

# **Glenville State College Faculty Senate Minutes**

January 22, 2013

## **I. Call to Order and Roll**

President David O'Dell called to order the Glenville State College Faculty Senate at 12:30 p.m. on January 22, 2013 in the Mollohan Center Conference Room, Room 319.

Senators present: Gary Arbogast, Larry Baker, Liza Brenner, Cinda Echard, David O'Dell, Art DeMatteo, Kevin Evans, Rico Gazal, Megan Gibbons, Ida Mills, Paul Peck, Shelly Ratliff, John Taylor, Milan Vavrek, Dennis Wemm and Joseph Wood

Others present: John Peek

## **II. Approval of Minutes**

Motion to approve minutes by Taylor / Evans (m/s). Motion passed unanimously. Add one sentence from Paul Peck regarding ACF report and adjust one phrase regarding number of meetings with President Barr during the academic year.

## **III. Ongoing Reports**

### **ACF/Board Representative Paul Peck:**

The next ACF meeting is January 31<sup>st</sup>, 2013.

There is a Board of Governors Meeting on February 6<sup>th</sup>, 2013.

## **IV. Old Business**

### **2012-2014 Committee Appointment Revisions**

Mike Curtis is no longer employed at the College, so Joseph Wood (first alternate) will now be appointed to Academic Appeals. Gary Morris will be added as alternate. Joseph Wood's appointment will be one year.

Motion to approve recommendation by Baker / Wemm (m/s). Motion approved unanimously.

### **Faculty Role Model**

In I and II, leave Needs Improvement and other rankings in the document in order to show faculty where improvement can be made.

In III Part A the box for Student Advising can be expanded to allow space for elaboration of advising activities. A note should be included in the instructions that a description of advising activities is necessary in addition to stipulating the number of advisees. The note will also make clear that a faculty member will not be evaluated based on number of advisees.

The Introduction should also include a table that lists courses taught, number of students, credit hours and contact hours per semester.

In Recommendations item #6 add that only one Distinguished evaluation can be removed by the Chairs Committee.

Regarding the timeline, one week was added in order for Chairs to meet with Faculty. Question was asked if two weeks would be better, given that two weeks is the current model. This longer period of time would also allow for the Chair meeting to happen (if necessary).

Discussion ensued about when a faculty member should be advised of the recommendation. One option is for the Department Chair to inform the faculty member that he/she has three Distinguished rankings and that his/her evaluation will be reviewed by the Department Chair Committee before being forwarded to the Provost. The Department Chair will tell the faculty member the result of the Department Chair Committee meeting.

There was then discussion about the process of appeals. The current FRM allows three days for a rebuttal to be submitted. For the new, revised FRM, should the Provost be the last point of appeal (as he is now)?

Motion to make the process transparent by Echard / Mills (m/s).

There was a suggestion to include an additional page of instructions related specifically to the business of three Distinguished rankings.

Motion to approve the revised FRM with amendments by Evans / Ratliff (m/s).

There was a suggestion to leave time to go back to departments and review everything once more.

Motion to amend previous motion such that vote be taken at the next Faculty Senate meeting by Peck / Baker (m/s). Motion approved unanimously.

**V. New Business.**

**Bylaws of Enrollment Management Committee**

Enrollment management is to merge with Retention. Motion to approve bylaws by Baker / Taylor (m/s). Motion approved unanimously.

**VI. Adjournment.**

Meeting adjourned at 1:25.