructions on how to add someone in one of these three roles. This can be done via e-mail as well as support ticket. Professor Zimmerman recommended the support ticket route as the e-mail method can be unclear about which course faculty want to add someone to.</p> <p>Professor Zimmerman then opened the floor for questions. A suggestion came from Dr. Kristian Simcox about having the observer watch a recorded Zoom session rather than a live one, as an addition to option 1 to ease the time commitment required. Professor Zimmerman said that this could make sense. As there were no other suggestions or questions, he asked for a motion to approve the proposal.</p> <p>I move to approve the Online Teaching Proposal as amended per Dr. Simcox's suggestion.</p> <p>Motion: Antoinette Abeyta Seconded: Yes Discussion: None Vote: Unanimous Motion Carried: Yes</p> <p>Professor Zimmerman offered a final thanks to the Operations Committee and the Distance Learning Committee before moving to the next discussion item.</p>	

DISCUSSION ITEM**FACULTY SENATOR ELECTIONS/ PROFESSOR JOHN**

CONSTITUTION & BY-LAWS CHANGES ZIMMERMAN

DISCUSSION	
	<p>Professor Zimmerman stated that Dr. Tracy Lassiter and Professor Alok Dhital had been elected as new Faculty Senators to Albuquerque. Dr. Finnie Coleman, President of the Faculty Senate, has been discussing a liaison committee to bring branch issues to the table, which this group can become involved in.</p> <p>However, the constitutional and by-laws changes did not pass as only 60% of eligible faculty voted in favor of the changes, whereas they needed a two-thirds majority voting in favor. The Constitution and By-Laws changes had overwhelming support, but not enough actual votes. The Distance Learning Committee and Adjunct Affairs Committee are still ad hoc; visiting faculty do not have voting rights. There has not been a discussion on the official results as yet, but it will be discussed moving forward. Professor Zimmerman stated the process of changing the constitution would continue as it is considerably outdated.</p> <p>One Assembly member asked what the number of eligible voters was compared to the number of votes received. Professor Zimmerman replied that out of 55 voters, we had 32 voting in favor.</p>

ACTION ITEM	CURRICULA COMMITTEE	DR. CAROLYN KUCHERA
--------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

	<p>Dr. Kuchera began the discussion by asking Professor Jon Saatvedt to present on the Process Technology Program, as he had done much work in developing it.</p> <p>Professor Saatvedt thanked everyone who had helped him review the necessary documents to create the program and given him feedback. He believes the process has improved those documents.</p> <p>He said the Process Technology program will provide local manufacturers with a group of highly skilled workers. It will start as a vocational certificate, and then will become an associate's degree. However, it was simpler to make it a certificate first. Professor Saatvedt explained that he had selected a program designed by the North American Process Technology Alliance. Currently, there are 45 different process technology programs throughout North America, and Professor Saatvedt hopes to see ours become the 46th. This program will focus on the basis of process technology, involving plants that are producing products. This could be the local refinery down the road, or the recycling facility further on. There is also a boiler facility that is using the recycled waste and burning that for energy generation, hydroelectric and solar generators, and wind turbine areas. We would be training service technicians and operators for them. There is even a local water treatment facility that has hired people off the street, but its employees need state minimum certifications to work on the drinking water. The process technology program will teach communication skills, computer skills, and analytical skills, along with work in hands-on labs.</p> <p>Dr. Kuchera announced that the Curricula Committee had approved Form B's for 12 new courses, and these are Process Technology courses to extend over four semesters with a summer internship. Altogether, they will count as 30 credits.</p> <p>I move to approve all 12 Form B's for Process Technology.</p> <p>Motion: Carolyn Kuchera Seconded: Yes</p>

Discussion: None
Vote: Unanimous
Motion Carried: Yes

Dr. Kuchera explained that new programs also require a Form C to be filed. The Curricula Committee had approved this form for Process Technology, which included an executive summary and proposal written by Professor Saatvedt.

I move to approve the Form C to create the Process Technology program.

Motion: Carolyn Kuchera
Seconded: Yes
Discussion: None
Vote: Unanimous
Motion Carried: Yes

DISCUSSION ITEM	RANK, TENURE, AND PROMOTION	PROFESSOR JOHN ZIMMERMAN
------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------

DISCUSSION		
-------------------	--	--

Professor Zimmerman noted that the Assembly had some extra time to talk through faculty's concerns about rank, tenure, and promotion, as other discussion items had ended a bit early. He proposed to move through the list of concerns raised at the last Assembly meeting and offer some extra clarity and information gathered since then.

