

Minutes of ACCE Annual Retreat  
July 12-14, 2009  
The Resort at Glade Springs  
Daniels, West Virginia

ATTENDANCE

Members in attendance:

Amy Pitzer, Concord University  
Mike Dunn, Marshall University  
Robert E. Long, West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission  
Fred Hardee, Bluefield State College  
Ellen L. Moore, Blue Ridge Community and Technical College  
Cathy Stevenson, Bridgemont Community and Technical College  
Larry Bloom, Eastern West Virginia Community and Technical College  
Mary Alltop, Glenville State College  
Lee Ann Porterfield, Kanawha Valley Community and Technical College  
Natasha Robinson, Marshall Community and Technical College  
Mary M. Igo, New River Community and Technical College  
Bo Sellers, Pierpont Community and Technical College  
Kenneth Harbaugh, Shepherd University  
Mary Ann Edwards, West Liberty University  
Verne Britton, West Virginia Network for Educational Telecomputing (WVNET)  
Pam Woods, West Virginia Northern Community College  
Kenneth Moon, West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine  
William H. Porterfield, West Virginia State University  
Paul Martinelli, West Virginia University  
Barbara Boyd, West Virginia University Institute of Technology

Excused:

Janene Seacrist, Council for Community and Technical College Education  
Deborah Cruse, Potomac State College of West Virginia University  
Terri M. Wells, Southern West Virginia Community and Technical College  
Timothy Beardsley, West Virginia University at Parkersburg  
Johnna Beane, West Virginia University Robert C. Byrd Health Sciences Center Charleston Division

Unexcused:

Vacant, Fairmont State University

## CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson, Ms. Amy Pitzer from Concord University, convened the meeting at 1:27 pm.

## WELCOME/INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Pitzer initiated the opening discussion by introducing herself, the institution that she represented and her position with the institution followed by a request of other members to provide similar information.

## NEW MEMBER QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Ms. Pitzer recognized the new ACCE members and provided them with an opportunity to seek information on issues of concern. Mr. Kenneth Harbaugh from Shepherd University encouraged new members to utilize the ACCE LISTSERV when issues surface and answers are needed. He stated that any issue will typically generate responses from a number of ACCE members. Mr. Robert E. Long from the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission advised new members on the availability of code language and other tools that were distributed at the Leadership Conference. He stated that he brought several sets of that material and made it available to new members should there an interest. Mr. Paul Martinelli from West Virginia University encouraged members to utilize the statutory and regulatory tools to assist Staff Councils in responding to issues. Ms. Pitzer mentioned that ACCE members bring a high level of skill and knowledge to the table and come from all facets of the academic community. Ms. Pitzer and Mr. Long mentioned the importance of sharing issues addressed by ACCE with Staff Council members in order for Staff Council to provide the ACCE member with a position should a stance need to be taken. Otherwise, the ACCE member will decide based on their professional judgment. Mr. Harbaugh reminded new members that code mandates that an ACCE member be a voting member of the Staff Council but the Board of Governors representative is not a voting member of Staff Council. However, Mr. Harbaugh encouraged the Board of Governors representative to attend Staff Council meetings. He also advised new members that code enables ACCE representatives to attend Board of Governors meetings. Ms. Ellen L. Moore from Blue Ridge Community and Technical College indicated that her President had approached her with the question about the use of internet capabilities such as video conferencing for ACCE meetings. Ms. Pitzer commented that the idea has been previously discussed on several occasions with no formal action being taken. Should such method become the norm by which other sectors of the higher education community conduct meetings, then consideration will be given to adopting this approach for future ACCE meetings.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Robert E. Long, Secretary from the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission reported that the minutes from the May

meeting that was held at the Williamson campus of Southern West Virginia Community and Technical College needed to be approved. He proceeded to distribute copies of those minutes. He indicated that such minutes were distributed via the ACCE LISTSERV on June 5th and based on responses several minor corrections were made. The current version reflects those changes.

Mr. Kenneth Harbaugh from Shepherd University made a motion to accept the May minutes. Mr. Fred Hardee from Bluefield State College seconded the motion.

