

## **ADVISORY COUNCIL OF FACULTY DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF JULY 9, 2006**

The Advisory Council of Faculty met at Twin Falls State Park for their Retreat on Sunday, July 9, 2006. Chair Sylvia Shurbutt called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m. with a welcome to those present. She highlighted the importance of the Retreat and the attractions of the area. This Retreat is a very nice way to get to know others from the institutions in the State, she said. Those ACF members present were:

Blue Ridge CTC (formerly Shepherd)	Billie Unger
Concord University	Darrin Martin
Pierpont CTC (formerly Fairmont State)	Leslie Lovett, Vice Chair
Glenville State College	Joe Evans
Marshall University	Ben Miller
Marshall University CTC	Betty Dennison
Shepherd University	Sylvia Shurbutt, Chair
West Liberty State College	Ann Rose
WV State CTC	Charles Shafer
WV State University	Patricia Shafer, Secretary
WV University	Roy Nutter
WVU-Parkersburg	Gary Waggoner
WVU-Potomac State	Jim Hoey
WVU-Institute of Technology	John David
Guests present from the HEPC were:	
Chancellor Brian Noland	Dr. Bruce Flack
Dennis Taylor	
Those absent were:	
Bluefield State College	Bruce Mutter
Fairmont State University	Connie Moore
New River CTC	Gerry Hough
Southern WV CTC	Thad Stupi
WV Northern CTC	Mike Davis
WV School of Osteopathic Medicine	Dr. G. Boxwell
WVU-Institute of Technology CTC	P. Michael Ditchen
WVU-School of Medicine	John Linton

Chair Shurbutt introduced HEPC Chancellor Noland to the group. He thanked us for the opportunity to be here. He said this is the beginning of week 6 in his position; he said he has been trying to visit each institution in the state and has thus far gotten to them all except for two. He's spending some time listening and taking many notes. He said he wants to listen to us because we are where it is at – our students in the classroom. He sees the role of the Commission to be an advocate for students and constituent groups. He has degrees in Political Science (undergraduate, graduate and Ph.D.). He formerly ran the financial aid system for the state of TN; they have a program similar to Promise. He said much of what faculty does with students links up to what the Commission needs to do at the state level.

The chair called for the approval of December 2, 2005, minutes. They had not heretofore been approved because the January meeting, at which they routinely would have been considered, did not have a quorum. She moved that the minutes be approved; B. Dennison seconded the motion and it carried.

The group then turned to the approval of April 7, 2006, minutes. Chair Shurbutt was to investigate whether or not there was to be a representative to the ACF from MUGC. It was determined the representative for MUGC has been eliminated; they will be represented by the representative from Marshall University. A correction was made at the top of page 4: the Unger bill sought the right of faculty to serve in the Legislature, not on the HEPC. With this correction, A. Rose made a motion that the minutes be approved; D. Martin seconded the motion and it passed.

For the agenda item the ACF 2005-2006 Report Card, The Chair noted this year for the first time we had a Legislative Advisory Committee – the ByLaws have been amended to include this Committee as a part of the ACF. S. Shurbett said she has heard wonderful reports about Dennis Taylor and the staff of HEPC providing information to the Legislature. There is an electronic copy of the Report Card that we should distribute to our faculty so they know what the ACF is doing for them. The Chair said she will send it out again following this meeting and the Report Card will be attached to the Minutes of this Retreat.

She said our input was well received and some Legislators sought our opinion on various issues. We generated several position papers that were sent first to our members for input and then sent to Legislators. Our Higher Education Faculty Day at the Legislature seemed to garner respect. We had conversations with Delegates Michael, Plymale, and Campbell, as well as with Governor Manchin. This meeting was a sit-down in his office and he listened to us and asked for more interaction with us.

