

**ADVISORY COUNCIL OF FACULTY
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
OCTOBER 19, 2006**

The Advisory Council of Faculty met with Faculty Senate Chairs at New River Community & Technical College in Beckley, WV, on Thursday, October 19, 2006. Chair Leslie Lovett called the meeting to order at 2:08 p.m. Those ACF members present were:

Blue Ridge CTC	Billie Unger (by phone)
Fairmont State University	Connie Moore
Glenville State College	Joe Evans (by phone)
Pierpont CTC	Leslie Lovett, Chair
Marshall University	Ben Miller
Marshall University CTC	Betty Dennison
New River CTC	Gerry Hough
Shepherd University	Sylvia Shurbutt
West Liberty State College	Ann Rose (by phone)
WV Northern CTC	Mike Davis (by phone)
WV State University	Patricia Shafer, Secretary
WV State CTC	Charles Shafer
WV University	Roy Nutter, Vice Chair
WVU-Parkersburg	Gary Waggoner
WVU-Institute of Technology	John David
WVU-Institute of Technology CTC	P. Michael Ditchen

Guest present from the HEPC were:

Dr. Bruce Flack
Dr. Mark Stotler

Those absent were:

Bluefield State College	Bruce Mutter
Concord University	Darrin Martin
Eastern WV CTC	Sharon Gott
Southern WV CTC	vacant
WV School of Osteopathic Medicine	Dr. G. Boxwell
WVU-Potomac State	Jim Hoey
WVU-School of Medicine	John Linton

Faculty Senate Chairs present were:

Bluefield State College	Angela Lambert
Concord University	Hugh Campbell
Fairmont State University	Joseph Riesen
Glenville State College	Dennis Wemm
New River CTC	Nick Bassett
Pierpont CTC	Les Boggess
Shepherd University	Sylvia Shurbutt
WV State University	Jerry Levine
WV University	Parvis Famouri
WVU-Institute of Technology	Krishna H. Murthy
WVU – Potomac State	Phillip Douthitt

Chair L. Lovett welcomed the group to the ACF meeting. Chancellor Noland, who had anticipated attending this meeting was unable to attend. Dr. Stotler attended representing Dr. Flack and CTC Chancellor Jim Skidmore attended the meeting. Each person present introduced him/herself.

Chancellor Skidmore was asked to give his thoughts on higher education and to entertained questions from the group. He said each year as the Legislative session approaches, his office develops a budget package and submits it to the CTC Council for approval. He presented to the group a copy of the Budgetary Improvement Package request that in a couple of weeks will be presented to the Governor's Budget office and then to the House & Senate Education Committees. The Council has taken the position that peer equity funding as in SB 653 is an important process. The CTC Chancellor is asking for \$5 million for peer equity; he said if it doesn't come through peer equity they need it just for operations. The CTC system asked for peer equity last year but got none. Allied health program expansion has already been submitted to the Legislature and to the Governor; Chancellor Skidmore said primarily it is for faculty positions and they are asking for a commitment to funding for 3 years so programs can grow to where they are able to sustain themselves. Regarding Tech Program development, the CTC Office has \$1 million now and they want another million to compliment economic development efforts and high demand areas. For rapid response programs they are requesting an additional \$1 million. Chancellor Skidmore said earlier that day the CTC Council approved their top ten list of capital projects to be funded by bonds. Marketing money is being requested to highlight the CTCs, particularly for those that are administratively linked because in many cases the public doesn't know the CTC is there. If the ACF is so inclined, he asked for their support for the Budgetary Package as well as support from individual faculty talking with their legislators. He said likely over the next couple of years there will be budgetary surpluses but the Legislature is less likely to increase base budgets but may fund specific programs – like the Tech development. That is his hope in this regard.

The Chancellor was asked if this Budget Improvement Package has yet been submitted to LOCEA? He said it must first goes to the governor's office. He has presented the allied health expansion to LOCEA because he was asked to do that. The Chancellor was asked not including the capital projects totaling \$16 million, is the budgetary improvement package an increase over and above what the CTC system got last year? He responded it is. Regarding rapid response, he was asked how that coordinates with the money received through Workforce Investment Boards? Chancellor Skidmore said the WIA Board has a rapid response team for company shutdowns, etc., but as a facilitator; the CTC rapid response money is for the training for the workers who will be unemployed. This can also be used to train workers to meet the needs for a new company coming to town.

The question was asked what comment Chancellor Skidmore would have about the talk we have been hearing about combining the HEPC and the CTC Council? He said he hadn't heard that but he said he would be against it and wants to give the CTC Council time to work. He was further asked what comment he would have about remerging some of the administratively linked CTCs? He said he is not in favor or it. If there is any discussion about moving administratively-linked back together, first of all, he said, base it on true facts. He asked the group to keep in mind two publics served: students & employers. He also asked the group to keep in mind how well those two publics would be served. With the change in the system made in 2000, there have been growing

pains. But before that was done, the move was examined, including the 30-year history. If any further changes are to be made, he would ask that a thorough study be done prior to them.

