

# **ADVISORY COUNCIL OF FACULTY DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 14, 2002**

The Advisory Council of Faculty met at the HEPC offices in Charleston, WV, on Thursday, November 14, 2002. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Chair Connie Moore. Those ACF members present were:

Bluefield State College	Roger Owensby
Concord College	Bob Whittinghill
Fairmont State College	Connie Moore, Chair
Marshall University	Chuck Bailey (proxy for Ben Miller)
Marshall University Graduate College	Barbara O'Byrne
Shepherd College	Sylvia Shurbutt
Southern WV CTC	Mary Holder
WV Northern CTC	Mike Davis
WV School of Osteopathic Medicine	James Nemitz, Vice Chair
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:

Glennville State College	Gerry Hough
West Liberty State College	Jody Seabright
WVU-School of Medicine	John Linton

Chair Connie Moore called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. T. Long moved and S. Shurbutt seconded that the minutes be accepted as published. Motion carried.

The Chair reported that four Faculty Senates have endorsed the ACF Legislative concerns: Northern WV CTC, Shepherd College, WVU-Parkersburg, and WV State College.

The very nice finished brochures developed by the ACF were distributed to the Council members to take back to their campuses for distribution. Several suggestions were made regarding to whom they should be distributed, including to the Boards of Governors. S. Shurbutt also gave each member a camera-ready copy of the brochure but asked that when making our copies on campus that the brochure be printed on linen paper using the same color scheme as the printed ones. B. Flack said he would be sure a brochure is included with the HEPC handouts at the meeting on November 15. We could put the brochure on our WEB sites.

The next topic of discussion dealt with the Legislative concerns and how to deal with these. C. Bailey from Marshall University reported that many of their faculty are members of the American Federation of Teachers and that group is endorsing the ACF concerns but they are also going ahead with pushing for faculty representation on the HEPC. The discussion revolved around how we should approach the Legislature. One suggestion was to invite key Legislators to meet with us since we represent the faculty

across the state. We don't yet know who will be the Chair of the Education Committee. It was pointed out that we might ask why some Legislators are opposed to us serving on the HEPC. It was suggested that we meet with Legislators and distribute our brochure before the session even begins; a group of ACF could meet with Legislators in teams to discuss our issues. J. David suggested we might send a letter along with our brochure to Legislators introducing us and asking them whether or not they support (or a yes/no type response) our four concerns or whether they need more information on them. This should be done now and then we will know better how to plan our contacts. C. Moore will have letters sent to each Legislator. S. Shurbutt will draft a letter and share with ACF members for comment. The letter will ask for responses by a specified date (to be determined later) and we will enclose a self-addressed, stamped envelope to return the responses to Chair Moore. It was suggested we might ask a few Legislators how they react to the survey questions, ask for suggestions, etc. for how it would best be received. It was suggested that we use the January ACF meeting time (which may be different than our regular meeting time because of the start date of the Legislative Session) to visit Legislators and discuss with them our issues. It was pointed out we need to be sure we aren't using "state" funds to do our lobbying. Using the January meeting to do this activity may mean that many may not be able to be reimbursed for the expenses of the trip to the Charleston meeting. Concern was expressed that if we do this as an organized body of the ACF, we must be very careful about the use of state funds for what may be perceived as lobbying. We will seek clarification on this.

Continuing discussion of the Legislative concerns, it was shared that faculty were specifically excluded from the increment pay because our salary at that time of its implementation was based on a salary schedule where the years of service were a portion of the compensation package. It was suggested that we identify key Legislators that this is the inequity of the situation.

On the topic of the WVEA vs the AFT, Joe Wyatt from Marshall University has given us some information on the AFT. They have a higher education group within their unit and they will be supporting higher education issues this session. There was no report regarding WVEA.

Regarding the WEB portal, J. Hoey has gotten some information on the WEB site as well as the portal. The group was asked to use the WEB portal among ourselves to see how it works. Feedback should be given to him.

A new draft of the Evaluation of Institutional Administrators was distributed for discussion. The revised draft is attached to and made a part of these minutes. The final draft of the form will be distributed by E-Mail and the vote will be done the same way.

