

**JSCC Faculty Council Meeting Minutes**  
**July 22, 2019**

The Faculty Council met Monday, July 22<sup>nd</sup> at 12:00 p.m. in the Health Sciences Building, Conference Room 111

Present: Kim Holland, Vivian Grooms, Ryan Guth, Lauren Bryant, Ben Jeter, Tammy Prater, David Hart, James Mayo, Lisa Matlock, Pete O'Brien, Anna Esquivel, and Emily Fortner.

---

Minutes from the April meeting are not ready for review. Apologies were made for the unavailability of the minutes. It was assured that they will be ready for review and approval in August.

**Old Business**

1.1 Withdrawal Survey (Holland)

Holland provided background about the withdrawal survey.

Dr. Hamilton created the DREAM team about a year ago whose mission was assess student progression and degree/certificate completion using data-driven methods. This team was charged with reviewing an existing withdrawal survey, created in 2010, that had previous been used to solicit information about why students withdrawal from online courses. In November 2018, the 2018-2019 faculty council was provided an opportunity to review the survey. The consensus from the membership was that the survey had many problems, but that the most outstanding issue was language about “conflict with instructor.” The council recommended striking that language and addressing the larger problems of the survey, suggesting that the team revise it completely.

Holland said that she assumed that feedback would be incorporated into the survey revision and that another draft would be submitted to Faculty Council with time to meet with DREAM representatives and provide further feedback. She attended the DREAM meeting in at the beginning of July, after which she received the new draft of the survey with instructions, emailed to her on July 8th, to provide feedback by August 1st, after which it would go live.

Council reviewed the most recent draft of the withdrawal survey. Council voiced the following concerns about the survey:

- Because the DREAM team is comprised of appointed members that there was not sufficient review of the survey by faculty. Holland clarified the DREAM team membership was comprised of several faculty and confirmed that she was a member of the committee as a faculty council representative.
- How will this information be rolled out to students and is it connected with IOTA?

- Council raised logistical concerns about the timing of the survey, the length of the survey, and the content/wording of the questions, which does not adequately address the previous council's request to strike the language about conflict with instructor.

Council suggested that this survey be put on hold by IR so that it might be reviewed an appropriate standing committee.

Holland addressed her concern that important information, such as the withdrawal survey, is not being properly vetted. There was concern that this situation was indicative of a larger, systemic issue related to shared governance in which committees are being created and dissolved without faculty input. She stated that the August 1st. deadline for feedback on the survey before it goes live is not realistic or in the spirit of shared governance, since it does not provide enough time, especially in the summer months, to share the survey with our constituents.

The following motion was made, seconded, discussed, and approved:

*Produce a written response, addressed to Dr. Hamilton, outlining our concerns about the withdrawal survey and the process through with the survey has been revised. The letter should logically state the problem that the faculty have not had appropriate time to review the survey. The letter should also include the specific concerns we have about the content of the survey, such as the problems with the Likert scale as a measurement on certain questions, the leading language, the inclusion of language about conflict with the instructor, and the length of the survey.*

## 1.2 Assessment of Administrators Update (Holland)

Dr. Hamilton has committed to administering the Assessment of Administrators every year. Faculty council requested and received information on the following:

1. **What were the response rates?** Hamilton reported that the response rate was 72%. This suggests that people trusted that the measure was secure and confidential. Hamilton extended the offer to share response rate results sans personal identifier information, which speaks to her willingness to be transparent.
2. **How will survey results be used?** Hamilton plans to share the data with her direct reports in order to establish goals for the year. She will also provide the information to Chancellor Tydings. Bailey was also asked that question but he has not responded.
3. **What are the big lessons learned from the Assessment of Administrators?** Sara Vonderheide believed that the pilot was a success and that it went off without a hitch.

It was also noted that a formal policy regarding a regular assessment of administrators was discussed at the July meeting of the TBR faculty subcouncil.

## 1.3 DEI (Holland)

The Digital Enhancement Initiative was brought to the attention of the faculty council chair in early summer following the president's cabinet meeting. Because it was difficult to schedule a meeting between Dr. Bailey and the FC executive committee, the FC chair posed the following questions to Bailey in an email on June 10th:

*Are you under the impression that TBR will support faculty's right to choose materials, digital or otherwise, for their classrooms?*

In an email sent on July 17<sup>th</sup>, Dr. Bailey responded that he continues to receive assurances from TBR that faculty will remain in control of choice of materials in their classrooms.

*In president's cabinet, Dr. Bailey mentioned that he formed a group to talk about DEI concerns. Faculty Council was not aware there was a group. Who comprises this group?*

Dr. Bailey responded that Dr. Hamilton asked him to chair a group focusing on administrative issues related to DEI. He mentioned that Ann Barlow from Follett will be at in-service for further questions.

Faculty council posed concerns about the DEI:

- Some students need to keep textbooks long after the conclusion of a semester because they have to study for boards.
- We have received assurances that students can get a copy of a text with no pictures as part of their fee, but pictures and illustrations are important elements of textbooks, particularly in the sciences.
- If there are free options, even those available through Follett, why are students being assessed a DEI fee?
- How will this fee assessment affect student refunds?

Faculty council will present these issues regarding the DEI initiative to President's cabinet.