The comment was made that the ACF agenda does little to address the structure of higher education in WV (the blue-green line). Chancellor was asked for his sentiments. He said that is not in his arena and he didn't wish the CTC pulled into that. He said his major concern is service to our students.

Regarding the process of peer equity Chancellor Skidmore said each CTC has a set of national peers. J. Levine said he saw a schedule last spring related to funding of CTCs in WV that showed funding wildly diverse. He asked how are those things decided, how has it come to be? Mr. Skidmore said this has been done over a period of time. Part of the peer equity formula is to correct the inequity of funding of the CTCs in WV. At WVSCCTC, for example, it is quite possible the base budget was incorrectly set several years ago and the peer equity process is designed to correct those errors. The Chancellor was asked what input the individual CTCs have to identify peers? He said that is an agenda item for later in the meeting but the institutions have a opportunity to participate in the selection process.

Chancellor Skidmore was asked about the Faculty/Staff \$1.3 million request, is there a percentage salary enhancement he had in mind? He responded that whatever is the allocation, it has to be distributed according to the salary policy. The Chancellor was asked how well the Governor and Legislature realize how poorly WV higher education is funded, that it is last in funding in the SREB. He said they hear it all the time.

On the upcoming ACF Legislative agenda, we are asking that the CTC tenure faculty target be raised from 20% to 30%. Mr. Skidmore was asked for his reaction to that. He said it will take us a long time even to get down to those numbers. Originally the tenure target was only for free-standing but then was expanded to all CTCs. He said he doesn't feel strongly about it. Currently the tenured faculty at most CTCs is significantly above those benchmarks. He feels it would take many years for us to get down to them. M. Ditchen shared it is expected WVU-Tech will be at that point in six years. Blue Ridge currently has 19% of its CTC faculty tenured; FSCTC has 28%. The Chancellor said he has no problems with 30%; he said likely he wouldn't actively support it but certainly he wouldn't oppose it.

G. Hough asked that Chancellor what he foresaw for the WV CTC system under great opposition. Chancellor Skidmore responded he doesn't feel there is great opposition. He said companies are coming in, sitting around the table, they know what technical skills they need—there isn't opposition from them. There is such a demand for those technical jobs, and for the people who will be trained for these jobs. He said these students are never going to be 4-year English majors, for example. He sees this demand is going to have to be met. He said if you look at the breakdown at least at the CTCs, there is a deficiency of males in them. Allied health is predominately women and particularly for those male students who are those less likely candidates for baccalaureate programs, we need to start more technical programs to meet the needs of this sector of the public. As CTCs, we need to advance people in these mid-level occupations; if we don't do that, then we are missing the boat, he said. There are also people who need developmental education and therefore access to higher education. One reason we don't have the "get your hands dirty" programs at the CTCs that were

with the 4-year institutions, the Chancellor said, is because those programs weren't perceived as "college programs."

B. Dennison shared that on Sunday evening at LOCEA, Chancellor Skidmore made a very strong case for developmental education and she commended him for that.

The comment was made that it has come out that the higher education price index is going to jump 5% this year; the question was asked whether or not this was figured into the budget request? Chancellor Skidmore said it is a balance of what you think is reasonable and what you think you can get. He said it is unlikely we will get what would be needed to keep up totally with inflationary increases.

The final question was whether or not the marketing for the CTC system be just blanket marketing or for specific institutions? He said it will likely be a combination.

Chair Lovett thanked the Chancellor for his presence and his comments.

Dr. Stotler said he asked Dr. Flack if there was anything he wanted to share. Dr. Flack wanted the express appreciation to the faculty who served on the Faculty Study Committee. It was not an easy assignment but they stuck to the task and have a good outcome.

Chair Lovett thanked G. Hough and New River for hosting the group at the meeting that day.

The Chair called for the approval of the Minutes of the September 21 meeting. There was a correction on page 3 of the minutes. The third paragraph was revised to read: "After consultation with Attorney Bruce Walker on the proposed By-Laws change it was determined one of the proposed changes would be at variance with the Code. S. Shurbutt made a motion that we rescind that portion of By-Laws Section 3b proposed change that is at variance with code in the By-Laws; B. Dennison seconded the motion and it carried." S. Shurbutt moved to accept the minutes as corrected; G. Hough seconded the motion and it passed.

S. Shurbutt said that the two years she was Chair of ACF, often HEPC personnel would make appointments to committees without informing the ACF Chair. She felt it would be helpful if someone is representing the ACF on Committees, that person would make reports to the group. She said she also felt the Chair should be consulted first for recommendation rather than someone on the HEPC staff making the appointment him/herself. She asked that the ACF write a letter to the HEPC asking for them to consult with ACF Officers concerning appointment of committee members.

