

Meeting Time

Delete Reply Reply all Forward



Robert P. Culp
Wed 10/8/2014 1:45 PM

Mark as unread

To: Faculty Senate;

Senate:

Faculty Senate meets today at 3:30 p.m. in Peeple's Science Building #115.

Regards,

Robert

Faculty Senate Minutes

10.8.2014

Meeting Called to Order @3:32 P.M.

Established a Quorum

Old Business

None to Discuss

New Business

Discussion began with a conversation regarding the lack of information that the college appears to have on the search for a new President (and Vice President for Academic Affairs at the College).

- Chris Wozny noted that we should do our best to be prepared for whatever it is that the BOR might do and that we should do our best to be out ahead of the BOR to best position Dalton State moving into the future.
 - Robert Culp noted that at the last Board of Regents Meeting the BOR took no action on finding a new president or organizing a new search committee for the Dalton State Presidency. He mentioned that we had been concerned about the BOR dragging their feet on this issue.
 - Matt Hipps told the faculty Senate that he had talked to Houston Davis, USG Chief Academic Officer and Executive Vice Chancellor, and that Houston had discussed the fact that the BOR knew the concerns that Dalton State had and that they would be unlikely to drag their feet on this issue. He had also shared that we draft a letter, written to him, that highlighted our concerns moving forward as both a Senate and an institution asking the BOR to provide some clarity and insight into how they were going to proceed.
 - Sarah Mergel noted that we should form an Ad Hoc committee to draft the letter to Houston Davis (and by proxy, the BOR) and that anyone who wanted to be on the committee should volunteer (or if people simply wanted to give some input but not be on the committee that that would be fine also).
 - Discussion ensued about the size of the committee.
 - Committee was formed with Kent, Sarah & Kent
 - Agreed to form a faculty space in the Faculty Senate webpage that would allow faculty to comment on the proposed letter to the BOR.

Item #2: Academic Rigor

- Robert noted that after a discussion with Jodi Johnson during the Faculty Welfare subcommittee meeting, which he was concerned about the BOR forcing our admissions process to revert to the admissions standards of the past. Robert noted that Jodi noted that all but one of our students who were denied admission would have been accepted under our new standards. [Of the 300 people that we denied all but 1 would have been admitted this year].
 - Sarah noted that the changes were mostly related to the addition of the GPA as a factor in admissions
 - Chris Wozny and Robert Culp noted that the major concern with this is that we as a faculty (and as an institution) are still being held to a standard where our funding is related to retention.
 - Celeste Humphrey noted that they are going back to the same admissions that they had several years ago. Discussion ensued regarding the potential impact and reasoning behind these changes. Cathy Hunsicker mentioned the changes in Reading Learning Support and the impact that might have on the larger institutional mission to educate our students.
 - Robert Culp mentioned that there was concern that students will declare a major (specifically business) and hurt their retention numbers. Other folks noted that this could be an issue in other departments.

Item #3: Committee Reports

- Faculty Development Subcommittee
 - Chose a chair, Chris Wozny
 - Decided to work in conjunction with Marina Smitherman and the new CAE were trying to figure out a way to meet the needs of faculty and how to meet the needs of the faculty. The committee discussed being the “Eyes & Ears” of the CAE and to help with feedback and assessment of CAE activities.
 - Also discussed a proposal brought to the Academic Programs Committee about recognition of those who attend faculty development committee. Made a motion and passed it that the committee would make changes to the proposal.
 - It was corrected that Academic Programs was actually the Academic Leadership team.
 - Robert noted that Dr. Stone had talked to the Deans & Chairs about DFW rates and they understood and would use them appropriately.

- Matt Hipps noted that he was at the Leadership Team Meeting and that if the faculty senate really wants to stand up for the recognition idea, that we should be prepared for a battle because the deans and chairs were not empathetic to the idea of the DFW.
 - Chris Wozny talked about how Marina wanted to create a point system to recognize faculty accomplishments within DSC. He noted that, as he understood, the Deans & Chairs did not like the fact that Marina was trying to insert herself into the process. The committee believes that if there is some sort of recognition process that it could not be denied that you attended those faculty development activity.
 - Matt Hipps noted that there were certain chairs who wondered if we had confused attendance versus development.
 - Chris Wozny and Leslie Harrelson brought up the fact that there needs to be more clarity in what the concerns of faculty are versus the staff.
 - Kelson Smith noted that the issue is the same issue that exists in committee work so therefore the argument is not valid.
 - Robert noted that there would be different levels and that you would have to engage in implementation to be able to gain recognition at the highest levels. He then posed the question of are we, as a faculty senate, prepared to back Marina and the process she is suggesting.
 - Matt Hipps warned the faculty senate is going to butt heads about something is this the thing that we want to dig our heels in on.
 - Chris Wozny offered that he believed the plan of the faculty senate committee was solid and they would continue to look at the issue.