#### 1.4 Online Quality Council Policy (Fortner/Grooms)

A new policy regarding online course development was penned in March and was given to faculty council the night before our April meeting. The council responded to the policy by stating that course developers should have been consulted during the review and revision of the policy. In the meantime, Bailey asked the Deans to send it to their faculty. The deans did not get much feedback from their faculty.

After faculty council received a copy of the new policy at the April meeting, Faculty Council requested that course developers look at this proposed policy. Bailey responded that the faculty should have asked for this to happen sooner. Holland believed that this was disrespectful to the faculty council, because she received the policy the night before a council meeting and that she had to ask for it, rather than it being offered freely.

Originally, the policy was set to go live in July, but it has now been put on hold. Dean Grooms explained that this is because accessibility training will have a significant impact on the policy and will affect what developers will be agreeing to do, given new guidelines on accessibility and universal design. She believed that the contract pay may not be considered sufficient compensation for the amount of work that will be involved in updating, developing, or redesigning online courses. They will be researching the policies and implementation methods of other colleges across the state. It was confirmed that we are currently still using the old online course development policy, although it is being inconsistently followed across divisions. Dean Grooms did caution that faculty should not start any online development work without a signed contract.

Accessibility training will be a crucial aspect of online development moving forward. Any work in Elearn, even for ground classes, will have to follow the new accessibility policies and faculty will have to have accessibility training for their courses to transfer liability from the college to the faculty.

Bailey has not communicated directly to faculty or Council that the online policy in question has been put on hold.

#### 1.5 College-Wide Committees (Holland)

Dr. Hamilton has been made aware that there has not been much communication between Bailey and Faculty Council about review of campus committees, though she is aware that faculty council has persistently expressed interest in being part of the review process. Bailey has been asked to give a presentation on the review of committees at the July 29<sup>th</sup> cabinet meeting. He has also been asked to meet with faculty council during convocation week to review his recommendations from the perspective of shared governance. Council agreed that a final decision about the review of committees should not be made until consultation with faculty council and that Bailey should be given a deadline for making decisions about the dissolution and addition of committees after faculty council's review.

Council discussed issues related to committee accountability, definitions of committees, and committee structures.

The next steps will be for Bailey to present his committee review findings in President's Cabinet. Emily Fortner will report those findings to Council at the next meeting.

### **Other Discussion Items**

#### 2.1 President's Cabinet Report (Holland)

Faculty council reviewed and felt satisfied with the current population of President's Cabinet.

#### 2.2 Report from College Wide Standing Committees (Council)

Funding for campus projects has changed at a state level, with an emphasis on projects that are in line with current state-wide initiatives. The primacy seems to be with new campuses for underserved regions. We are now in competition with all community colleges and TCATs across the state, but there also seems to be pressure to open up new campuses in order to get funding under this new funding formula. As a result of these funding changes, it is unlikely the library renovation will be approved.

It was noted that committee itself has met only once in four years, so regular meetings might allow the committee to be more helpful and effective in terms of scoring, prioritizing, and providing feedback on proposed campus projects.

### 2.3 Report from the Dean's Council (Grooms)

Dean Grooms provided information related to evidence-based reviews of program viability. The consulting firm Gray and Associates will be reviewing programs viability and providing recommendations about new programs.

It was discussed that faculty development committee take on a larger role as part of a teaching and learning initiative, which will help faculty training and education, such as in the case of accessibility, universal design and storyboarding, equity in the classroom, etc.

Major changes are being made to general education. They reviewed general education core about ten years ago and are doing it again. They are looking at focusing on six learning objectives that general education courses will be able to provide. TBR has asked CAOs to generate faculty input by putting out a call for volunteers to serve on the project teams. Bailey has asked deans to serve as faculty representatives on the team.

### 2.4 Report from TBR Faculty Sub Council (Esquivel)

Anna Esquivel attended the subcouncil meeting on June 19th.

She reported that the faculty subcouncil pressed Dr. Denn about concerns related to academic freedom in book selection as related to the DEI. Dr. Denn and Dr. Schulte reaffirmed faculty's freedom to select textbooks for their class as long as they are following the policy regarding the consideration of low cost options. It was also stressed by Dr. Schulte and Dr. Denn that we must tell students that they can get their books anywhere they want, short of providing them specific company to buy from. A change was made in the policy that "encourages" faculty to consider low cost options, rather than "requiring" it.

Council brought up the issue that the DEI confuses the distinction between low costs options from other retailers and low cost options from the publisher.

The subcouncil reviewed the policy on academic freedom and responsibility. Shared governance will now be included in the definition of academic freedom in the HR policy.

Dr. Denn did not provide his update on DEI during the subcouncil meeting, but he would be sending his slides via email. Those will be forwarded to faculty council upon receipt of that email.

### **Other Business**

Faculty Council discussed faculty peer review as part of the tenure and promotion process. Because of changes to specific criteria related to the peer review that was mentioned in faculty subcouncil, Faculty Council will follow up with administration about this criteria and when it would go into effect.

Kim Holland announced that she has resigned from the college. She extended her appreciation for the relationships she created over the past seventeen years and stated that it has been an honor to serve on the council.

The meeting adjourned at 2:54 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Anna Esquivel  
Faculty Council Secretary

---

Emily Fortner  
Faculty Council Chair