**Journal for Academic Excellence**

**Katie Pridemore Named to Lead CAE**

In January 2013, Katie Pridemore, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, will take the helm of the Center for Academic Excellence. She was chosen after a committee reviewed applicants. She will assume responsibilities from Dr. Christy Price.

This is Ms. Pridemore’s fourth year as a faculty member at Dalton State. She teaches MATH 1111 (College Algebra), 1113 (Pre-Calculus), 2200 (Introduction to Statistics), 2253 (Calculus and Analytic Geometry I), 4701 and 4702 (Probability and Statistics I and II). She has been serving as a Faculty Fellow for the CAE this semester, helping to compile and interpret statistics related to last year’s course redesign initiatives.

Compiling and interpreting statistics is Katie’s specialty. She will soon earn her Ph.D. in Math from the University of Central Florida. She is finishing her dissertation, which studies survival analysis, an area of statistics with biomedical applications. She also holds an M.S. in Math from UCF and a B.S. in Math from Stetson University.

When asked how she felt about her future journey as the Director of the Center for Academic Excellence, Katie said “Amazing! Excited!” Her present plans are to keep the structure and programs of the CAE as they are, but she would also like to develop two areas: undergraduate research and increasing the Center’s web presence.

Professor Pridemore’s interests in college pedagogy center on active learning, games

---

The editor of the *Journal for Academic Excellence* is proud to draw the reader’s attention to all of our features in this issue, but especially to the three original articles. Dr. Jason Schmurr and Ms. Lydia Knight have contributed timely researched essays for this edition.

Mr. Jerry Drye has helped out the editor by taking over the “Editor’s Column” for this issue, an act for which she is quite grateful.

Lots of other news and notes are to be found here. Enjoy, attend, learn—that is what faculty development is about.

Faculty involved in the book discussions are reminded that if they write two to three paragraphs about their “experiment” of using one of the techniques from the Elizabeth Barkley book on student engagement techniques, it will be published in the February edition of the *Journal*.

Finally, the editor would like to thank Dr. Christy Price for her leadership in the Center for Academic Excellence this summer and fall. She has established a vibrant program upon which Ms. Katie Pridemore can build. Many kudos to her tireless work and for being sure we have meals at our meetings!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Speaker/ Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barkley Book Discussion</td>
<td>Tuesday, November 27</td>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>LIA 236</td>
<td>Barbara Murray/ Barbara Tucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkley Book Discussion</td>
<td>Wednesday, November 28</td>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>LIA 236</td>
<td>Orenda Gregory/ Jerry Drye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkley Book Discussion</td>
<td>Wednesday, November 28</td>
<td>1:40</td>
<td>LIA 236</td>
<td>Christy Price/Matt Hipps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkley Book Discussion</td>
<td>Wednesday, November 28</td>
<td>1:40</td>
<td>LIA 236</td>
<td>Marina Smitherman/ Annabelle McKie-Voerste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race, Gender, and Class Workshop</td>
<td>Friday, November 30</td>
<td>12:00 (lunch provided)</td>
<td>LIA 201</td>
<td>Dr. Pamela Molenaar-Wirsey and Dr. Debbie Moon, Georgia Perimeter College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Learn Training</td>
<td>Thursday, December 6</td>
<td>3:00-5:00</td>
<td>ETC Room—Brown Third Floor</td>
<td>ETC Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All faculty are welcome to attend the book discussions, even if they have not been reading the book. Colleagues will be sharing their experiences of using the strategies in their classrooms over the past months.

CLICK HERE TO REGISTER FOR THESE SESSIONS

Will YOU Be Part of the Teaching & Learning Best Attenders?

The faculty who attend the most CAE events and workshops over the course of the semester will be celebrated at the December faculty meeting and will earn stylish CEA Polo Shirts.
November is open enrollment time for our benefits plan here at DSC. Many other organizations observe this practice as well. It is a time for folks to consider PPOs, HMOs, HSPs, 1-2-3s, ABCs, and Do-Re-Mis. I would recommend also considering a few Tee-Hee-Hees and encourage everyone to sign up for an LPP (Laughter Prescription Plan). Let me tell you why.