Chair Shurbutt said the ACF Duties & Responsibilities agenda item usually was done by Connie Moore, who was unable to be with us this year. The Chair noted she has done so much work with ACF over the years and she thanked her for her work on the Council as well as for her interaction with Legislators. Duties of ACF representatives are:

- 1) Attend meetings (ours as well as Faculty Senate/Assembly meetings of our institutions). It was noted we may wish to amend our By-Laws to include the duties of the ACF representative.
- 2) Arrange selection of alternate/proxy. If a representative is unable to attend the meetings, there needs to be an alternate to serve as our proxy. The alternate needs to be sent all the information from the ACF so they may be kept up to date about the Council. We need to be sure the alternates are also on the Listserv. Be sure to have our institutions elect their alternate.
- 3) Pass on to our constituency minutes, reports, issues that come over the listserv
- 4) Obtain feedback from Faculty Senate/Assembly (of which we are a member) on issues to bring back to the ACF
- 5) Seek Senate/Assembly approval on the issues we develop
- 6) Attend Senate/Assembly Meetings
- 7) Check e-mail regularly and respond when responses are sought.

It was suggested in the By-Laws – Article II. Membership – perhaps add a C. Duties of ACF Council. Some people thought it may be beneficial to have these included in the

By-Laws because sometimes new members are unaware what they are to do. Chair Shurbutt said she will revise the By-Laws and send them out for action at the next meeting. There should be consultation with C. Moore about why certain language was included in the By-Laws (like proxy can't vote for Chair) since she worked on development of them several years ago.

Ann Rose is the webmaster and she does a wonderful job of keeping it up to date and including relevant information, Chair Shurbutt said. A. Rose puts up whatever we have to be put up on the site. The address of the ACF Listserv was pointed out so we can send messages to one another. J. Hoey keeps the listserv current. It was noted we want to be sure the Alternates are on there too.

The Chair discussed some ground rules with using the listserv. There is a certain sense of transparency among the group, being able to say what we wish as part of the discussion process. While we are trying to hash out our positions, we want to be able to freely discuss implications of what we are saying without our discussion being "leaked" to those outside the group. The Chair proposed

- 1) courtesy & ethical interaction
- 2) confidentiality – we need to be confidential during our discussions
- 3) transparency – we need to be able to discuss our ideas among the entire membership without being concerned that someone in the membership will forward our information to someone outside the group that can have major repercussions.

A. Rose suggested we may wish to attach a tag to any listserv communication that addresses the issue of confidentiality. It was noted that when using the listserv, if a person wishes to reply only to one person on the listserv, be careful how the reply is done because otherwise a reply will normally go to everyone on the listserv.

The Faculty Resource Directory was noted and discussed. Chair Shurbutt said we may need to update the Directory. B. Miller questioned what does the Legislature want from our Directory? We may wish to ask them if there are things that may be helpful to be included. Last year when we gave our presentation to the Legislative Committees, Chair Shurbutt included information about the Directory, gave them a hard copy of it, and clicked on the Directory during her presentation to show them its existence. S. Shurbutt will seek input from Senators Unger & Plymale about what they would like to see in the Directory revision. She said we will not do anything about the revision yet – we will first get additional information about what is needed. It was noted we need to make those who are listed on the Website aware this information is out there and available for anyone who reads the WEB to see.

Election of officers:

ACF Chair: S. Shurbutt nominated Leslie Lovett, current vice Chair, as Chair. B. Miller seconded the nomination. A. Rose moved that nominations be closed; B. Dennison seconded the motion and it passed.

S. Shurbutt turned the meeting over to new Chair Leslie Lovett for nominations for Vice Chair. S. Shurbutt nominated Roy Nutter from WVU; P. Shafer seconded the nomination. It was moved and seconded that nominations be closed and the motion carried.

For Secretary, B. Dennison nominated P. Shafer for another year. S. Shurbutt seconded nomination. She moved that nominations be closed; the motion was seconded and it carried.

For Webmaster, the By-Laws do not state that the Webmaster needs to be elected. A. Rose agreed to be appointed to serve another year.