Chair Lovett asked for thoughts from Senate or Assembly Chairs on issues that the ACF should include either this year or in future years. The question was asked how can the Legislature purport they have raised funding (as they said they did last year) when what they increased was financial aid, not funding to the institutions? For a long time there has been the impression that when we raise tuition, and they raise aid, they are increasing the possibility of people attending college. B. Miller said that what we found last year in talking with some Legislators was they were angry with the institutions raising tuition which caused them to have to increase funding to Promise. We told them we were forced to do that since there has not been an increase in funding to base

budgets. C. Moore shared she tried to point out that higher education index is going up, that the state is benefiting from the energy revenues so we need to have some of that money returned to us to afford these higher costs. It is important we reproduce the *Chronicle* articles about our last place position to show it isn't just us talking about trying to save our jobs, that we are really last place by independent statistics. WVU-IT found the peer equity selection list inadequate to find comparable institutions as well as a very short timeline for turn around. J. David said he feels the peer equity system is fatally flawed overall. N. Bassett asked how many of the faculty senate/assembly chairs have seen the peer equity list? Only two indicated they had.

WVU Senate Chair P. Famouri said he has followed the ACF group for many years and he commended the group for their accomplishments over the years. He said when he came to WVU on 1990, they were primarily a teaching institution; now they have evolved into a research institution with research highly pushed for WVU to become like an Ohio State. He asked that the change in the mission of our faculty be remembered. WVU-Tech faculty is concerned about whether or not the same research demands will be made on them once they are fully a division of WVU. It was noted that Potomac State has been a part of WVU for many years and they do not have the same research demands as the home campus. It was also noted, however, that the appointment letters the new faculty identifies research as a necessary component.

S. Shurbutt asked Chair Lovett how many senates and assemblies have endorsed the ACF Legislative agenda. The response was fifteen at this point.

Concern was expressed about Dr. Stotler's very, very short presentation and the fact the College & University representatives did not have the opportunity for dialogue that the CTC personnel had. L. Lovett said she would let Chancellor Noland know how much we had looked forward to talking with him and were disappointed when he was unable to be here. She asked whether it might be a good idea to have the senate presidents & assembly chairs at two meetings a year – the other one in Charleston where they might be closer to Drs. Noland & Flack. It was suggested we may aim for a second meeting in February and combine it with our Legislative Day. The ACF meeting could coincide with our visit to the Legislature.

Chair Lovett distributed the schedule of meetings for ACF, HEPC, CTC Council & LOCEA. She also distributed the list of ACF members and Faculty Senate Chairs. She said the meetings indicated with the double stars indicates ACF presentations.

Chair Lovett had prepared a handout of ACF updates. S. Shurbutt said she thought the document should also be sent to all Senate Presidents.

Regarding the Faculty Study, it likely will be on the February HEPC agenda and then afterward presented to LOCEA. S. Shurbutt said she believes it will be after the February meeting that it can be made public. Since there have been people asking for the report for reference, S. Shurbutt said she will ask Dr. Flack how soon it can be shared with the group. Regarding Faculty Merit Plans, she was asked if it is an issue for us about how merit is derived on the various campuses. S. Shurbutt said the Faculty Study shows nearly every institution is dissatisfied with portions of their merit plans and are revising them. What are your schools doing as to how the funds are distributed? Are the funds divided among the schools and then are distributed through the schools? Or is there a formula? She said the plans are all over the map!

There was no report regarding the ACF Web Page. It was noted the approved September minutes need to be posted.

Under New Business Chancellor Skidmore talked about the LOCEA meeting already. It was felt nothing needed to be added in this regard.

On the item of Tuition for Dependents, S. Shurbutt distributed the e-mail communication between her and Bruce Walker. B. Unger shared their attorney told them the tuition waiver would be discriminatory. B. Miller said he felt as we go forward with this, we better make sure our statements and thoughts are accurate. He noted the proposal put forth doesn't identify fees (is there a difference between tuition & fees?); R. Nutter implored the group that if we ask for this, be sure to also ask for funding for it. This would put a large burden on the institutional budgets. C. Moore asked what are the institutions receiving right now in the number of waivers? How are they being used? Is it for whatever number of hours they wish? Is there a limit to the number of credits? It was observed there are restrictions on who is eligible for the waivers. M. Ditchen said he would like to see a state-wide bank of tuition waivers to be allocated to dependents regardless of which state institution they wish to attend.

At this point in the meeting, the Faculty & Assembly Chairs were thanked for attending this meeting; they were dismissed at the end of the consideration of new business.

The remaining discussion revolved around the format and wording of the ACF Brochure. Chair Lovett went through the slides in the PowerPoint presentation with the group and entertained suggestions for items to include and to exclude.

Chair Lovett adjourned the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia M. Shafer, Secretary