Depending upon the source, it has been estimated that children aged infant to preschool laugh anywhere from 300-400 times per day. Of course, as I recall from my child rearing days, it really does not take that much to get a baby to laugh. You just need to jiggle keys in front of them, put on a funny hat, play peep-eye, or stick a French fry up your nose. The tiny tots’ sense of the comic is not very sophisticated. Some of the same people who investigate things such as kiddie laughter have also estimated that adults may only laugh 15 times or fewer per day. This would seem to be a great disparity. If this is true, then why is it true? Is it because we are so entangled with the stresses of daily life that we are too serious or too busy to make time for laughter?

While the evidence is mixed, there is certainly some justification for the notion that laughter is the best medicine. The famous story of Norman Cousins is a case in point. The former editor of the Saturday Review was diagnosed with Ankylosing Spondylitis and given a horrible prognosis. He used laughter therapy to reduce pain and improve the quality of his life. You can read his story as he describes it in his books Anatomy of an Illness and Biology of Hope. Around the world laughter yoga groups, laughter clubs, and laughter therapy practices abound. The idea that laughter is good for you has caught on, but we still forget to do it sometimes.

I suppose that I am in touch with my inner child, because I know that I laugh more than 15 times per day. I often say that laughter is not a luxury— it is a necessity. I would say that it is my mantra, except that I am not really certain what a mantra is, and it seems kind of pompous and supercilious to even have a mantra. In fact, it seems kind of pompous to use the word supercilious, so pretend I did not.

Nevertheless, I believe that laughter is very important, especially in these times of budget cuts, long days, furloughs, and concerns about such things as promotion, tenure, Weave, Lust for Learning (D2L), DFW rates, and the like. I know that there are days when we do not know whether to laugh or cry. Well, if I have a choice, then I choose laughter. I remember once meeting a couple at hotel breakfast buffet line one morning after I had performed comedy there the evening before. The gentleman apologized to me for his wife laughing too much and too hard the night before. I assured him that his apology was not necessary and that it was actually my goal to have his wife and other members of the audience do exactly what she was doing. I wondered if he had ever been to a comedy show before. Still, his attitude may be indicative of the notion that if we laugh too much we will no longer be considered serious people. This is hardly the case.

So since it is open enrollment month, join the LPP. It may or may not add to your general sense of health and fitness, but it probably will not hurt you. It might even make you feel better. It does not cost a lot of money the way gym memberships and fancy fitness equipment does. More importantly, it will not hurt your stomach the way aspirin can. You cannot laugh your cares away, for they will always be with you. You can take a respite so that you will be able to deal with your cares better. You folks are my heroes, so let us help each other by sharing as many smiles and laughs with one another as we can. If you have any trouble increasing your daily laugh total, then just come by my office and I will put a French fry up my nose.

Go Roadrunners!
and group work, flipped classrooms, and distance learning.

Katie is married to Adam Pridemore, who teaches English at Virginia College in Chattanooga. As exciting as becoming the CAE director is for Katie, a more exciting and life-changing event happened four months ago. On July 20 at 2:01 p.m., their first child, Theodore Spencer Pridemore, was born, weighing in at eight pounds, thirteen ounces.

“Baby Teddy” is, of course, a wonderful baby, and we’re pretty sure Katie will show you pictures if you ask.

The Journal of Academic Excellence congratulates Katie Pridemore on her new position and looks forward to working with her in the months to come to build on a strong foundation of faculty development at Dalton State.

BIG NEWS!

The date for the Fourth Annual Dalton State College Conference on Teaching and Learning has been set!

Mark Friday, March 15, on your calendar, Blackberry, planner, Iphone . . . .

Information on submitting proposals for review will soon be available.

This is a solid opportunity for you to share your scholarship and experience about teaching and learning with your peers.

REMEMBER

Friday, November 16th 12:30 pm -3:00 pm
LIA 201 — Lunch Provided

Race, Gender, and Culture in the Classroom

Dr. Pamela Moolenaar-Wirsiy, Director,
Center for Teaching & Learning and Academic Initiatives

Dr. Debi Moon, Associate Professor of Business,
Georgia Perimeter College

Colleges increasing diversity brings classroom opportunities and challenges. Curriculum needs to be broadened to include cultural and ethnic representations. In this interactive workshop, we’ll explore one’s race, gender, and cultural outlook and brainstorm ways to appropriately respond to the opportunity diversity offers in an academic setting.
Introducing the Faculty Senate Subcommittee on Faculty Development

