

ADVISORY COUNCIL OF FACULTY DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 13, 2002

The Advisory Council of Faculty together with Faculty Senate Chairs met at the Erickson Alumni Center at West Virginia State College in Institute, WV, on Friday, September 13, 2002. The meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m. by Chair Connie Moore. Those ACF members present were:

Bluefield State College	Roger Owensby
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	Jody Seabright
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
HEPC	Chancellor Mike Mullen

Those absent were:

Concord College	Bob Whittinghill
WV Northern CTC	Mike Davis
WVU-School of Medicine	John Linton

Faculty Senate Chairs joining the meeting were:

Bluefield State College	Bruce Mutter
Concord College	Charles Brichford
Fairmont State College	Vickie Findley
Glenville State College	Nick Bassett
Marshall University	James Sottile
Shepherd College	Robert Willgoos
Southern WV CTC	George H. Morrison
West Virginia State College	Timothy C. Alderman
West Virginia University	Stanley H. Cohen
WVU-Parkersburg	Paul Milhoan

Chair Moore asked those present to introduce themselves.

The minutes were approved as published with one correction: Ken Hall has been nominated to the HEPC to replace Dr. Ron Stollings but he has not yet been confirmed.

There was discussion about the evaluation of administrators. A draft of the document was not available for discussion. The proposed distribution of this document from this group will be to the Faculty Senates for discussion, then to the HEPC, and then to the

Boards of Governors. The document will be E-Mailed to the ACF members and be on the agenda for discussion at the October meeting.

J. Hoey reported that he has received no information about whether or not the WEB portal is available. He was asked to contact Jim Barton at the HEPC to see if it is available. B. O'Byrne offered to assist with the WEB site.

Chair Moore advised the group that Vice Chair Dr. James Nimetz was named as national 2002 Educator of the Year by the American Osteopathic Foundation. The award recognizes an educator who serves the osteopathic profession, demonstrates compassion, exhibits leadership and displays a commitment to education and the osteopathic philosophy. Mrs. Moore noted that the Foundation nominated him for attributes of which we are already aware and we are proud of him for this achievement. He was congratulated by the group.

S. Shurbutt shared with the group the draft of the ACF pamphlet she is developing. She noted this idea came from the joint committee with the Advisory Council of Classified Employees. Much of the pamphlet content comes from the PowerPoint presentation that J. Nemitz did for the Council to the Higher Education Policy Commission as well as to LOCEA. She envisions these will be printed and available for Legislative members and HEPC members and anyone else to whom we wish to give them. The pamphlet adopted by the group this year can serve as a model and each succeeding year it could be revised and updated. It is suggested that these could be given to any new HEPC members as they come onto the Commission so they know what the ACF is about. This could be given to new faculty as well so they understand their state-wide representative organization. If political candidates are on campuses for open houses, the pamphlet could also be given to them. Several suggestions were made for revisions to the draft which Dr. Shurbutt will incorporate into a revised copy to be brought to the October meeting for approval.

The topic of hiring a lobbyist to push our agenda was brought up by G. Hough. This has been discussed previously but hasn't become an actuality but the Joint Committee on Awareness with ACCE has discussed it. This failed in the previous attempt but it was postulated that perhaps we have a new level of discontent among faculty that could make it work now. It was pointed out that the ACF cannot employ a lobbyist. This will be brought to the Faculty Senate Presidents later this morning. It was suggested we discuss with a lobbyist how we might approach legislators. G. Hough will invite one to the ACF meeting at Glenville. While it is important to work at the state level, it is very important to work on our campuses to galvanize faculty on the important issues. The other level on which we need to work is our students to get them to support faculty issues.

On the topic of salary increment pay, classified and non-classified staff get a one-time salary increment check each July 1. The classified staff increment pay is capped at 20 years; non-classified is not capped. This raise is in addition to any other salary increase granted to classified and non-classified staff. Faculty are specifically excluded from annual increment pay.

The Chair distributed copies of the new Series 5 that was considered at the September 12 meeting but was tabled. This series addresses appointment of presidents at regional campuses in Section 3 but it does not specifically dictate wording for evaluation of the

presidents of the regional campuses. It was suggested that we bring back next month suggested wording for a change in this Series to be presented to the HEPC at their October meeting. It was suggested that we research what are the current procedures in place for evaluation of the presidents. Since WVU is the only institution with regional campuses, those representatives will ask how they are handling this and report back.

At this point in the meeting most of the Faculty Senate Presidents had arrived and the focus of the meeting was shifted to issues we wished to share with them. Chair Connie Moore presided over the meeting and asked those present to introduce themselves. It was suggested that we meet not just once a year but perhaps twice a year, at the beginning and at the end of each academic year.

