

# ADVISORY COUNCIL OF FACULTY DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 12, 2002

The Advisory Council of Faculty met at the HEPC offices in Charleston, WV, on Thursday, December 12, 2002. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Vice Chair Jim Nemitz. Those ACF members present were:

Concord College	Bob Whittinghill
Marshall University	Ben Miller
Marshall University Graduate College	Barbara O'Byrne
Shepherd College	Sylvia Shurbutt
Southern WV CTC	Mary Holder
WV School of Osteopathic Medicine	James Nemitz, Vice Chair
WV State College	Patricia Shafer, Secretary
WVU-Potomac State	Jim Hoey
HEPC	Bruce Flack

Those absent were:

Bluefield State College	Roger Owensby
Fairmont State College	Connie Moore, Chair
Glenville State College	Gerry Hough
West Liberty State College	Jody Seabright
WV Northern CTC	Mike Davis
WV University	Thomas Long
WVU-Parkersburg	Gary Waggoner
WVU-School of Medicine	John Linton
WVU-Institute of Technology	John David

It was moved, seconded, and passed to approve the minutes as published. The agenda was amended to include several additional items. It was then approved.

Additional Faculty Senates have endorsed the Legislative concerns published by the Advisory Council of Faculty. In addition to the four Senates reported at the November meeting (Northern WV CTC, Shepherd College, WVU-Parkersburg, and WV State College), Concord College, Fairmont State College, WVU-Institute of Technology, and the WV School of Osteopathic Medicine have now endorsed the concerns. Marshall University requested clarification of the increment pay. Section 5-5-1 defines who is eligible for increment pay. It reads, in part:

**Section 5-5-1. Definitions.**

For the purposes of this article: (1) "Eligible employee" means any regular full-time employee of the state or any spending unit thereof who is eligible for membership in any state retirement system of the state of West Virginia or other retirement plan authorized by the state; Provided, That the mandatory salary increase required by this article shall not apply to any faculty employee at public institutions of higher learning or any employee of the state whose compensation is fixed by statute or by statutory schedule,....

The actual granting of the incremental "adjustments" is found in Section 5-5-2, which reads, in part:

**5-5-2. Granting incremental salary increases based on years of service.**

Effective for the fiscal year beginning the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred ninety-six, every eligible employee with three or more years of service shall receive an annual salary increase equal to fifty dollars times the employees' years of service, not to exceed twenty years of service. In each fiscal year thereafter and on the first day of July, each eligible employee shall receive an annual increment increase of fifty dollars for that fiscal year....These incremental increases shall be in addition to any across-the-board, cost-of-living or percentage salary increases which may be granted in any fiscal year by the Legislature.

**Editor's notes: Generally.** – The incremental increase provided for in this section is an annual salary adjustment, and not a bonus....

The question was asked what is the source of the money for incremental pay? Does the Legislature give the institutions the money for these adjustments or does each campus have to generate the funds? It was noted that the administration on the campuses have not supported inclusion of faculty in the increment pay. It was suggested that if there is a freeze on salary increases next year, we should point out that this increment pay should not be given either.

The due date of the Legislative questionnaire was changed to December 31; the Legislative session starts on January 8. It was noted there should be a tally kept on who responds, who does not respond, who supports our concerns and who does not. The responses will be used when we meet with the Legislators and presenting our concerns. We might share the result of the responses to our campuses: with the faculty, the staff, the Board of Governors, etc. C. Moore sent information from a conversation with the Chancellor regarding any legislative activity by the ACF. She reported he was pleased with the brochure. She also reported he said it was OK to meet with Legislators (and treat the trip as a business expense) if we meet as an ACF (in the HEPC Board Room) for a regular meeting and then divide up the visiting responsibilities among ourselves. What the Chancellor saw as a problem was to just drive to the Capitol to see Legislators and turn that in as a travel expense.

Notice was received that the HEPC is going to a bi-monthly meeting schedule (2/21, 4/24, 6/13, 8/22, 10/17, 12/05). This impacts our ACF meeting schedule. The question was asked whether there will be budget cuts for ACF travel. Shepherd has discussed this, it was reported. Others are concerned the budgets may be cut although the code says this travel must be paid. It was discussed that we should meet in January and then immediately prior to each HEPC meeting. Meetings during the "off months" will be made on a case by case basis. The next meeting will be Thursday afternoon, January 23, at 2:00 p.m. to develop our strategy for visiting Legislators on Friday morning. We would want to meet with Legislators who support us, those who do not, and those who did not respond to our survey. We should also meet with our representatives as well as those on the Education Committee. Committee rosters and the leadership should be announced this Sunday, December 15. ACF members would like for Chair Connie Moore to send each of us the survey results as early as possible so we can make some preparation for the Legislative meetings via E-Mail. S. Shurbutt moved and B. Miller seconded to accept the proposed meeting schedule. Motion passed.

Dr. Flack joined the group and he has been working on

- 1) teaching certification – they are looking at the Praxis scores and whether they should be raised or are they OK;
- 2) transfer CTC credits to baccalaureate institutions particularly with the EDGE credits; and
- 3) dual credit and advanced placement and concerns about how quality might be measured - examining qualitative standards of the course as well as quality of faculty for college credit courses for high school students. Currently they are looking at the practices on the campuses for 2001-2002.

The question was asked about the LOCEA report on the Glenville/Bluefield/Potomoc State study. Dr. Flack said that may be discussed at their meeting on Sunday, December 15. The question was asked whether he knew the Legislators' schedule as to when they might be available for meetings. He said they may be known the day before but sometimes not. He advised we get in touch with the Legislator's staff to make appointments. He was asked whether or not he anticipated a change in the HPEC in 2003 with the bi-monthly meeting schedule. He said he didn't really know. There was concern expressed that both the meetings and the agendas will be longer.