The first of these concerned actual guidelines for tenure and promotion. Section F of the Handbook says to follow Section B. However, our entire FTE as branch campus faculty is based on 15 teaching load units. There is no definition of our service or scholarship responsibilities, or which one should be emphasized more. This is confusing, and can heavily impact promotion and tenure. This session, therefore, was dedicated to helping provide expertise and knowledge, and to getting division chairs on the same page as faculty and the Dean of Instruction. This is vital, as the division chairs are the ones that organize this information.

Professor Zimmerman started that UNM faculty are required to be excellent in either teaching or scholarship. For us, as branch campus faculty, this is probably teaching. Beyond that, we need effectiveness in personal characteristics and service. It does create some flexibility for faculty choice. The handbook does not say that we have to prioritize scholarship; for some Assembly members, such as CCTE faculty, prioritizing service over scholarship is the norm. Other, tenure-track faculty members who are chairs of committees with an intense workload might prioritize that service instead. The annual review does let us know if we need to improve in certain areas, and Professor Zimmerman urged faculty to contact their chairs if they needed advice on that front. However, if we maintain effectiveness in areas other than the ones we prioritize, we should be fine. Professor Zimmerman added that he had spoken to Professor Joe Kee, Jr., and Dr. Kamala Sharma out of the division chairs, and knew they were in agreement.

As far as the inconsistencies between the Faculty Handbook and the Provost's e-mail message about rank and tenure, we are not following the Provost's guidelines, because we follow the handbook. On scholarly work and professional development, Professor Zimmerman reminded the Assembly that there has been a pause on the tenure clock for some people. A question for the chairs that had arisen in

relation to professional development was that if someone had been going to present at a conference but it had been canceled, how would the chairs deal with it?

Professor Ann Jarvis, head of the Business & Applied Technology division, said that many of the CCTE conferences had gone virtual, so that people could still present. There are also applicable professional development activities for members of her division available through online learning modules, including ones on bettering or understanding the online delivery systems, because there was not a lot of online learning done in these fields before the pandemic. Dr. Kamala Sharma, chair of the Math & Sciences division, agreed with Professor Jarvis and said that virtual conferences and professional development sessions are likewise available for professors in math and the sciences.

Another concern had arisen about conferences that were simply canceled outright, with no virtual option. Faculty did not want to be marked down in their tenure dossiers for failing to attend canceled conferences. Dr. Sharma said that faculty should not be penalized for that, especially as it can happen at the last minute.

Another faculty member asked whether such consideration would apply only for the academic year, or for the whole tenure process, if the pandemic lasted longer than the single academic year. The answer was that it should apply to both. Another question was asked about whether branches of UNM or other community colleges should have a conference where people could share work that would have been presented at canceled conferences. New Mexico State University has had a similar “round-up” tradition. Other professors had heard of and participated in these conferences, as well.

The next question was whether an acceptance to a conference could count, in lieu of the actual presentation. Others admitted this was a good point.

The next discussion item concerned promotions for CCTE faculty. This has been a barrier and an issue for some time. Part of the problem has been instability in the chair’s position in that division. Another is that those in Albuquerque do not really understand what CCTE faculty do for advancement and professional development, due to lack of similar classes taught at their campus. They understand the academic part of promotion, academic degrees and writing books and presenting in journals.

Professor Chris Chavez pointed out that the titles are also inconsistent and confusing. There are Lecturer I, II, and III titles, and then there are Senior Lecturers. There has been no specific CCTE system. It is in fact rare that UNM branches teach courses like Construction Tech, leading to further lack of support. UNM-Gallup disbanded its Rank and Tenure Committee, but even when they existed, they never approached the CCTE faculty. There have been some ad hoc attempts to help individual instructors, but never any consistency.

The next issue on the list was the lack of a mentorship culture at UNM-Gallup. Professor Zimmerman stated that he is willing to work with chairs on this, and some colleagues have expertise they can lend. We need to build up being better mentors and colleagues. Professor Zimmerman wants to have a meeting with the chairs, the Dean of Instruction, and the Operations Committee, to discuss the processes for lecturer promotion, but there has been no support or mentorship for lecturers.

One Assembly member stated that, given the amount of administrative turnover, the faculty should guide the faculty. She did not think it effective to keep up mentorship through the administrative structure. Professor Zimmerman asked if this faculty member was advocating for the creation of a Mentorship and Promotion Committee that would provide guidance and training, or some other method. She replied that other faculty in tenure-track positions at universities get assigned mentors by their institutions. These new faculty got followed all the way through the tenure process. This faculty

member, on the other hand, had only received feedback when she solicited it, and there are no clear sets of questions. To improve our campus and increase job satisfaction, we should initiate a similar process.