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

## RESULTS OF LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE SURVEY/DISCUSSION

Ms. Ellen L. Moore from Blue Ridge Community and Technical College presented the tabulated results from attendee evaluation of the 2009 Leadership Conference that was held at The Resort at Glade Springs in June. After distributing a copy to members, Ms. Moore reviewed the responses from attendees to each of the questions listed on the evaluation form. On such issues as overall impression of conference, effectiveness of materials, conference location as a learning environment, relevancy of topics covered, meeting of conference expectations and length of conference, the vast majority of responses fell between well above average to outstanding. For the question of attending a future Leadership Conference the overwhelming response was “yes” as was for the question were you energized or inspired by this conference. Overall, attendees gave high praise for the scope of the topics presented and the quality of the material and information provided.

## A LIVING WAGE

Mr. Paul Martinelli from West Virginia University reported on a living wage and the need to ensure all employees are paid at a reasonable level. He mentioned that the topic surfaced during one of the sessions at the Leadership Conference and has been frequently discussed by ACCE within the past year. In fact, the video to be shown had previously been shown at an ACCE meeting. Mr. Martinelli stated that the issue took place at Vanderbilt University and video has been shown via Public Broadcasting Station, pbs.org called “Now A Living Wage”. At the conclusion of the showing of the video, a discussion ensued. Mr. Harbaugh mentioned two issues about a living wage. He indicated that he was having trouble obtaining data on market (working with Chancellor Noland on issue) and outsourcing (quality of service has been questionable when services have been outsourced). He provided statistics on the number of classified employees on his campus (45) whose annual earnings are below \$22,000. It was mentioned that the projected cost of the special session of the legislature amounted to approximately \$380,000. Discussion continued on the need to modify the salary schedule to address the living

wage issue in the context of market. The meeting was suspended for the day to reconvene on Monday at 8:15 am.

Ms. Pitzer called the meeting to order on Monday morning. She indicated that the Personnel Study would be the first topic to be discussed.

## PERSONNEL STUDY

Ms. Pitzer reviewed the chronological sequence of events that had occurred with the Personnel Study from the adoption of Senate Bill 603 through the 2009 legislative session. She emphasized that the study impacted the three categories of higher education employees-classified, non-classified and faculty but the reaction to the study varied drastically in perception from the faculty who expressed satisfaction with the current system to non-classified who was silent on the issue to classified employees who were extremely critical of the current system.

Ms. Pitzer reported that the lack of legislative action on the Personnel Study can be attributed to the inability to finalize and report on the data results from the market study which was essential for action to occur. It prevented the drafting of comprehensive legislation to address vital components of the study and members were unwilling to accept a piece meal approach. She advised members that she had communicated with the Education Chairs, Senator Plymale and Delegate Poling of the critical importance for continuing the study. The immediate issue for ACCE is to determine those areas of the study that can be implemented without statutory and/or regulatory language. Mr. Martinelli recommended the individuals who served on the original design committee be selected in order to provide on-going continuity. Ms Pitzer indicated that a consultant may be needed to finish the work as there is no individual at the Policy Commission with the expertise and/or trust of classified employees to accomplish the task. By issuing an RFP the proposal could require the contractor to submit periodic status reports at monthly interim meetings of the legislature. Such approach would likely ensure completion of the project on-time and secure greater legislative support through better understanding of the process.

To accomplish the task of determining the status-(1) statutory, (2) HEPC/CCTCE or (3) institution for each of the 74 recommendations and then assigning a priority-(1) high priority, (2) medium priority or (3) low priority it was suggested that the most effective approach may be to access the minutes from the February meeting when ACCE worked through the entire list of recommendations. This approach would provide greater clarity as each member could read and react as the discussion took place. The consensus of members was to pursue this approach. Thus, the material was accessed for viewing as each recommendation was considered. Discussion started with the first recommendation.

**RECOMMENDATION #1:** The Commission, Council and higher education institutions should adopt a “total rewards” human resources strategy.

**ACCE position:** OK

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE**

**Priority-High**

**RECOMMEDATION #2:** In exchange for being allowed to designate units for “bumping” purposes if thee is a reduction-in-force at those institutions, West Virginia University and Marshall University should be expected to develop and implement written human resources plans that align with institution missions, master plans and compacts.