Dr. Flack was asked in light of the budget cuts might we see a return to the formal geographic service area idea. He responded we didn't think we would return to that but it would certainly make sense to have collaboration rather than competition on offering classes. It was noted that the investment in education is the way the economy in the state can be augmented but this is where the budget is being cut instead. Vice-Chair Nimetz advised Dr. Flack that the lack of a faculty presence at the HEPC meeting the next day must not be seen as disinterest – but rather we are in final exams and have our allegiance with our student in place of attending that meeting. Dr. Flack did share that we might discuss the frequency of our meetings and travel in light of the tight budget times. He expects there will be more telephonic meetings rather than personal meetings. Much concern was expressed about the impending budget cuts, that they are going to cut "muscle" and they have ominous overtones. It was noted it might be important to identify Legislators who are supporting economic development and tie on to economic development's show since we are on the same wagon. Some feel it is very ominous when it is likely faculty position will also be cut and more and more classes will be taught by adjuncts and it is getting to the place that it is damaging our credibility as institutions. Some campuses are going to distributing handouts to the students via E-Mail and having them print them out rather than providing them already printed. It was noted that any budget cuts for the institutions will be done by the Board of Governors. The question was asked whether the HEPC is an advocate for Faculty to the Legislator and the Governor. The response was that the HEPC, the Chancellor, institution Presidents, and Boards of Governors may be all involved. Regarding the ACF Legislative concerns, Dr. Flack was asked who will speak for Faculty. He responded that the best way to express our needs and concerns is that the Chair meet with the Chancellor regarding them. We might also meet with the Chair of the HEPC. Great concern was expressed that we are trying to lift off graduate programs in the face of these budget cuts; Dr. Flack concurred. Innovative new programs are being looked at and whether they will bring in enough money to cover costs and make money for the institutions. The question was posed whether we are entering the survival of the fittest mode in higher education. It was pointed out that the Chancellor is speaking at the Marshall University Faculty Senate meeting on January 23. There was discussion about

whether we wish to meet with the Chancellor at Marshall or meet with him early on Friday morning, January 24.

It was reported that according to the Town Meeting on December 11, the Governor is talking about a longer term budget cut and saying there will be pain. J. Nemitz gave the web-site address for participating with questions and responses. At the Town Meetings it was stated that education and economic development are the priorities. The observation was made that lots of education costs belong with public education, which may not be cut. There has been a 1½% cut asked for public education but it is possible they will sue and get it rescinded.

It was reported that it is likely the tobacco tax is the only tax that will be increased next year. The funds from the tobacco tax goes to fund the Medicaid program, which has a 3:1 federal match which frees up more of the remainder of the state revenues for other appropriations, like higher education, etc. The other reasons for the crises are the lagging pension payments and the reduced taxes collected because of the economy. We might start our conversations with the Legislators next month with the tobacco tax. S. Shurbutt moved and B. Whittinghill seconded that we endorse the increased tobacco tax. The motion carried. Once we know what Legislation is introduced and we have the bill numbers, we can E-Mail our support of the bills.

The proposed Evaluation of Institutional Administrators was discussed. S. Shurbutt moved to accept the proposal with a slight punctuation change in Process #2 and B. Whittinghill seconded. The motion passed. This will now go to the Policy Commission. The revised document is attached to and made a part of these minutes.

Regarding the WEB portal, J. Hoey said we need to visit the site and register. The address is: [acf.hepc.wvnet.edu](http://acf.hepc.wvnet.edu) We need to become familiar with this so perhaps we can use this to communicate rather than face to face. The chat room would work to discuss a single issue, rather than conference calls, for which we don't have a budget to pay for them.

The next agenda item discussed was our presentation to the HEPC. The question was posed who is representing us to the HEPC? It was pointed out it can't be just the Presidents because they are concerned about the whole institution. It was suggested we might wish to report to them on our contacts with Legislators or we might invite HEPC Commissioners to our meetings so they can actually hear what is happening. We can think about what we might wish to present for our January meeting, act on what we wish to do in February, and then ask to be on the agenda in April. The main topic this year will be the budget cuts and we might discuss what it is going to do on our campuses. We might talk about adjuncts, average FTE, percentage of budget that is Education & General. It was suggested we might have the Chair of the HEPC meet with us in February to discuss issues. The group was asked to think about what other issues on the budget cuts might we present from a faculty perspective, what might faculty do to support the cuts and what might they not be willing to do. We have to find the common issues of the faculty across the state and not just local issues, it was observed. We need to inform the HEPC how we are going to manage the cuts and still maintain academic quality. We need to be discussing this with our faculties. There was discussion of putting this presentation off until Fall so we can make a really favorable impact on the Commissioners.

The topic of adversarial students and interaction with faculty was discussed. Some campuses have experienced students suing faculty members for alleged violations of their rights. It was reported that each employee has a lifetime \$1,000,000 insurance indemnity coverage against suits. The question was asked, though, what is the responsibility of the institution to defend the faculty. It was noted that administrators get represented by the institution's (or the Board) attorney but the faculty member does not enjoy the same representation. There needs to be an update at the next meeting and then investigate what should be done to protect the faculty. This is an HEPC issue since we are employees of the system.

Presented was a memo from Amy Pitzer of the Advisory Council of Classified Employees who reported her president (Dr. Beasley of Concord) asked that the Higher Education Awareness Committee consider adding three presidents and three students to their committee. This would add strength to the group as they can work on common issues. We do not know what common issues there might be but we might benefit in adding students. S. Shurbutt will talk with Ms. Pitzer about whether to proceed with presidents and students.

With the items of the agenda completed, the meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

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.