

# ADVISORY COUNCIL OF FACULTY DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 17, 2002

The Advisory Council of Faculty met at Glenville State College in Glenville, WV, on Thursday, October 17, 2002. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Chair Connie Moore. Those ACF members present were:

Concord College	Bob Whittinghill
Fairmont State College	Connie Moore, Chair
Glenville State College	Gerry Hough
Marshall University	Ben Miller
Marshall University Graduate College	Barbara O'Byrne
Shepherd College	Sylvia Shurbutt
Southern WV CTC	Mary Holder
West Liberty State College	Ann Rose (proxy for Jody Seabright)
WV State College	Patricia Shafer, Secretary
WV University	Thomas Long
WVU-Parkersburg	Gary Waggoner
WVU-Potomac State	Jim Hoey
WVU-Institute of Technology	John David
HEPC	Bruce Flack

Those absent were:

Bluefield State College	Roger Owensby
WV Northern CTC	Mike Davis
WV School of Osteopathic Medicine	James Nemitz, Vice Chair
WVU-School of Medicine	John Linton

Guests at the meeting were:

Fairmont State College Faculty	Elizabeth Savage & Jim Mathews
Fairmont State College Board of Governors	Phil Reale
Glenville State College Faculty	Nick Bassett

Chair Connie Moore introduced member of the Fairmont State College Board of Governors Phil Reale who talked to the group regarding organizing and lobbying. He said he doesn't think there is an appreciation for what faculty do, that they are the front line players with the customers, the students. We don't have to go with a full-blown organization, which is quite expensive, but we can start with baby steps, he said. Faculty are the ones on the front line and they know the needs and can perhaps better share that unique perspective. The job of faculty is to convince Legislators of this. There are three steps in presenting the message to Legislators:

- 1) conditioning – educating the hearer of the situation
- 2) coalition building – with the ACF that could be the HEPC, could be business, identify the potential allies and get them to endorse our point of view
- 3) consensus – repetition of the message

In conditioning, the ACF cannot assume Legislators know anything about our issues, though some will know more about one subject, some another, and some higher education. The ACF will have to very respectfully lay the groundwork for how our issues have evolved. Then we would become the education resource. It is important to give Legislators information in summary form, not a 100 page report, and have

documentation for the issues and resources. Remember that while we are relaying our concerns to Legislators, they have many other issues about which they are concerned. Right now, the HEPC is the only real face on higher education; faculty needs to create its face. This comes through having regular contact with our Legislators through visits, E-mails, newsletters, in their home districts, sometimes over coffee. It is important not to try to force the solution on them but to help them come up with our solution. We have a good start with our brochure but we need to refine and script the message so we all will say the same thing each time we talk with a Legislator; a divided message fails. Mr. Reale continued that it must be a clear, consistent, well-reasoned, reasonable message. After talking with a Legislator, he suggested we always follow-up with something in writing, thanking them and reiterating the message. This is like a campaign where it is the name recognition of the body: faculty and our message. It is always important to give praise where praise is due. Another very important point is to be sure we are talking to key players, not back-row Legislators – that is the kiss of death, Mr. Reale said. If we have a newsletter, let Legislators be seen in it. If they really do something great for higher education, get a picture and be sure it gets into the newspaper. When selecting our issues, pick ones we can win with right off the bat; then we will have some momentum. It is important to help the Legislator who introduced this win and publicize this. Mr. Reale recommends some PAC groups. If we can get about \$15,000-\$20,000 into a PAC and support the key players, we can get action. The question was asked what level of contributions would be needed to get their attention: \$250 and the public endorsement or newsletter. It is also important to talk about the influence of all the faculty: family, students, economic power, etc., etc., to get their attention. Anytime we can get public groups to understand, they are powerful.

If an issue is put forth, have the Faculty Senates pass a resolution and communicate it to the Legislature. If there are constituent groups who can also pass a resolution and also communicate it, the more times Legislators hear the message, the better. Looking at strengths in numbers, and the distribution of the representatives of this group, we should be able to cover the state with our message. Mr. Reale suggested having a rally at the beginning of the Legislative session and have the media there to endorse our proposals.

Mr. Reale emphasized it is very important not to complain because it doesn't serve us well. Identify an issue without complaining. Articulate the issue, try to get ourselves a seat at the table to try to solve the problem: like our PEIA concern.

Lobbying is a hard job, Mr. Reale said, and we really need someone who puts time in the schedule to do this on a full-time basis for the period. If we are going to have an organization with an Executive Director and an office, the \$125,000 estimated is too low. We were told to be sure to watch all issues so if another issue which was formerly hot suddenly becomes cold, strike with our issues as soon as possible. With Legislators there is no schedule; we would have to be at the right place at the right time and it is so important to be there and be present when the action happens. It would be very difficult for the faculty to do all this because we have full-time jobs and cannot be there at all times waiting for the action to happen.

