

CNM Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Date: 06/21/2013 (FRI)	Meeting Time: 1:00 pm. – 3:00 pm.	Meeting Location: MS-402	
Attendees	Chair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michael Crane (MSE)	Vice-Chair <input type="checkbox"/> Judith Tomasson (SAGE)	Secretary <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steve Glass (MSE)
	Treasurer <input type="checkbox"/> Cef Garcia-Heras (SAGE)	<input type="checkbox"/> Phelan Gavaldon (AT)	<input type="checkbox"/> Jason Manzanares (AT)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Barbara Bates (BIT)	<input type="checkbox"/> Kalynn Pirkl (BIT)	<input type="checkbox"/> Maxine Freed (CHSS)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rinita Mazumdar (CHSS)	<input type="checkbox"/> Andy Russell (CHSS)	<input type="checkbox"/> Ron Reid (CHSS)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Shanna Davis (HWPS)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amy Rademacher-Neel (HWPS)	<input type="checkbox"/> Jennifer Schardt (HWPS)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Colleen McNamara (MSE)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Roderigo Padilla (Acad Advisement)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Janna Goodyear (SAGE)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Bonnie Bailey (SAGE)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doug Scribner (HWPS)	
Guest(s)	Erica Volkers		
I/II . Determination of Quorum & Call to Order:			
III. Approval of Agenda			Action Taken
IV. Approval of Minutes from April 2013 Meeting			Action Taken
Michael noted several corrections to the April 2013 minutes, and commended Janna for preparing the minutes. Doug discussed the record of his comments pertaining to college service.			
V. CNM Distinguished Faculty Award			Presenter
Erica briefed the FS about the need to value and recognize faculty at CNM, in addition to the existing student nomination process. The proposed draft was created from a pre-existing form, with simpler nomination procedures and alignment with CNM core values. A specific substantial award of value to CNM faculty is being researched. Michael noted that more emphasis should be placed on instructional performance and less on college service; Erica agreed, noting that the issue may be the terminology used. Michael inquired about the point system referenced in the draft; points assessments should be more standardized if a single group is to evaluate the nominations. Michael asked about the difference between college service and discipline service in the nomination, which could cause confusion. Erica agreed with the importance of distinguishing between the types of service. Michael noted that the amount of paperwork			Erica Volkers

CNM Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

<p>required of nominees may dissuade some faculty members; Erica noted that the process is typical at other colleges, but requested suggestions for improvement. Barbara observed that the award may justify the effort. Andy noted that information included in the teaching review might be applicable for the nomination form, and Michael responded that the approach won't work for part-time faculty. Andy and Janna suggested that an initial questionnaire and instructor interviews by a selection committee might be an alternative approach. Michael indicated that the timeline for the nomination seems long; Erica responded that the award is envisioned as an annual event (such as a dinner for FT and PT finalists from each School), and that it should be made clear that nominations will accepted at any time. Erica confirmed that the award will include public announcements. Andy asked if Chairs will be eligible and have an advantage; Erica confirmed eligibility, and stated that Chairs will not have an advantage.</p>		
Actions to be taken	Person Responsible	Deadline
Erica will take FS suggestions to the Chairs committee for consideration, and bring decisions back to FS.	Erica	
VI. Senate Resolution 2012a (Parameters of success)		Presenter
		Michael
Actions to be taken	Persons Responsible	Deadline
VII. Academic Affairs Goals for 2013/2014 Ideas		Presenter
<p>Michael noted the AAC goals handout, noting that academic affairs goals for next year must be written. Only Barbara has heard about next year's goals from her Dean and/or Chair. No information was available about which of last year, though progress is apparent on some of the goals.</p>		Michael
Actions to be taken	Person Responsible	Deadline
VIII. Academic Affairs Council Communication Log		Presenter
<p>FS reviewed the 6/12/13 AAC Communication handout.</p>		Michael
Actions to be taken	Person Responsible	Deadline
IX. UNMFS resolution on MOOCs		Presenter
		Michael
Actions to be taken	Person Responsible	Deadline

CNM Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

X. Calendar Proposal Committee: The Continuing Saga for Feedback?		Presenter
Michael requested that Senators develop Plus/Deltas for the various calendar proposals. Barbara noted that the late start for 8-week classes this summer semester prevented at least three students from completing their programs due to cancellation and prohibitions on late enrollment in alternative 12-week classes; Michael explained that the late start was intended to accommodate needs of APS teachers and students. Michael observed that a one-size-fits-all approach is not workable.		CPC
Actions to be taken	Person Responsible	Deadline
XI. Faculty Senate Blog		Presenter
		Judith
Actions to be taken	Person Responsible	Deadline
XII. College Service Rubric Letter to the Chairs		Presenter
FS members reviewed Judith's draft letter. Doug and Amy noted that, despite the existence of a scoring rubric, they have never actually received a score. Janna observed the inconsistency with requirements that instructors provide scores as feedback to students. Barbara questioned if Deans care about the college service assessment; Michael responded that most do. Andy observed that the rubric terms "emerging", "developing" and "proficient" may be misleading; Doug added that CNM is pushing instructors to use measurable assessments. Several Senators discussed how the assessment is used by Deans; Andy noted that it could be used to pressure faculty to do more college service. Janna expressed concern that faculty usually don't see their scores. Doug and Barbara observed that the assessment seems to measure how much non-instructional involvement a faculty member spends. Michael noted that Judith's letter stresses the need for some consistent, objective measure for assessing college service. Michael recalled Cef's contention that college service is not included in the CBA and is a non-issue. Andy noted that Administration wants to include college service in the future CBA, and encouraged FS to support the union's efforts to protect faculty. Michael reiterated the inconsistency in college service hours requirements between schools at CNM. Barbara asked why a point system exists for college service, but not for any other faculty assessments; she suggested that the college service assessment might be eliminated altogether. Doug observed that Chairs and Associate Deans should not be involved in college service evaluations; Barbara and Michael agreed, but further noted that communication by the Dean with his/her subordinates is unavoidable. Senators offered editorial suggestions for the draft letter, which Michael recorded. Further discussion centered on the college service rubric, noting inconsistencies between college service, program		Judith

CNM Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

<p>service and instructional service, and how such activities are classified and evaluated. Michael noted that Dean's Council has not provided clear justification for the college service assessment process. (Senators engaged in a discussion about student course evaluations and the supposed FS responsibility to increase response rates. Senators also discussed faculty relationships with Deans.) Barbara questioned how college service improves the student experience at CNM, noting that the focus should be on students in every CNM process. She further postulated that the developers of the rubric did not have student welfare as a primary consideration. Janna indicated that agreement between faculty and administration about interpretation of the college service rubric is important. Janna asked if the letter should include a reference to the lack of similar rubrics for other faculty evaluations; Barbara suggested that the letter focus on elimination of the college service rubric. Andy suggested that the letter include a request for an explanation of the genesis and purposes of the college service rubric, in order to avoid an appearance of FS approval of the college service rubric process.</p>		
Actions to be taken	Person Responsible	Deadline
Senators will evaluate the draft letter and offer editorial suggestions.	FS	July meeting
XIII. Announcements		
<p style="text-align: center;">Approved</p>		
XIV. Adjournment and next meeting		
<p>The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM. Next Meeting: 00/00/2013 Location: MS 402</p>		