Legislative Advisory Subcommittee: Members of this committee are not elected – but S. Shurbutt said she feels there needs to be an appointed coordinator. It was suggested that perhaps the coordinator be appointed and then permit the coordinator to select the committee. Roy Nutter moved that S. Shurbutt be nominated as that coordinator; A. Rose seconded the nomination. It was moved, seconded and passed that nominations be closed. Motion carried.

Newly elected chair L. Lovett conducted the remainder of the meeting.

Next on the agenda was the Report on the Faculty Study Committee. S. Shurbutt reported that in addition to ACF members, C. B. Wilson from WVU also serves on the Committee. At the first meeting, they organized ourselves and at the second meeting they developed a format for the document on which to collect the information. Each member of the group collected information from specific institutions. The information requested was

- 1) institutional mission statement
- 2) current merit pay and salary documents – from that they ascertained what was the current merit policy, current salary policies, current practices, and then made certain recommendations regarding merit pay and salary policies. In most institutions the merit/salary/practices policies are consistent.
- 3) policies and procedures for faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure.
- 4) instruments for faculty evaluation: faculty annual reporting, forms for administrators or peer evaluators to evaluate the faculty, forms to evaluate adjunct faculty, forms for students to evaluate faculty, recommendations
- 5) information on adjunct faculty. Is there a policy statement on the use of adjunct faculty? What is the percentage of adjunct faculty headcount. What is the percentage of courses taught by adjuncts. Disciplines with the highest proportion of adjunct instruction. What is the minimum salary level of adjuncts? Is there a minimum of one full-time faculty for each program?
- 6) faculty workload policy – there are differences with research faculty but at most baccalaureate institutions, the workload is 12 hours and at CTCs it is 15 hours. It was pointed out that in recommendations, perhaps there may be reasons to recommend that some workload hours be changed. S. Shurbutt pointed out that if a recommendation is made, it will be also have to be tied to the rationale together with the Mission statement. She invited responses from CTC people if they wish to ask for changes.
- 7) Term appointments – primarily with the CTCs. C. B. Wilson asked S. Shurbutt to get feedback from the ACF on whether or not these should be extended to other institutions. This could be for a person who does not wish tenure or does not wish to do research. Their rationale is that it would improve the adjunct pool, to give them better pay and benefits. Titles may be Assistant Lectureship of Teaching.

It was pointed out this could be a very slippery slope that jeopardizes the tenure process at the institutions that would adopt this. C. Noland observed the problems that occurred in Tennessee when they created these term contract ideas.

In another issue, it was suggested the Annual Experience Increment benchmark be “benefits-eligible” faculty instead of “full-time” status. We believe we worked so hard to get 9-month faculty considered as full-time. C. B. Wilson said the problem comes with

those faculty who are on phased-retirement and they aren't receiving the AEI. The question was asked whether or not we should inquire who are on phased retirement and how much money is involved. There are those who feel this is a "sleeping dog" issue that should be left alone. The Faculty Study will be circulated among the Committee, the HEPC will likely receive the report, and likely it will then go to the Legislative Committee that requested the study.

Faculty Market Study: Dennis Taylor reported he proposes to bring faculty into a market policy the Commission is preparing to do. He wants to talk with the Faculty Personnel Study Committee before proceeding, he said. Every 4-5 years, the HEPC has done a market study for Classified Staff and in 2001 the Legislature then put a salary policy into Code that wasn't realistic for institutions to fund. He doesn't want to do another study that does that. What he is hoping to do is to develop a solid process where annually they can update information and do relevant comparisons of salaries to market for classified, non-classified, and faculty. This will be helpful in requesting more money from the legislature as well as knowing where our people are with regard to market at each institution. Before the RFP is distributed, it will be circulated among the HEPC staff, the ACF, the ACCE, etc., for comment, he said. At this point, there is still a debate as to how the markets will be defined: the state, the region, the nation. It is easier to define the market for faculty than it is for classified staff – who are employable not only in higher education but also in many industries within their local regions.

The Conference Packet included a summary of the legislative bills that were passed in the last Legislative Session. The list was promulgated by Bruce Walker.

