

Eastern New Mexico University
University Council
February 22, 2021 3:10 p.m.

- Present** Patrice Caldwell, Enrique Carrillo, Allan Crawford, Clark Elswick, Russell Johnson, Jamie Laurenz, Rachel Lingnau, Jeff Long, Christi Melton, Shawn Powell, Darrell Roe, Laura Smart, Scott Smart, Brent Small, Marshall Swafford, David Sweeten, Vickie Thomas, Ryan Trosper, Konni Wallace
- Guests** Tracy Carr, Brad Mauldin, Ryan Roark, Kristi Waldo
- Call to Order** Dr. Swafford called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. A motion (Roe/Allan) to approve the minutes of the January 25, 2021, meeting passed unanimously.
- Reports** President's Report: No report on governance, thanked the committee for the work on governance review.
- President Powell's Report: Had a meeting with faculty and professional senate presidents, we are going through a compensation study and looking at adjustment to compensation levels. Faculty Senate had concerns about committee work and how they are being rated in the COVID environment with regards to faculty evaluations
- President Trosper's Report: No report on governance. Construction update, will have substantial completion done on phase two project on April first. From 2019 Bond. Increased square footage for the students and community which is much needed in Ruidoso.
- Dr. Laurenz: Program Review subcommittees have finalized drafts to send to the programs. The programs have a chance to respond to the program review committee. They can respond by either writing or set up a time to meet. The committee will be finalizing recommendations by the first part March, probably the 5th through the 8th.
- Dr. Long: No report on governance
- Mr. Smart: No report on governance
- Mr. Elswick: No report on governance
- Faculty Senate: No report on governance
- Professional Senate: No report on governance
- Support Senate: No report on governance
- Student Senate: No report on governance
- There were no other reports.

Note- we allowed the presidents to report as they joined the meeting. The order above is not exact.

Old Business

Governance Review- Chairman Swafford went over the Governance review document for Scholarship and Financial Aid Committee, he had questions regarding the number of members, which is currently at 14 members with 4 student member which are not filled. Brent Small explained the purpose of the committee, which is to review appeals from students who are not meeting SAP. Also reviews appeals regarding departmental scholarships not awarded such as athletics and NM lottery. The committee is lucky to get six members in attendance. Committee functions well. Chairman thanked Brent for the depth of his explanation of the duties of the committee.

Dr. Sweeten stated Faculty Senate has suggested language change to faculty committees as presented in the last University Council meeting, Dr. Swafford ask if Stephanie took it back to senate to have it voted on again. Dr. Sweeten responded yes, she did. The changes are

Proposed Committee Membership Restructuring

- All current committee members will retain current membership until end of their term, regardless of tenure status
- **The following committees will reserve membership for faculty required to build service, as defined in their contract (regardless of rank and/or tenure status), unless an eligible faculty member is not nominated.**
 - Curriculum Committee
 - Distance Learning Committee
 - Faculty Personnel Policy and Handbook Committee
 - Faculty Research and Instructional Development Committee
 - General Education Committee
 - Undergraduate Admissions and Standards Committee
- *Procedure changes:*
 - *nominations will be called for by college election chairs*
 - *election chairs will specify requirements of each available position*
 - *nominees will be validated by respective department chairs, as to tenure ranking*
 - ***if, after two weeks, no tenure-track faculty have been nominated for a position, election chairs will re-open nominations to include non-tenure-track faculty to self-nominate/be nominated***

Motion to approve the above changes (Sweeten/Russell) Unanimously passed

No other old business.

New Business

We are not voting on anything, we have members of each of groups for the review documents which will be presented today.

Dr. Carr for the Administrator Evaluation committee. Summarized the review document.

Committee Comments

Is the committee charge/responsibilities and the “report to” administrator or unit appropriate?

Yes, the committee is composed of members from each the four ENMU constituencies (academic, professional, support, and student) and the charge of the committee is to collect input from each of the constituencies regarding the annual evaluation instrument, the administrators evaluated, and the annual evaluation process (dates and delivery method).

The committee also reviews the data and creates a summary report. The Director of Institutional Research distributes the individual reports to the specific administrator and their immediate supervisor. The ENMU Portales President receives a copy of the committee’s summary report as well as copies of all administrator’s reports. The committee reports directly to the President and is appropriate.

Does membership and voting rights for this committee make sense? Does the committee have suggestions for modifying it?

Yes, the membership is composed of one faculty member from each of the four academic colleges (elected, tenured and full professor status) and the elected vice presidents from the professional, support, and student senates. Each has voting rights. The faculty appointments are for three-year terms and the senate members are elected by position. Additionally, the Director of the Institutional Research Office and the Executive Director of Planning and Analysis are consultative, non-voting committee members. All members contribute to the creation of the evaluation instrument, the evaluation process (form of delivery), and dates of evaluation process.

Consultation. With whom does the committee membership consult? How effective is that consultation?

The committee consults with the Director of Institutional Research and the Executive Director of Planning and Analysis at the fall meeting, and throughout the year via email communication or in-person meetings. The President approves any and all changes to the evaluation instrument, administrators to be evaluated, dates of process, etc and is consulted by an in-person meeting with the chair of the committee typically late fall/early spring to discuss any proposed changes. Once approved, the information is confirmed with the entire committee (voting and non-voting members) and the evaluation dates are shared as a courtesy with the Faculty Senate President.

Is the scope of the Committee work reasonable? Is support for the work of the committee adequate?

Yes for both questions.

Is the work of the committee duplicated by any other group, committee or council?

No.

Other comments or suggestions for improvement.