It was suggested that we ask the HEPC at their December meeting for suggestions on strategy for contacting Legislators. Dr. Flack suggested instead that the Chair talk with the Chancellor about how to proceed with talking to Legislators. On the question of the use of state money for visiting Legislators, he suggested we also ask the Chancellor that but he said the Chancellor would probably refer us to Attorney Bruce Walker.

On the topic of the LOCEA studies, Dr. Flack will present five such studies to the HEPC on November 15 and there are two additional studies relating to Advantage Valley and Promise also to be presented to LOCEA in November. The Chancellor is doing studies for Glenville, Bluefield, and West Liberty. The Survey of College Courses for High

School Students will be given to the academic leaders later in November as well. The purpose of that survey is to get a snapshot of how this program is working in the state. After we get the report, we may do an audit of the campuses. This is in response to the request of the HEPC to investigate all dual credit courses by the time the Legislative session begins. While this investigation cannot be completed by then, it will give significant information.

T. Long asked Dr. Flack if he could direct us to certain people in the Legislature to whom we should address our concerns. His response was that the best place to begin would be the people on the Education Committee; Jerry Mezzetesta and John Doyle are on the House Education Committee; Plymale will be on the Senate Committee.

There was discussion of the reallocation of excess HERF funds and it was noted that the Chancellor has increased the faculty development from \$20,000 to \$70,000. Dr. Flack was asked the purpose of the additional funds; an explanation will be sought.

The report of the Math Task Force recommends the raising to 20 the ACT score for going into college-level math by 2008.

Dr. Flack reported the HEPC is considering an alternate meeting schedule beginning in January, 2003. The discussion is to go from a monthly meeting to a bi-monthly meeting schedule.

The following question was posed: After this year, we have been told we will not be using WebCT. Are we getting a new system? We have spent lots of time and money to learn Web CT. Is this prediction true? J. Hoey will inquire and let us know. There is also concern that some say we should teach 20% of our courses by distance learning. Is this true and how will it work at each campus? Mike Davis shared that there are some distance learning courses that have a 100% attrition rate. We need to bring in some experts related to distance learning to discuss with the HEPC how it really works.

Discussion of an upcoming presentation to the HEPC posed the questions of when would we do it and what would we say since our brochure comes from the presentation from last year. J. Hoey pointed out that talking to the HEPC about our concerns is like preaching to the choir: they can't do anything about these issues. We should try to identify issues for presentation to the HEPC that they can do something about, like the use of adjuncts, the WebCT question, etc. J. Nimetz suggested we need to be ready for discussion of our Legislative concerns at the December meeting. Chair Moore is to meet with the Chancellor about getting this on the December agenda. We can also identify specifics related to our presentation last time. It was suggested we could discuss several points like work load, small class size, any area where we would like to give a rebuttal to some of the areas that some people keep saying but may not be entirely accurate.

On the topic of faculty work loads, which are increasing exponentially, the question was posed about whether or not there is a way to combine with the HEPC on what educators do and educate LOCEA. They appear to think educators do very little and therefore they wish to find more and more things to push down to educators to be done.

With most of the business of the agenda completed, the meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

**The next meeting will be in Charleston on Thursday, December 12 at 2:00 p.m. as scheduled.**

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia M. Shafer, Secretary

## **ATTACHMENT:**

### EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

**PURPOSE:** The Higher Education Policy Commission has set guidelines that require faculty and non-classified staff to have salary increases based substantially on merit. The purpose of this policy is to ensure that each institution has in place a policy for the evaluation of all major administrations as defined by the institution, such as: *President, vice-presidents, deans and other designated administrators*. This evaluation of administrators should be multidimensional including input from students, staff and faculty. The inclusion of more voices and points of view in the evaluation process increases the accountability of the evaluation process, as well as the entire higher education system.

#### **EVALUATION PROCESS:**

1. All administrators shall receive a yearly evaluation of performance directly related to responsibilities defined by the institution.
2. Evaluation procedures shall be developed by the institutional Board of Governors, and a copy sent to the Policy Commission and filed in the HEPC Central Office. Such procedures must be multidimensional and include criteria such as peer evaluations, student, faculty and staff evaluations, and evaluations by immediate supervisors.
3. Boards of Governors of institutions that have regional campuses must also approve the evaluation procedures developed by regional campuses of all major administrators.
4. Institutions that have regional campuses must include in their criteria procedures and evaluations from the applicable regional campus constituencies of the main campus administrators.