Dr. Bruce Flack reported he met with Public Education officials regarding Series 23, Admission Standards. There are major academic issues in large part because of the new baccalaureate changes coming in 2008. Section 3.3.2: there are two basic changes that will happen with baccalaureate institutions. The current policy for admission is either 17 ACT **OR** 2.0 high school gpa. Individual institutions may have a higher admission requirement (WVU & Marshall, for example). Effective August, 2008, entering baccalaureate students (other than WVU or MU) must have 18 ACT **AND** a 2.0 high school gpa. For WVU & Marshall, it is a 19 ACT **and** 2.0 high school gpa. If we had in place in Fall, 2005, the 2008 standards, 76% of students wouldn't be eligible for baccalaureate admission. Dr. Flack said his concern is that steps need to be made to avoid significant problems for students who do not qualify for baccalaureate admission. He doesn't want to back away from the standards, he said, but we need to address conditional admission. Section 3.3.2 addresses that it will be a phase in whereby in 2008 for two years institutions are to develop a conditional admission policy and there would be no limit on "conditional" admission. By 2010, no more than 20% of the admissions could be conditional; 2011, 15%; 2012 and thereafter, 10% of admissions may be conditional admissions.

On section 3.3, SAT 1 now includes the writing sample, the ACT did not include a mandatory writing sample. The HEPC stated, though, they want a writing sample. The ACT composite does not include writing – the writing is a separate score. We include in our admission requirements no minimum score for any of the parts of the test – but we were saying there was a minimum score on the writing sample. Dr. Flack does not think the writing should be a part of admission to College, but should be part of freshman English placement policy. The proposal is to remove the writing sample from the admission issue to college and move it to course placement (in series 21).

3.3.5.a – required unit standards. English, Social Studies remain the same. Math goes from 4 to 5 units, all sciences must be lab sciences. Currently on the unit requirements, institutions may waive up to 5% of the students from the requirements. Recommendation is that beginning with 2008, 10% could be waived, but students admitted with the waiver must satisfy any curricular deficiencies through the successful completion of commensurate college coursework. 3.3.5.c gives more latitude to out-of-state students who do not meet the standards. Public School administration was angry with this provision. Dr. Flack recommends that there be waiver percentages on out-of-state also. The question was asked if a student could come into the CTC without the unit requirements – can they then transfer to the University (in a 2+2) program without the unit requirements. The answer was yes.

The question was asked whether there would be a push to drop the number of hours for graduation to 120 hours, as has been discussed in the past. Chancellor Noland said he would discuss this issue with Dr. Flack and perhaps develop a position on number of hours for graduation. He acknowledged the number of hours required may be greater when there are specialized accreditation issues involved. This Series 23 draft will likely be presented to the HEPC at the August meeting.

Dr. Flack said he has become convinced in the last couple of years that one area in which we need to move is in globalizing the awareness of our students. There are some international studies requirements at some institutions but less at others. There will be money put into internationalizing the curriculum, students studying abroad, etc. to try to get this advanced.

He indicated another study on which the Central Office has been working is college courses in the high schools. He believes the policy is rather solid, the problems may be in implementation and in some campuses adhering to the policy. This is an area of continuing discussion.

S. Shurbutt asked what does the HEPC do with institutions that do not comply with the policies? Dr. Flack responded there have been large and long efforts to get institutions to adhere to the policies – sometimes it is difficult to get compliance but they work with it.

L. Lovett called for a list of faculty issues that we want to address for next year:

J. David said the inequity of adjunct salaries among the institutions is something we may need to address. (\$500/cr hr at WVU-Tech vs \$1400 at WVU)

B. Miller mentioned another issue is representation lost by the MUGC. P. Shafer mentioned that with graduate programs at several institutions, does that extend to a representative from the graduate program at each of the institutions?

S. Shurbutt said she would like to see our issues continue a second, third, fourth year until we get them passed. We had a big success with AEI and she thanked Jim Hoey for keeping that at the forefront. Globalizing the curriculum, which is an academic issue, should be included.

The meeting of the first day of the Retreat concluded at 5:25.