The purpose of the Faculty Development Subcommittee is to identify, promote, and support professional development opportunities and to oversee initiatives for faculty development in the area of teaching and learning for full-time Dalton State College faculty. This subcommittee will be merging with the CAE Leadership Team that has been active in Summer and Fall 2102 to aid Dr. Price in planning professional development events. Duties of the subcommittee are that it will suggest, propose, and work with the College administration to provide, support, and promote the most appropriate opportunities for faculty to enhance their teaching effectiveness. The subcommittee will make recommendations to the Director of the Center for Academic Excellence as appropriate.
Regional and International Teaching and Learning Conferences

University System of Georgia Teaching and Learning Conference - April 4-5, 2013
(proposals due January 4, 2013)
http://www.usg.edu/facultyresources/conference/

Georgia Conference On College & University Teaching at Kennesaw State College - February 15-16, 2013
(proposals due Friday, January 11, 2013)
http://www.kennesaw.edu/cetl/conferences/gaconf/2013.html

Teaching Matters Conference at Gordon College in Barnesville, GA—March 22-23, 2013
(proposals due February 14, 2013)
http://www2.gdn.edu/teachingmatters

EDUCAUSE Regional and National Conferences
http://www.educause.edu/conferences-events

Teaching Professor Conferences
http://www.magnapubs.com/conferences/

Lilly Conferences on College and University Teaching
http://lillyconferences.com/

International SUN Conference on Teaching and Learning
http://cetalweb.utep.edu/sun/

Professional Organizational Developers (POD) Conferences
http://www.podnetwork.org/conferences.htm
Three Pilot Courses For Learning Support Mathematics

Dr. Jason Schmurr, Assistant Professor of Mathematics
Dalton State College

Paul Fonstad, Assistant Professor of Mathematics
Franklin College (Formerly Dalton State College)

Abstract
One area of concern at many college and universities is the poor passing rates in remedial mathematics courses, as these courses hold many students back from advancing toward graduation. We discuss a variety of approaches recently taken to improve instruction in learning support math at Dalton State College. These approaches include an emphasis on group work and two different styles of computer-based learning, one using the WebAssign software and another using the ALEKS software. We assess the approaches by examining student success rates on the COMPASS standardized test and student evaluation forms. Our recommendations for how to proceed in teaching these courses as well as the data we used to arrive at these conclusions are provided.

Learning support mathematics courses are a stumbling block for many students. From Fall 2009 through Spring 2012, the pass rate in MATH 0098 at Dalton State College has averaged 49.4%. This poor pass rate is a concern for many reasons, but one of the largest reasons is that since a student cannot continue enrollment at DSC after failing to exit learning support in three semesters, repeated failure to pass this class leads to many students losing the opportunity to complete their degrees.

In addition, we have observed a low level of apparent student engagement in MATH 0098. This lack of engagement is concerning, especially for learning support classes, as often these students are the ones who need to spend more time and effort on a mathematics course. By not being engaged, these students risk not putting in the required level of commitment needed to successfully acquire the skills to pass the course.

To address these issues, during the 2011-2012 academic year we offered special sections of DSC’s MATH 0098 course, focusing on three nontraditional approaches. One approach involved a strong emphasis on group work. A second approach involved self-paced work on computers using the ALEKS learning system. A third approach involved instructor-paced work on computers using the WebAssign learning system. As described in the Data section (pages 9-10), one instructor implemented group work sections and instructor-paced computer sections; the other instructor implemented group work sections and student-paced computer sections.

We assessed our experiments by looking at our students’ performance on the COMPASS exit test. Students must pass this test to exit learning support. We also gathered quantitative data from student evaluations measuring student interest and overall student satisfaction. The data suggests that the group work sections and the instructor-paced computer sections performed significantly better than the college average, whereas the self-paced computer sections did not show any improvement over the standard mode of instruction.

Continued on page 8
The Standard Model

We shall use the term “standard model” to refer to the sections of MATH 0098 at DSC during our study other than our pilot courses. The standard model generally involves a large amount of lecture. Each instructor has a distinct style; however, it is fair to say that the majority of MATH 0098 sections taught at DSC have involved a large amount of time with the instructor at the board, either lecturing or leading class discussion. A common thread amongst our three pilot courses is that students spent most of each period actively engaged in doing mathematics rather than passively learning from an instructor. Active learning has been shown to produce positive learning outcomes in academic disciplines as diverse as economics (Maier and Keenan, 1994), computer science (McConnell 1996), foreign languages (Szostek 1994), and social work (Steiner et, al., 1999).