The ACF's proposed Legislative concerns for the faculty in WV were discussed. They are:

- 1) annual increment pay: we have never been included in this program and we wish to be;
- 2) donation of sick days for catastrophic leave for those faculty who earn sick leave and who wish to do it;
- 3) higher education faculty having the right to serve in the Legislature; and
- 4) increase of premium cost of PEIA vis-à-vis the very small annual raises being given. There is an ancillary issue with PEIA that spouses who have the option of insurance in their jobs must take it rather than be covered under the Higher Education options. There is a question about whether those current employees will be grandfathered in. There is also a question about how this will work in the situation where the spouse works for another state agency.

It was suggested that the WEB portal to be developed should be available to all faculty for posting of faculty news, research, etc.

The question was asked whether any Faculty Senates have administrators who are voting members of their Faculty Senate. There are some campuses that have this; SWVCTC has a rule that if a person supervises faculty, they are not permitted to serve on and vote on the Faculty Senate. WVU has a new faculty constitution that is posted on their WEB site that may prove helpful to campuses with this question. There is some concern that some institutions have administrators who were **appointed** to the Faculty Senate.

The question was asked whether or not there should be a coordinated effort between the ACF and the Faculty Senate Presidents to work on a Legislative package. It was suggested that the ACF goals be adopted by each Faculty Senate as resolutions. It was noted that Dr. Bruce Flack said Attorney Bruce Walker has been collecting a list of Legislative concerns. We should communicate our concerns to him for coordination.

The issue of banding together to hire a lobbyist to bring faculty concerns to the Legislature was discussed with the Senate Presidents. Chair Moore shared that the question the ACF is considering is whether there is enough discontent among faculty to renew interest in this. The ACF asked that Faculty Senates explore this issue with their respective faculties and bring back a response. A corollary is whether faculty are willing to put money on the table for this. The ACF needs to come up with an amount that would be needed to bring this about. The last time we had a lobbyist it was projected that it took \$125,000 annually THEN to support the effort. The last effort was for faculty,

classified staff, and students who would be members. There is more of a commitment required than to just pay the dues; faculty and staff must be willing to work further in the effort. At the October 17, 2:00 meeting at Glenville this will be on the agenda and Faculty Senate Chairs were invited to hear the discussion.

Faculty Senate Chairs were advised that the ACF is in the process of writing a process for the evaluation of administrators. It has been felt that the evaluations have never been multifaceted. The ACF is working to draft a policy for these evaluations and Chair Moore promised the Chairs they would be hearing from the ACF on this issue.

Dr. Hazo Carter, President of West Virginia State College, and Chancellor Mike Mullen joined the group for lunch and for the afternoon session. Dr. Carter welcomed the ACF members and the Faculty Senate Chairs to the campus and said he saluted the quality of the faculty because they determined the quality of our educational institutions. Education is a value, he said, and he thanked the group for providing the opportunities we bring to our students. He asked that all educators help to educate those outside education what academic freedom means and to know that students have academic freedoms as well. Following Dr. Carter's remarks, he hosted lunch for the group.

The afternoon session was dedicated to the Chancellor interacting with the group providing information about various actions and initiatives of the HEPC and receiving questions and comments. He began by talking about the high school graduation rates and said that with the decline in high school graduates, we have to increase the number who go on to higher education. Our goal is to achieve 70% participation of high school graduates going to college, he said. He observed that the growth will occur in only parts of the state: the Eastern panhandle, Northern panhandle, and some southern counties will experience growth, the remainder of the state will decline. In order for high school students to participate, they must be better prepared and this has led to the increased requirements for high school graduation, which the State Department of Education has approved for implementation by 2008. The new unit requirements are:

- 4 of English (including courses in grammar, composition, and literature)
- 3 of Social Studies (including U.S. History)
- 4 of Mathematics (three units must be Algebra I and higher)
- 3 of Science (all course to be laboratory science; Coordinated and Thematic Science I & II combined count as one lab science unit)
- 1 of Arts
- 2 of Foreign Language (two units of the same foreign language)

The Chancellor said he would be asking campuses to re-evaluate their general education programs as the students will be coming in better prepared. He believes what we are seeing Promise Scholarship students taking now will be what the 2008 incoming freshmen will be taking. Those admission standards will not apply to the 2-year component and the free-standing CTCs.

He reported on the NCHEMS Assessment Report and distributed copies to the group. Chancellor Mullen said that Peter Ewell, who reported for NCHEMS, said the real benefit of assessment is not being about to satisfy the external population, it is really to be able to better the courses we are offering – changing the curriculum to address the deficiencies. He also shared that North Central is requiring it in order to get their full blessing.

The state-wide Biological Sciences Program Review is the result of monitoring scores on the tests related to Biological Science and those scores are falling. The HEPC is going to look at facilities and curricula to help ensure that quality programs can be offered because the facilities are targeted for examination too. It was asked whether the allied health programs will be examined too. Chancellor Mullen said the support courses for Allied Health will certainly be examined and this is the first of a series of reviews of all academic areas over the next several years.