Professor Zimmerman asked Professor Jarvis about her experience and whether she had discussed promotion and mentorship with her faculty. Professor Jarvis replied that they had not yet gotten that far. No mentorship system for CTE faculty has ever existed. She thought that some branches had once gotten together to discuss their vocational side, but that was as far as it had gone. The Albuquerque campus does not understand Health Careers or applied tech classes, and her division has wide reach.

Other discussion concerned an old system of informal mentor assignments in Arts and Sciences before it had become two separate divisions, and that a mentor would be assigned for two or three years to new faculty. However, it would be better to replace it with a formalized, continuing system. Another person offered information on Dr. Finnie Coleman's words about rank, promotion, and tenure, and that Albuquerque's campus has mentors for the tenure process. Our campus does not have that sort of guidance on definitions of scholarship or other features of tenure.

As to why guidelines do not exist for the branch campuses, some related it to the turnover in the Provost's office and how it makes the mentorship system problematic. They want to have flexibility in Albuquerque for each new Provost to make his or her mark, and this is why we do not have written standards on branch campuses, because they extend the flexibility to us. Our dossiers get reviewed by Assistant Provosts, who also have turnover. We want to mentor, but we do not know what Albuquerque is actually looking for, because it is a moving target. Some new Provosts want to be rigorous; some want to be lenient. The specifics of the standards are purposely vague. There have been mentoring attempts for CTE to move towards a goal, but then the goal changes. The mentoring we offer is often just common sense or experienced faculty members' memories, but this may not apply with the next Provost. Professor Zimmerman said that he hoped the union will force the adoption of more specificity and sustaining standards that will apply in the rank, tenure, and promotion process.

The conversation then turned to definitions. What is the definition of excellent or effective or needs improvement in the four categories we need to consider? What does it mean in Biology vs. Fine Arts vs. English? Albuquerque's campus has set benchmarks via departments, but they are not made known to the branch campuses. The chairs should have the ability to develop their own written guidelines.

Others stated that everyone should be afforded mentorship, and it should not hinge on luck and connections. There are no clear guidelines and UNM-Gallup has no guidelines, but this is the easiest way that we should alter them. Otherwise, we will have implicit, explicit, or systemic bias to contend with. Professor Zimmerman stated that he would like the chairs to develop the mentorship culture. The training on putting together a dossier should be done a year before its deadline, at least. The training should also be done every year. This would support faculty and cut down on their stress.

The last issue on the list was concerns over race, ethnicity, and gender, especially for lecturers. There are many industries and institutions that are currently acknowledging the systemic racist and gender bias they have. The supposedly meritocratic system at universities has raised barriers for these individuals. The UNM-Gallup campus should acknowledge systemic bias by taking a careful and painstaking evaluation of hiring, promotion, and tenure. Who is getting those opportunities? What barriers are in place for what individuals versus others?

Professor Zimmerman said that he had reached out to Professor L. D. Lovett and Vice-President of Equity and Inclusion, Dr. Assata Zerai. They will present at the November Assembly meeting to help

us develop a plan and answer our questions. At this point, he drew the discussion to a close as the end of the meeting was approaching.

INFORMATION	COMMITTEE REPORTS	COMMITTEE CHAIRS
DISCUSSION		
<p>Professor Zimmerman asked for committee reports:</p> <p>UNM-G Senator to Albuquerque: Dr. John Burke reported that the last Faculty Senate meeting had talked about the impact on branch campus faculty. Dr. Finnie Coleman, President of the Faculty Senate, has made it very clear that UNM’s branches are underrepresented in their ability to make themselves heard in the Senate. However, there are now more branch Senators, and Dr. Coleman revealed that branch faculty are under 15 teaching load units, which not everyone in the Senate knew. Dr. Burke urged Gallup Assembly members to both attend virtual Senate meetings and to speak to the UNM-Gallup Senators to Albuquerque about their concerns.</p> <p>Budget Review Committee, Constitution & By-Laws Committee, Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, Curricula Committee: These committees had no report, as the Curricula Committee had nothing in addition to their action item already voted on.</p> <p>Teaching Excellence Committee: Professor Zimmerman was aware that this committee has had meetings, and is getting a schedule together, as he has been receiving e-mails from them. However, the chair was not present to give a report.</p> <p>CARC: Professor Kelley Schukar, who has taken over as chair, said that she had nothing to report, but is getting used to working on the assessment process with the Albuquerque campus.</p> <p>Library Committee: Dr. Arun Muthaiyan has become the chair. He reported that the committee needs two more members to make up their required numbers, and will hold a meeting in October.</p> <p>Strategic Planning Committee: Dr. John Burke, the chair, said that they had had one person step away, so that they could use one or two more members. As they have all divisions represented currently, these new members could be from any division.</p> <p>Distance Learning Committee (ad hoc): Dr. Yi-Wen Huang said that they have met, and they have a meeting scheduled for next month.</p> <p>Adjunct Affairs Committee (ad hoc): Dr. Kristian Simcox, the chair, said that members were disappointed that they are not a full committee. They would want to meet with the Operations Committee to discuss strategies and perhaps new members.</p>		