Group Work-Centered Sections

In this model, we mixed “mini-lectures” with short activities to be completed in groups. We began each period with a short quiz designed to check student retention and to guide the initial course of the lecture. The rest of the class time was spent mixing brief lectures with a wide assortment of group activities, with no single component of a period exceeding 15 minutes in length. The short activities included “Think-Pair-Share,” passport activities, and other dynamic exercises designed to get students talking about math with each other. During the Spring 2012 semester, we were also given the ability to conduct these sections in a room specifically dedicated to group work; the desks were grouped into islands of four at all times.

Our group work-centered sections outperformed the standard model (see Data section), as measured by pass rates on the COMPASS exam. Our data analysis suggests that the group work sections displayed a statistically significant improvement (P=0.0405). Student response was positive; course evaluation scores for the pilot instructors were somewhat higher than they had received in the past. Additionally, there was an increase in student interest during this pilot (as measured by student evaluations), which suggests to us that group work may generate enthusiasm for mathematics.

Computer-Centered, Instructor-Guided Sections

In this model, we presented a “mini-lecture” at the beginning of the period, generally lasting between 10 and 15 minutes. For the remaining 60-65 minutes, students worked on problems delivered over the Internet via the WebAssign homework system. The instructor circulated throughout the classroom, helping groups and individuals as requested. These problems could only be accessed during class time and were the same for every student, encouraging students to attend class and to work together. A homework assignment was also given via WebAssign each day. The details in these assignments were randomized so that each student had a unique assignment; the goal here was to encourage students to attempt the homework individually.

Our computer-centered, instructor-guided sections outperformed the college as a whole (see Data section). Our data analysis suggests a fairly significant improvement (P=0.05773). However, we do recommend that more data be gathered to support this hypothesis.

Computer Centered, Self-Paced Sections

In this model, students used the online system ALEKS to complete the material. Each student was free to work at his or her own pace during the semester. In contrast to our other two pilots, in which paper-based tests were given at regular intervals to the entire class, each test was taken within the ALEKS program whenever the student was ready. The instructor circulated throughout the classroom, abandoning the “sage on the stage” model of education for that of a “guide by the side,” and helping individuals as requested.

In contrast to our other two pilot courses, the self-paced sections slightly underperformed when compared to the college as a whole (see Data section, p 9). Our data analysis did not show a statistically significant difference (P=0.8839) between the self-paced sections and the standard model.

Conclusion

The group work focused pilot and the instructor-paced computer centered pilot showed promise by outperforming the standard model. We believe that the techniques employed in these pilot courses should be adopted more widely within the college as a whole, and that further study should be done to determine more precisely why these techniques are succeeding. The self-paced computer centered pilot did not outperform the standard model. We hypothesize that students in learning
Three Pilot Courses, Continued from page 8

Support mathematics may need more instructor guidance than the self-paced model affords.
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Data

Pilot Courses Versus College-Wide Performance, Fall 2011 and Spring 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrolled</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed COMPASS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Passed</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We compared the pilot courses with the standard model using the P-value method for comparing two population proportions. Using the claim that the pilot course exceeded the standard model, we arrived at the following P-values and conclusions. Note that since we ran group work pilots in both semesters, we also compared the cumulative performance of the group work pilots to the cumulative performance (Fall 2011 and Spring 2012) of the standard model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2011 Group Work</th>
<th>Fall 2011 WebAssign</th>
<th>Fall 2011 Standard</th>
<th>Spring 2012 Group Work</th>
<th>Spring 2012 ALEKS</th>
<th>Group Work Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>0.18988</td>
<td>0.05773</td>
<td>0.01854</td>
<td>0.88388</td>
<td>0.04046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistically significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Perhaps</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also compared the performance of the pilot courses with the performances of previous MATH 0098 sections taught by the same instructors. Data collected is listed below.

