

## Meeting Notes: CNM Faculty Senate, January 24, 2014

- ❖ Michael convened the meeting at 1:00PM
- ❖ Attendance
  - Amy Rademacher-Neel, HPWS
  - Maxine Freed, CHSS
  - Michael Crane, MSE (Chair)
  - Phelan Gavaldon, AT
  - Roderigo Padilla, Academic Advisement
  - Rachel Black, MSE
  - Kathy Kaestner, HWPS (new senator)
  - Bonnie Bailey, SAGE
  - Judith Tomasson, SAGE
  - Steve Glass, MSE (PT)
  - Steve Klein, BIT (PT)
  - Shanna Davis, HPWS
  - Janna Goodyear, SAGE (PT)
  - Brian Sailer, guest
- ❖ Agenda was approved by acclamation
- ❖ Minutes were approved unanimously upon motion by Bonnie and second by Amy
- ❖ Michael welcomed new Senator Kathy Kaestner from HPWS and announced that Cef Garcia has resigned from FS
- ❖ Audit data and distance learning proposal
  - Background
    - CNM cannot track when a student selects audit option
    - Fall 2012 numbers look weird, probably due to a change in policy that occurred then
    - Face-to-face students audit more than DL students do, usually later in the semester; achievement coaches confirm that students are using audit as an escape from failing a class and that students who audit don't retake
    - CHSS and MSE have highest audit rates
    - Some students audit to gain knowledge; some audit lecture to remain in co-requisite lab
    - Audit status is useful for some, and should be retained
    - Audit status affects Lottery Success Scholarship, but not financial aid (if 60% of class is completed); Banner now allows instructor to record last date attended for students who change to audit status
    - Some students believe that audit status absolves them from attendance and homework
  - Brian Sailer briefing
    - Online attendance policy at CNM does not comply with federal requirements
    - New proposed master syllabus/catalogue language will require student participation in online discussions about academic matters or regular

- communicate with instructor to discuss course topics
  - Blackboard attendance module will be updated to track, as long as homework assignments are in Blackboard
  - AAC is OK with proposed language; seeking FS approval
  - Administration wishes to make rules consistent across all class types
  - Phalen moved approval , Bonnie seconded, approved unanimously
- Michael shared research about audit policies at other (4-year) institutions and CNM peer institutions
  - Good idea to require students to interact with a human advisor before selecting audit
  - Most do not allow audits of online classes
  - Limits on when switch to audit can occur to reduce bail-out use
  - Some require approval of instructor and/or petition to Dean, with request form
  - Some prohibit switch to audit mid-semester, require declaration up-front
- Steve K asked about the objective of the audit discussion
  - Michael stated that FS needs to make a recommendation to Dean's Council about audit
  - Banner allows registration in audit status HWPS, although HWPS prohibits it
- Bonnie moved that audit status change be cut off at census date, Maxine seconded, motion passed with Steve Klein voting against
  - Steve K noted that IT students often need a later audit option, and withdrawal option does not allow students
  - Rachel suggested that an appeal of an audit denial be allowed; Rodrigo noted that the registration appeal process already exists
- Michael asked if FS would like to prohibit audit for degree-required classes
  - Should be limited to degree-requirements specific to student
  - Kathy and Rachel suggest it's a Department decision
- Michael asked if instructor approval should be required; Maxine and Phalen noted that timely instructor notification is sufficient
- Banner should show grading option for each student in each class
- Bonnie moved approval of the following suggestions, Phalen seconded and the motion passed unanimously
  - Change to audit status should be prohibited after Census Date, with an appeal option
  - Instructors must be timely notified when students change to audit status
  - Banner should clearly display grading status for every student
- ❖ Professional review process: Primary topic for FS during the Spring 2014 semester
  - Some FS members have interviewed Deans about professional review process
  - Is a faculty survey about professional review desired?
    - PTERS may not give much feedback, since the resurrected evaluation system is new
    - The professional development process is considered busy work by most

#### FT faculty

- Judith and Shanna expressed concern over the assignment of numbers by Deans in professional reviews
  - Bonnie stated the numbers are meaningless
  - Shanna is concerned that future administrators may use the numbers in layoff decisions
  - The numerical ratings appear to be based on college service, and not teaching excellence or professional development
- FS believes professional review should be based on faculty contributions to student success (teaching and professional development)
- Proposed questions for FT faculty survey
  - What should focus of reviews be? (Prioritize a standard list, including college service and “Other”)
  - How valuable have your reviews been in the past? Explain your answer.
  - How many reviews have you had?
- Proposed questions for PT faculty survey: Janna wants PT reviews to have meaning; Maxine observed that Erica seems to agree
  - How would you like the PT faculty review process to enhance your professional development?
  - Will your review have an influence on future selection processes here or at other institutions?
  - Has the review improved your academic performance?
- ❖ Faculty Senate blog on Blackboard
  - Judith demonstrated how to enroll, access and use the FS blog on Blackboard
  - Subscribing to a forum results in emails when posts are entered in the forum
  - Live chats are supported, but may not be immediately useful to FS
  - Michael is working to embed FS Blackboard in FS webpage
- ❖ Early Alert project: Likely a back-burner issue this semester
- ❖ Bonnie moved to adjourn, Maxine seconded and the meeting was adjourned at 3:00PM