He said there is a new philosophy in the HEPC offices: in the past we did an over-all degree productivity review. The first of the new philosophy, unless it is a new program, is that we will recommend closure of non-productivity programs by 2005. If students complete programs but cannot pass the licensure tests, those programs must be corrected or closed. The current productivity standard is 10 graduates over a three-year period. In many cases, if it is a low-productivity program, then usually upper level courses will have very few students in them.

The Chancellor distributed a class-size report that had been distributed at the HEPC meeting the preceding day. He said that small classes aren't in and of themselves good if they produce student learning and large classes aren't inherently evil if they produce student learning. The Boards of Governors will have to analyze class sizes as they face budget cuts.

This led to a discussion of the budget crises, which Chancellor Mullen said is real and campuses will have to deal with the cuts. He wants all facets of the campuses involved in deciding where the cuts must be. He shared that states around us are taking cuts larger than ours. The states around us are growing and we should market our services to them but he warned we must have a quality product to market to them. He is asking that the pop tax be increased to 3-4 cents per bottle to fund the Medicaid shortfall because those dollars can be leveraged to draw down two or three times their amount of federal dollars. He said that while Higher Education is hoping the cuts aren't 10%, it has been discussed that the 10% will not be across the board. There are some items that the HEPC doesn't want to push down to the campuses. There is also a priority plan for restoration of some of the cuts.

Further discussing the Budget, the Chancellor shared that the Boards of Governors have been given guidelines for developing strategies for their campuses. The HEPC will require that they protect the delivery of instruction and research. He said this is where the low-productivity programs come in as Boards decide what to consider in budget reductions. When the tuition and fee policy was established, the HEPC had said it should be implemented in six years. They are now recommending shortening the implementation phase from six to three years. It would generate over \$4 million the first year. There was some mention of "Metro fees" being discounted for out-of-state students.

Chancellor Mullen advocated elimination of subsidies to athletics and auxiliary enterprises (such as parking). He estimated that across the system, \$2.7 million dollars is drained from institution budgets to fund the athletics programs and \$2.1 million is drained for parking. He stated that institutions have to decide where their priorities are: athletics vs the English faculty, for example. He feels there must be a way to improve productivity. He asserted that young and new faculty are very productive but as faculties age, that declines. He suggested that if faculty are not doing research and obtaining

external funding, then they should be generating more student credit hours. This asserted faculty should make the determination of how this is played out. In the area of class size, some classes will accommodate larger class sizes and some can't. He suggested we might combine classes through electronic means for some upper level classes that have small enrollments.

The discussion then moved to space analysis. The Chancellor said we should not be building new buildings where buildings are not adequately used. In order to obtain permission to build a new building, the parameters will be:

Unless 70% of the week classes are scheduled from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. M-F and rooms are scheduled for 60% of those times

Unless the building has lived its useful life and needs to be demolished

He asserts that we have excess capacity in the system. This is the process to be completed for each campus before new construction will be considered.

Chancellor Mullen turned the discussion to the Peer group process and the re-alignment of peer groups. He referred to pages 20-22 of his Budget Discussion document that had been distributed to the group. He shared the process through this the new peer groups will be selected:

- 1) identify the variables to be used for analytical analysis
 - 2) produce a list of similar institutions rank ordered for each 4-year and each 2-year school (to include the component institutions as though they were separated from their host institution)
 - 3) through a process of challenge, analyze the data on the list and challenge those on the list to add or eliminate institutions in the peer list
 - 4) results must be approved by the HEPC and LOCEA
- FASTCLUS, a statistical procedure in SAS, will be used for the statistical comparisons of a list of approximately 30 variables.

The Chancellor reported that the preceding day the Policy Commission approved going forward with adding retirement options. On 10/01 the Great West plan will commence and 457s will be made available. For the 403-B plans, three of the sixteen plans that have more than sixteen members will be allowed to continue. LOCEA still has to review these actions.

Chancellor Mullen said he will be visiting campuses and while on each campus he wants to visit with Faculty Senates and Boards of Governors. He asked the groups if they could schedule such a meeting with the Faculty Senate to please do so. He said he wanted their input.

The Board of Governors is where so many of these higher education situations are considered and Faculty need to give their representatives on the Board of Governors their concerns. Faculty should be brought to these meetings – they are open meetings. In areas where certain faculty members have expertise, like assessment, the names need to be given to the Board of Governors to be used as resources as they deliberate on these issues.

There was some discussion of the salary increases being delayed to 10/01 rather than the start of the new contracts. There was concern expressed that merit systems are not being put into place across the campuses. It was shared that WVU has gone through

this and they were concerned that faculty who were satisfactory were not meritorious. They redefined merit to be performance-based. WVU's merit system is on their website.

Faculty Senate Chair Cohen said that in 1992 WVU went to using grades with + and – attached to them. However there is no quality point equivalents for the plus or minus. HEPC has a series on the grading system. He has been told the students are against using the + or - system because they fear the minuses.

With the business of the group completed, the meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia M. Shafer, Secretary