Performance by Instructors in Pilot Courses Versus Previous Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instructor A WebAssign</th>
<th>Instructor A Group Work</th>
<th>Instructor A Previous</th>
<th>Instructor B Group Work</th>
<th>Instructor B ALEKS</th>
<th>Instructor B Previous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Interest</td>
<td>2.827</td>
<td>2.709</td>
<td>2.650</td>
<td>2.723</td>
<td>2.933</td>
<td>2.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Semester Interest</td>
<td>3.172</td>
<td>3.167</td>
<td>3.185</td>
<td>3.357</td>
<td>3.133</td>
<td>3.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>+.345</td>
<td>+.458</td>
<td>+.535</td>
<td>+.634</td>
<td>+0.200</td>
<td>+.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Evaluation</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on page 10
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The pass rates below include the results of the pilot courses we ran in Fall 2011 and Spring 2012.

**Dalton State College-Wide MATH 0098 Pass Rates By Semester, Fall 2009 – Spring 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Passed</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>54.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>44.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2010</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>49.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>50.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>42.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2011</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>51.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>58.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>43.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td>3914</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>49.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On Friday, October 19, Dr. Amy Buddie, who serves as Associate Director of the Center for Teaching & Learning at Kennesaw State University, spoke to Dalton State faculty and staff on “Dealing with Difficult Student Behavior.”
Sharing the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Lydia F. Knight

Head Librarian, Derrell C. Roberts Library

Dalton State College

Abstract
Sharing scholarship is at the heart of academia. Technology now allows us to share scholarship with a broader audience than our own campus. The GALILEO Knowledge Repository (GKR) is providing a tool to share the scholarship of the University System of Georgia on a global basis. The Roadrunner Scholar repository at Dalton State is the first step to our college’s scholarship becoming part of GKR and achieving a state, national, and global audience.

Sharing scholarship with our colleagues is the heart of academic culture. According to the Vision Statement of the Center for Academic Excellence:

As colleagues and members of the college community we are committed to supporting one another's efforts to develop innovative and effective teaching and learning strategies. We seek to support all faculty in sharing best practices, implementing methods which enhance student achievement of learning outcomes, and in pursuing the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Supporting and sharing one another’s scholarly works leads to innovation and enhancement of teaching and learning. Faculty scholarship supports accreditation, building programs, promotion and tenure, and community outreach. Production of new knowledge through the publication of scholarly works and the maintenance of a scholarly record is part of the faculty culture. So how do we share our scholarship with one another?

Today’s technology provides a tool known as an institutional repository. Individual colleges can set up a repository to hold digital copies of faculty and student scholarship, college publications, and college archives. A consortium of these institutional repositories increases the access, visibility, distribution, and impact of the scholarly contributions (Oguz, 2011, p.13).

One of the strategic goals of the Regents Academic Committee on Libraries is to advance scholarly communication in Georgia through the GALILEO Knowledge Repository (GKR). The purpose of GKR is to provide a statewide and central institutional repository for the University System and to serve as a collaborative model. This repository provides the means to share scholarship within individual campuses, with other colleges and universities in the state and the nation, and with the global academic community.

The GKR was initially proposed in 2005 and finally received a grant in 2009 from the Institute of Museum and Library Services to build a statewide institutional repository online. The technology harvests metadata from several institutions and provides federated searching and browsing across the institutions’ holdings. That is library/tech geek speak for pulling the data from each institution’s database and making it easier to search and browse by keyword, author, title, and subject. Users may enter the search one time for all the institutions, instead of having to search each institution’s repository individually.

The current partners in GKR include Albany State College, Columbus State University, College of Coastal Georgia, Georgia Gwinnett College, Georgia Health Sciences University, Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia Southern University, Georgia State University, Kennesaw State University, University of...
Sharing, continued from page 11

Georgia, and Valdosta State University. The benefits of an institutional repository are four-fold (Bankier, Smith, & Cowan, 2009, p.5).

- Improving community outreach and engagement—(The scholarship becomes available to the community at large and provides tangible evidence of the institution’s value to that community.)

- Increasing institutional visibility and improving brand awareness—(A repository enables the college to have a global presence and reaches out beyond the local community or state.)

- Enhancing the quality of teaching and research—(The improved quality will affect student learning outcomes and our graduation and retention efforts.)

- Facilitating institutional advancement—(Scholarship is easy to access and to display as a recruitment tool for donors and prospective students and faculty.)