INFORMATION	ANNOUNCEMENTS	VARIOUS
<p>Professor Zimmerman announced that he had received almost all the committee preference forms; the Ops Committee will work with these to define committee rosters. He asked committee chairs to figure out some level of action plan and set benchmarks. He also encouraged the committee chairs to talk to him and Ops members if they needed help.</p> <p>Finally, Professor Zimmerman issued a last reminder to send faculty and student accomplishments to Mr. Lee Lamb for the website.</p>		

ACTION ITEM**ADJOURNMENT**

I move to adjourn.	
Motion: Antoinette Abeyta	
Seconded: Yes	
Vote: Unanimous	
Motion Carried: Yes	
Meeting adjourned at 1:58 PM, by Faculty Assembly President Professor John Zimmerman.	
Recorded by: Keri Stevenson, Faculty Assembly Secretary, on August 21 st , 2020	

Appendix: Proposal for Online Teaching Evaluations

PROPOSAL 9/18/2020

From: UNM-Gallup Operations Committee

To: Dean Primozic and Division Chairs

RE: Process for online teaching evaluation

Introduction:

Due to the ongoing national health crisis, there is a need to conduct the majority of teaching observations remotely. This proposal includes any Administrative, Chair or Peer observations for AY 2020-21. Henceforth, the person conducting the observation of teaching effectiveness will be known as the “observer.”

Guiding Principles:

To maintain fairness and equity in the adjudication of the agreed-upon instrument (attached), the Operations Committee has deemed it necessary to outline specific processes regarding how this observation might take place.

Faculty shall retain their right to declare which course/specific class will be observed and in which semester that the observation will take place.

A timetable for the observation length, post observation reflection and observation completion should be agreed upon beforehand by the observer and the faculty. Any change to the agreed upon timeline must be accepted, in writing, by both parties.

Observers would agree to adhere to FERPA guidelines and divulge any conflicts of interest (family members, dependents, etc... enrolled in the course) before viewing a faculty members online teaching.

Choosing one of the options below would be at the sole discretion of the individual faculty member based on their preferred teaching methodology.

Option 1- The observer could be invited to a synchronous Zoom (e.g., Blackboard Collaborate, Microsoft Teams, etc.) lecture/demonstration of the faculty’s choosing. This would be a comparable replacement for the standard classroom visit. As with a standard classroom visit the faculty would provide the observer with a syllabus and relevant SLOs beforehand and the observer and the faculty would meet remotely, after the observation, to discuss the “post observation reflection.”

Option 2- The observer and the faculty could arrange a Zoom (e.g., Blackboard Collaborate, Microsoft Teams, etc.) meeting where the faculty would be able to “screen share” one of their courses and walk the observer through that section. As with a standard classroom visit the faculty would provide the observer with a syllabus and relevant SLOs beforehand and the observer and the faculty would meet remotely, after the observation, to discuss the “post observation reflection.”

Option 3- The observer may be invited, at the discretion of faculty member, to serve as a “student,” “course builder” or “teaching assistant” in one UNM Learn course for an amount of time to be specified by the faculty member. As with a standard classroom visit the faculty would provide the observer with a syllabus and relevant SLOs beforehand and the observer and the faculty would meet remotely, after the observation, to discuss the “post observation reflection.”

Context

Any faculty, staff, chair or administrator can be assigned a role as specified in option 3. “Course builder” and “teaching assistant” would have the ability to alter course content. The “student” role is just an observer.

To add someone in any of these roles, simply click on the “create a support ticket” link in the Learn course you would like to have evaluated, fill out the requisite information, describe the access level you would like to grant, add the name and NetID of the observer, state the reason for the request (peer/chair observation) and submit.