

Faculty Senate Meeting 10.14.15

Senators Present: Tammy Byron, Lee Ann Cline, Richard Collison, Robert Culp, Cecile de Rocher, Brent Evans, Chuck Fink, Cynthia Fisher, Fernando Garcia, John Gullede, Richard Hambrock, Kent Harrelson, Matthew Hipps, Celeste Humphrey, Sarah Mergel, Sarah Min, Vince Postell, Andy Meyer, Barbara Tucker, Margaret Venable, James Rich, Jason Schmurr, Jane Taylor, Chris Wozny, Karen Wagner, James Wright, Molly Zhou

Senators Absent: Cathy Hunsicker, Ellie Jenkins, DK Kim (2), Gene Mesco, Lovey Mesco, Cheryl Owens, Regina Ray (2), Robin Roe, Marge Sharilla (2), Christy Walker

- Meeting Begins at 3:34 P.M.
 - o Call to Order
 - o Quorum Established
 - o Approval of September Minutes [**Unanimously Approved**]

Old Business

Committee Reports

Faculty Development Committee: Chris Wozny, chair of the committee. Talked about a number of things. Three main points that were covered: 1) faculty are overworked and it makes professional development difficult; 2) New Faculty Mentoring Program needs to be more consistent and formalized. Committee will explore policy and procedures related to teaching methods; 3) Advisory to Marina and there was discussion of the appropriate relationship building with the CAE. Chris noted that there is a special note that there is a meeting on Friday to do grading and encouraged us to committee.

Assessment Committee: Chuck Fink was elected as chair. They discussed WEAVE reports and creating a school/departmental expert who can help everyone else with WEAVE. Continued faculty training to increase our proficiency in WEAVE. In addition, they wanted to increase the usefulness of training related to WEAVE.

Faculty Resource: Elected a chair, Molly Zhou. The committee discussed three priorities for the committee: 1) the creation of a multi-media room to increase student success; 2) identify resources to help faculty find resources to use to aid in their teaching and student success activities. Robert asked about the specifics of the resources and Molly identified them as primarily class recording. In addition, they wanted to increase knowledge for faculty to adjust and explore technology.

Faculty Welfare Subcommittee: Discussed many topics. Elected a chair, Matt Hipps. Discussed concerns related to the calendar and the difficulty moving forward with the calendar given the adversarial nature of the interaction with mid-level administration. There was a conversation surrounding how we interact with the mid-level administration. Dr. Meyer and Dr. Venable stressed the importance of keeping the lines of communication open to ensure that the process becomes less adversarial. We then discussed that we would focus on independent studies and how faculty are compensated

Motion: For the executive committee to look into the bylaws to create an intermediate stage to include the mid-level administration in the process of shared governance. [Celeste Humphrey]
(Motion was never seconded or vote upon)

Comments from Dr. Venable

Dr. Venable made some comments and some thoughts with the Faculty Senate

1. The overall vision of the college → Who are we as an institution? How are we going to move the institution forward?
 - a. We want to be the best undergraduate institution
 - i. We want to be a first choice, destination college
 1. Be the place where students desire to stay here and graduate from here.
 - ii. There isn't a point in trying to replicate something being done a few miles down the road (Kennesaw) when we could be a great college here
 - b. Creation of a Retention Committee (or some fancier name)
 - i. Brought in consultants to look at our processes and procedures and how can we be more successful at helping them to succeed and stay and graduate from Dalton State
 - c. We will be working on a Strategic Plan in the Spring
 - i. Critical institutional endeavor → believes there needs to be more focus to the plan but that the themes are solid themes
 - ii. Branding and Marketing consultants
 - d. Capital Campaign Feasibility Study
 - i. Hired a consultant to help us figure out if it is viable to do a capital campaign.

Dr. Venable noted that faculty are doing a great job and that good instruction is at the core of the institution. Celeste brought up the fact that her entire time on campus there have been a hierarchical structure that made it difficult to facilitate discussions in a non-adversarial manner. Celeste asked what we can do to get out of the adversarial stance?

- Dr. Venable echoed the sentiments that we need to open the lines of communication so that we can have a more open and honest dialogue about the issues that face the campus. She noted the importance of two-way communication and urged us to continue to communicate with the administration to encourage shared governance.

Motion to Change the Bylaws: IEC

Fernando Garcia (IEC) explained the request for a bylaws change by Dr. Guo, Chair of the IEC, who wanted to extend the composition of the committee (proposal submitted via email 10 days before the meeting). Motion to increase the number of faculty from 2 to 5 on the International Education Committee. Wozny inquired as to the number of faculty members and expressed concern that the committee would be unwieldy. Sarah explained that some of the reps were more student based and serve a different purpose on the committee than the faculty department reps.

Motion to Accept the Proposal As-Is Made [Mergel]. Motion Seconded [Hippis] → Motion Passed Unanimously

NEW BUSINESS

Discussion of the Purpose of the Strategic Plan Monitoring Committee

Discussion of the purpose of the monitoring committee. John discussed that the committee has all the responsibility but none of the power to actually carry out their duties. Chris Wozny asked if that is our responsibility as faculty to monitor. John answered that we all have input into the plan. Sarah noted that in Liberal Arts we are told that we need to be putting it on our annual reports. There was more discussion surrounding the importance of this committee. Chuck Fink talked a little about the possible purpose. Wozny wanted to know why we are having this discussion. Culp said that there was a concern from a member about the purpose. The discussion suggested that the fs saw a reason for the committee and it should proceed to work on how to best monitor the college's plan.

Robert Culp mentioned a concern about WEAVE assessment and cutting back on the assessments. Several members said they were not cutting back. Chuck and Chris suggested it did serve a purpose beyond WEAVE. Matt said the issue is not doing assessment, but not really knowing what happened with it. Dr. Venable said that yes the information was used in reports she gets so it is valid.

Discussion of the Creation of an Honor Code

Matt brought up the issue of a possible honor code for DSC. Dr. Schwenn did not support the idea, but since several faculty members have come to us with concerns. It seemed an appropriate time to re-evaluate the issue. He then talked a little bit about the Harvard Honor Code as a possible model. Harvard's issues went down because of the sense of accountability. Matt just wanted to know if we wanted to pursue this. Molly wanted to know how it was different than the academic integrity statement used in the syllabus—Education has a common statement. Robert said there is difference between a statement and a code. John asked about

the model and said he would support moving in this direction. Matt pointed out that right now there is a lack of consistency in the current structure, especially when it comes to people cheating in multiple classes. James Wright mentioned that at the ACC level, Matt Chenoweth asked about buy-in across the campus. Specifically, that it might not be accepted all around the campus. The first step would be a common statement, which would be a major culture shift.

The Executive Session Began (Administrators were asked to leave)

[Note: In future, the Faculty Senate must motion and then vote to enter into executive session. If this is not done, no administrator is required (as per Faculty Senate Bylaws) to leave the meeting as our meetings are open to the faculty].

Robert discussed concern with the makeup of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, noting that an incident occurred this summer that brought into question the makeup of the committee and expressed concerns at the objectivity of deans and chairs to the concerns of other deans and chairs. Discussion ensued with several faculty members citing concern over the notion that deans and chairs lacked the ability to be objective. After discussion continued for several minutes, Kent Harrelson noted that as this seemed to be a discussion between members of the Executive Committee of the faculty senate that we could handle it in our next Executive Committee meeting.

Robert adjourned the meeting at 4:49 P.M.

Next Meeting is **November 11, 2015 @ 3:30, Location TBA**