The eventual goal is that every institution in the University System will be included in GKR. In planning ahead for that day, Roberts Library has set up our own institutional repository for Dalton State College—the Roadrunner Scholar. It can be accessed from the Roberts Library home page menu on the right hand side. It is currently set up in four sections: Faculty Scholarship, Student Scholarship, College Publications, and College Archives.

This past spring and summer several library staff members worked on scanning documents and building our repository by adding items to each of these sections. David Brown sought and uploaded contributions from faculty who had presented at the TLC Mini-Conference the last three years and from the Student Scholarship Showcase held in April-May 2012. Lee Ann Cline gathered college photographs and newspaper articles, and Blake Gentry scanned all the college yearbooks in the College Archives. Laurie Raper created a transcript of the interviews conducted for the college’s 25th anniversary with Dr. Gignilliat, Truett Lomax, Mark Pace, and others. Links were provided to college publications such as The Roadrunner student newspaper, The Tributaries literary magazine, the eQuill, and the Journal for Academic Excellence.

Future plans include continuing to upload papers from the Teaching and Learning Center, the Center for Academic Excellence, the Student Scholarship Showcase, and other faculty contributions. A section is being added for the Faculty Senate to preserve documents and committee minutes. A keyword search for “faculty senate” will bring up all the documents uploaded so far. In addition to the scholarship, the Roadrunner Scholar will preserve historical documents such as archival photos and newspaper articles about the college and local historical materials, including archival materials from the Bandy Heritage Center and the Carpet and Rug Institute.

GKR and Roadrunner Scholar provide effective means to share scholarship and ideas with our colleagues. It is not necessary to reinvent the wheel each time a faculty member begins a new research project. It also exposes Dalton State faculty scholarship to other colleges and universities and builds on the reputation and branding of Dalton State College. It can be an effective outreach tool for the community, donors, alumni, recruiting faculty, and prospective students and their parents by allowing them to see our scholarship and commitment to quality teaching and learning, as well as preserving local history.

More submissions are needed to build up our repository and to accurately reflect the current faculty scholarship across all disciplines. Please submit your contributions in MSWord or pdf format to David Brown at <dobrown@daltonstate.edu>. Help us build our repository in Roadrunner Scholar and show the world what a great faculty we have at Dalton State!
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Journal Submission Guidelines and Editorial Policies

1. Faculty members (and professional staff) may submit the following:
   - Book reviews on scholarly works on higher education administration or issues, college teaching, or adult learning published within the last two calendar years.
   - Scholarship of Teaching and Learning research. This is defined as a study in which an activity, strategy, approach, or method that reflects best practices or evidence-based research is tried in the classroom. The faculty member sets up an intervention, executes it, and assesses the impact, employing quantitative or qualitative methods. Articles should indicate that IRB process was followed where applicable, with documentation.
   - Literature review that synthesizes, in a relevant and interesting way, the evidence, theory, and/or research on a particular aspect of higher education, college teaching, adult learning, brain research, etc. Professional staff could write about issues in student services or advising, for example.
   - Essay of personal reflection of a classroom incident or phenomenon with an evidence- or theory-based approach to interpreting the incident or phenomenon.

2. Style Sheet
   - Submissions should be in APA VI format; Times New Roman 12 pt. font. Use APA guidelines in terms of margins. The writer should try to preserve his or her anonymity as much as possible. Obviously, the discipline will narrow down the writer’s identity in many cases. The editor will redact the name of the writer from the document’s title page before sending to reviewers.

3. Review Process
   - The submissions will be peer reviewed by three faculty members, whose identity will be known only to editor and not to each other. One member of the review committee will be a faculty member in the general discipline represented in the article, one will be a faculty member with an advanced degree in education, and one will be drawn from the advisory committee or other volunteer reviewers.
   - Articles will be returned to the writers in a timely manner with an indication of rejection; conditional acceptance (revise and re-submit, with suggestions for doing so), and accepted (possibly with request to edit or make minor changes). A rubric will be used for assessing the articles. It will be available to potential submitters upon request. If none of the members approves the article, it will be rejected. If one of the members approves the article, it will be considered a conditional acceptance. If two approve it, it will be returned for the necessary editions and published when finished. If three approve it, it will be published as is or with minor corrections.

4. Submissions should be sent as Word files to btucker@daltonstate.edu

5. Published articles will appear in the Journal for Academic Excellence, which will be available on the Center for Academic Excellence’s website and thus accessible by Internet searches.