Mr. Reale advised us to accept the politics. He said legislators will generally give us what you want if we get to the key players. "And remember," he said, "the Speaker and the President: nothing happens that they don't want to happen." He implored us to be informed about all the issues because we may be able to tie in with others to get what we want – perhaps an amendment on another bill.

How to get faculty to get on board with these strategies:  
establish a strategy to get what we want  
don't complain about why things haven't happened  
use our energy to make things happen

"Don't let the past dictate who you are, let it become part of who you will become," Mr. Reale quoted from the movie, "My Big Fat Greek Wedding."

On the right to serve in the Legislature, Mr. Reale advised us for the short-term to identify recently retired faculty and have them run for us.

If we are ever going to get anything like this to work, we are going to have to get the faculty on our own campuses on board – faculty are independent and somehow they just want to do their jobs and let the rest of the world go by.

The questions was asked, "What would we look for in a track record if we are looking for a lobbyist?" Mr. Reale responded that we should identify 12 or so people, ask them for an expression of interest, ask them to tell us their background, and on what issues they have worked. We should also want to know what is their track record. Also suggested was to talk to Legislators about what they find effective in the lobbyist with whom they have worked. The best ones are the most expensive. We might get referrals from other groups but we need to be sure our philosophy matches the philosophy of the lobbyist. We also need someone who knows the rules too.

One thing that might work in the beginning is if Faculty Senates have Legislative Action Committees and begin having teas with Legislators or just getting the information out to the faculty. If we decide to join an existing group, we must be sure that organization will set aside a division for higher education so we don't just become lost in the sea of members.

It was decided some members will contact some of the lobbying groups to gather information to share with the group at the next meeting. This group should ask Faculty Senates to see if they would have a meeting with faculty to see what is the sentiment on this topic. Ways of disseminating the brochure and our Legislative concerns were discussed. Phil Reale said we need to decide how we are going to be able to effectively communicate with faculty and get consensus on what the faculty will support. The group was asked to consult their Faculty Senates about passing a resolution endorsing the ACF Legislative Concerns for 2002-2003 and to notify Chair Moore of the results.

The ACF brochure was again discussed and some final revisions were suggested. A final draft will be shared by E-Mail and then will be printed.

The WEB portal is "up" and available for our use. It was suggested that at this time it be limited to the ACF until we are comfortable with its operation; then it can be opened up to all faculty around the state to use as a bulletin board. The address is: [acf.hepc.wvnet.edu](http://acf.hepc.wvnet.edu). Our task now is to decide what we want on it. It was decided we may put up a sample discussion group but to use it among ourselves to see how it will work. The WEB site is an information site with minutes, announcements of meetings, links to other sites, etc. For the WEB portal, at the end of each meeting we might post questions on which we wish to have comments from faculty, such as:

- 1) Do you believe there is a problem with faculty giving enough input on higher education issues?
- 2) Would you be willing to get involved in these issues?
- 3) Are you willing to donate money to accomplish our goals?

On the topic of evaluation of administrators, a draft document was presented to the group for discussion but the topic was tabled until a clearer understanding of the purposes of it could be developed.

M. Holder asked the group for feedback from their campuses on a couple of issues. She needs to know class sizes, such as the minimum and maximum number for a class. There is also the problem of people teaching specially arranged classes for no extra pay. It was generally the consensus that is the usual practice on the campuses.

The group expressed concern that there are academic issues that are being studied by HEPC committees but there are no faculty on those committees. We recommend that faculty members be included on such study committees.

The group reviewed the HEPC agenda for the meeting the following day. One question related to the action of asking for abolition of low-productivity programs. The question was posed that if the institution absorbs the cost of a low-productivity program through already existing resources, what are the consequences of the HEPC withdrawing its support of that program. It was noted that the action to be recommended is that the Board of Governors may vote to retain the program without HEPC support. That question will be posed at the Academic Policy Committee meeting the next day. (The response was that essentially there are no consequences. However, there is never the option of asking for support for it in the future.) Some observed that sometimes these low-productivity programs combine, like a BA in Arts & Humanities, in order to mitigate the appearance of low-productivity. Some professors observed the student is often less marketable because the diploma is so broad.

Reference was made to the Measuring Up document. Members were advised they can go to the HEPC Website for this study to compare us with other states, etc.

The minutes of the September meeting were approved as written.

Dr. Bruce Flack distributed a draft of the Final Report of the West Virginia Mathematics Task Force the HEPC had completed.

The November meeting will be in Charleston on November 14 rather than at West Liberty as previously scheduled.

The October meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia M. Shafer, Secretary