- Celeste Humphrey noted there are two issues
 - CAE wants to use levels as a way of giving some recognition (no problem)
 - Chairs feel like they are being told what they need to do and that we need to decide which of those issues need to happen.
 - Cathy Hunsicker noted that the process in the Humanities is that there are some inequities that exist between requirements of various schools and that needed to be addressed before we could address these other less important issues.
- Promotion & Tenure Committee (Richard Collison)
 - Discussed that the major problem is that Dr. Stone wants the school to come up with criteria before the school does (and Dr. Meyer wants to continue down that path). The committee is waiting on the individual schools to make a decision. Kelson Smith noted that Dr. Stone wanted individual departments to make decisions by the end of the semester. He continued by noting that if we look at the work that the previous P&T committee did (that he personally had no problem with, but others did). He brought this up to note that this is a complicated problem
 - Matt Higgs noted that the fundamental question is how deans and chairs protect their faculty. We are fighting an institutional structure that has been in place for some time.
 - Cathy noted that aren't there requirements that the entire school can agree on?
 - Celeste noted that the committee tried to address that issue that existed. That Dr. Stone noted that no one wanted to do this. Celeste noted that we need to figure out the document about timelines and procedures and get that on the table that will solve problems.
 - Discussion ensued about how the committee is reliant upon the other departments and academic units

- Kelson noted that we can't have it both ways: we either have a campus wide process or a departmental level. Kelson noted that you were going to get vocal complaints from a contingent of the faculty no matter what.
 - Matt Hipps noted that the criticisms of those opposed to the P&T document might be a bit misrepresented but that the larger concern was that we know who these people are that are complicating the process and yet we do nothing about it.
 - Kelson noted that no one ever informed the committee of the reasons why it was unsuccessful. Discussion ensued.
- Richard noted that there is a bit of confusion how the committee is supposed to determine the equity issues across criteria on campus. Sarah suggested that we have an outside auditor come in and decide if the standards are at least consistent across the school.
 - The Senate agreed this was a good idea, but we would run into funding issues in how we would pay for this.
 - Motion made to bring in an independent auditor come in and look at the P&T
 - Motion seconded (and "thirded")
 - Discussion ensued
 - A debate ensued about whether this situation was a hypothetical situation or a real situation that needed to be taken care of immediately.
 - It was noted that we know that there are departments on campus where people are being treated unfairly and yet we do nothing about it. The system will fail if the execution does not happen.
 - It was noted that there is an appeals process.
 - Matt Hipps noted that although no one has broken the rules, the rules are being used punitively against some

people. Clint noted that if there is a sword worth dying on, that he is willing to die on this. Several folks agreed.

- The motion was tabled until the next meeting.

- Intellectual Property (Kent Harrleson)
 - Brief discussion about the committee met and discussed several important topics but there was nothing to report to the group at large.
- Faculty Welfare Subcommittee (Matt Hipps)
 - Discussed the reduction of the remaining 5-4 folks to a 4-4 course load to equalize workload on the campus.
 - Discussed the calendar and the need to shrinking the way that we currently do finals. Jodi agreed to bring us some different schedule models that would allow us to visualize how the schedule would look under these different models.
 - Have a subcommittee take a look at the By-Laws, Statutes, and Faculty Handbook and make them all jive with one another.
 - We talked about equity and the salary study that was completed by the college and if we were able to make the conversation a campus wide
 - Finally, did we want to take on the Academic Programs Committee and try to get the Chair position of that committee under the purview of the faculty senate.
- International Education (Not Present)
- Campus Wide Promotion & Tenure (Celeste Humphrey)
 - Noted that they have 33 applicants and so the timelines are more important than they have ever been to ensure that they are able to get the applications to the VPAA's office in a timely fashion.
 - Discussion ensued regarding what happens if Andy is not the VPAA at the start of the fall.
 - Kelson noted that he remembered a time where there wasn't discussion on these issues on this campus that we are a relevant body based on the progress we have made.
 - Sarah Mergel was commended for her great job organizing information.

- Chris Wozny noted it's our job to tell faculty members what we are doing.
- Faculty Resource Committee (Leslie Harrelson)
 - Wanted to make sure that we identified the resources available to us and working on forming a relationship of mutual benefit to the folks in the library. In addition, we need to work on the relationship between our folks in the military and how we deal with them on an institutional level.
- Academic Rigor Ad-Hoc Committee (Clint Kinhead)
 - Committee met and discussed the need to increase rigor in our academic classes. In addition, the committee decided to begin the process of adding more rigor related questions to the faculty evaluations at the end of the semester.

Meeting Adjourned @ 4:42 PM

Next Meeting on Wednesday, November 11, 2014 @ 3:30 P.M.