My only suggestion may be to reconsider the word “evaluate” in favor of the word “review” in the description of the committee’s responsibilities as we are a collecting and reviewing body and not a decision making or evaluating body. Thank you, Tracy C.

Students have asked to have an outlet to evaluate offices on campus that all students have access to. The students do not have access to all the administrators. Dr. Caldwell suggested Mr. Carrillo take the student evaluation of offices back to the senate

Curriculum committee governance review presentation by Kris Waldo. Review the document

Committee Comments

Is the committee charge/responsibilities and the “report to” administrator or unit appropriate?

The committee charge and responsibilities as stated above are deemed appropriate and necessary.

The committee reports to Academic Affairs. Given the charge and responsibilities of the committee, reporting to Academic Affairs is appropriate.

Does membership and voting rights for this committee make sense? Does the committee have suggestions for modifying it?

The membership and voting rights for this committee are appropriate.

The committee has no suggestions or recommendations for modifying membership or voting rights.

Consultation. With whom does the committee membership consult? How effective is that consultation?

When carrying out its charge and responsibilities, the committee consults Academic Affairs, internal university constituencies, and external constituencies as needed.

These consultations are effective for furthering the charge and responsibilities of the committee.

Is the scope of the Committee work reasonable? Is support for the work of the committee adequate?

The scope of the committee work is reasonable and necessary.

The support for the work of the committee is adequate.

Is the work of the committee duplicated by any other group, committee or council?

No, the work of this committee is not duplicated by any other group, committee, or council.

Other comments or suggestions for improvement.

The committee has no other comments or suggestions for improvement.

Dr. Caldwell asked about Branch campus consultation with regards to the curriculum committees process. At this time, we have not worked as a committee with close consultation with the branch campuses. Mr. Trosper of the Ruidoso campus, said with the new leadership at his campus they are willing to be included in this type of committee. Dr. Waldo stated they would like participation from the branch campus. Mr. Trosper said he would get some names to help with that. Dr. Powell said Roswell campus said the Roswell campus would agree with Mr. Trosper said for the Roswell campus. Dr. Laurenz told Dr. Waldo to take the membership request for the Roswell and Ruidoso campuses back to the committee for input on how they wish to proceed, then bring those recommendations back to University Council.

Distance Learning committee governance review was presented by Ryan Roark.

Committee Comments

Is the committee charge/responsibilities and the “report to” administrator or unit appropriate?

The committee’s current membership agreed that the charge/responsibilities and the “report to” administrator are appropriate; no changes are recommended at this time.

Does membership and voting rights for this committee make sense? Does the committee have suggestions for modifying it?

The committee’s current membership agrees that the membership and voting rights for this committee are sensible, as they allow for broad representation among staff and faculty stakeholders in distance learning practices, technologies, and services.

Consultation. With whom does the committee membership consult? How effective is that consultation?

This committee regularly consults with the Faculty Senate, VPAA, and Deans. Occasionally, the committee also consults with the broader faculty and student body via electronic survey. This approach has been effective in adequately addressing the committee’s responsibilities.

Is the scope of the Committee work reasonable? Is support for the work of the committee adequate?

The committee agrees that the scope of work for this committee is reasonable. The support provided by the Faculty Senate, VPAA, and the Office of Distance Learning staff is more than adequate to fulfill the committee’s responsibilities.

Is the work of the committee duplicated by any other group, committee or council?

The committee is unaware of any duplication of work by any other entities at ENMU.

Other comments or suggestions for improvement.

The committee has no suggestions for improvement currently.

Professional Senate governance review presented by Allan Crawford.

Is the senate's Constitution, Bylaws' and responsibilities and the "report to" administrator or unit appropriate?

Our Constitution, Bylaws' and Responsibilities are appropriate to our mandate with changes and revisions being addressed recently. Reporting to ENMU President is likely still appropriate.

Does membership and voting rights for this senate make sense? Does the senate have suggestions for modifying it?

Membership and voting rights make sense and have been modified recently to address an issue with membership terms.

Consultation. With whom does the senate membership consult? How effective is that consultation?

We consult often with the Executive Administrative Assistant, Planning, Analysis & Governmental Relations. We occasionally consult with other departments and individuals depending of the item being addressed.

Is the scope of the senates' work reasonable? Is support for the work of the senate adequate?

Both the scope of and support for the senates' work is reasonable to achieve our duties.

Is the work of the senate duplicated by any other group, committee or council?

Our work is for the professional staff at ENMU and is only duplicated when there is cooperation between the senate and other organizations/groups to that purpose.

Other comments or suggestions for improvement.

Continue working on letting constituencies know who their Senate Representatives are.

Roswell has a faculty, professional and support senates on that campus.

Support Senate governance review was presented by Russell Johnson

Committee Comments

Is the senate's Constitution, Bylaws' and responsibilities and the "report to" administrator or unit appropriate?

Yes

Does membership and voting rights for this senate make sense? Does the senate have suggestions for modifying it?

Go to 3 members per area instead of the percentage of support members in each department.

Consultation. With whom does the senate membership consult? How effective is that consultation?

Yes, University Council and President of the Portales campus

Is the scope of the senates' work reasonable? Is support for the work of the senate adequate?

Yes

Is the work of the senate duplicated by any other group, committee or council?

no

Other comments or suggestions for improvement.

Remove the requirement of the outgoing senator to sit out 1 academic year before they can be re-elected.

University Council review document, tabled until next meeting.

No other new business

Adjournment There being no other new business, a motion (B. Small/Sweeten) to adjourn accepted unanimously at 4:16 p.m.

Minutes prepared by
Cris Watson