**ACCE Position:** ACCE recommends that if it is the intention of the Legislature to allow the Commission/Council to continue to study the area of reduction in force, all recommendations in the report referring to reduction in force should be part of that study and not acted upon at this time. If the legislature doesn’t allow for additional “study” then we recommend that all agencies comply with the current statute regarding reduction in force, given all currently are not in compliance. There should be a new recommendation from this language requiring each institution to develop and implement a human resources plan outlining those programs the institution will implement to accomplish the mission, goals, objectives and priorities of the institution.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #3:** In exchange for being allowed to participate in some of the flexibility provisions outlined in these recommendations, all institutional governing boards should be expected to promulgate a personnel rule that addresses personnel issues that institutions are required to address in statute and/or in a Commission or Council legislative rule.

**ACCE Position:** Institutional personnel rules should be given scrutiny beyond mere compliance-they should AT A MINIMUM:

- a) meet technical legal requirement
- b) be consistent with the intent of the law or Commission/Council rule
- c) consider best practices
- d) identify how an institutional personnel policy will align with the institutional human resources plan
- e) require input from those constituencies affected

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #4:** To assist institutions in developing comprehensive personnel rules, the Commission and Council should develop model personnel rules that institutions could use as a starting point in drafting their own personnel rules.

**ACCE Position:** Concerned that institutions won’t want to develop comprehensive rules, they would rather implement “procedures” which

require less or no scrutiny. With procedures, the employees usually have NO input. Series 4 of the HEPC outlines when a “rule” is necessary but some institutions interpret “campus wide effect” to mean ALL employees and students.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #5:** Both in exchange for being allowed to take advantage of some of the flexibility provisions outlined in these recommendations without system-level approval and as part of the overall process of ensuring that institutions are implementing best human resources practices, institutional human resources practices should be subject to periodic audits.

**ACCE Position:** We believe there should be a full-time auditor hired to insure the integrity of the system. The auditor should report twice annually to the Commission/Council and LOCEA for the first five years and then every five years thereafter. Each institution should be audited every other year or in staggered years until such time that they receive three consecutive outstanding audit reports. We also believe that in addition to withholding presidential salary increases, there should be a notation in the president’s annual written performance evaluation by the Board of Governors. We also believe that at a minimum, a portion of any approved tuition and fee increases should be mandated for those institutions that have not yet fully funded the 2001 schedule or for those that make no progress on the new approved institutional schedule.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #6:** Institutions that employ highly qualified classification and compensation professionals to make human resources decisions should be provided greater flexibility to make those decisions, particularly in the areas of classification and compensation, at the institution level.

**ACCE Position:** Concerns (for good reason) about the lack of trust in HR to fulfill their obligations/responsibilities within the proposal. The integrity of the system almost hinges on the HR community doing what they are supposed to do. It isn’t clear who will make the determination if the institutional HRs are “highly qualified” in the area of classification and compensation. All certifications must be kept current and continuing education according to industry standard should be required training for all HRs. All employees in HR can benefit from additional, regular, recurring training. All should have CUPA-HR memberships at a minimum, but World at Work memberships preferred. There is invaluable information and some training provided by these organizations FREE to members.

**Status-Statutory, HEPC/CCTCE and institutions**

**RECOMMENDATION #7:** Commission and Council staff should prepare and publish an annual report that summarizes how institutions are

performing on key human resources performance measures. Copies of the report should be provided to institution governing boards and administrators, as well as the Legislative Oversight Commission on Education Accountability.

**ACCE Position:** The annual human resources report should also include salary information-not exclude it. In addition to the information already requested in the recommendation, ACCE recommends that the following, at a minimum, should be included in that report:

- a) number of positions slotted at each institution
- b) number of new titles/jobs created/by institution/justification
- c) number of upgrades/downgrades/promotions/demotions
- d) number of employees affected by recommendation #11
- e) number of grievances/cost/topic
- f) track initial movement (and for first five years) of non-classified employees into classified system/effects
- g) number of employees receiving increases based on performance
- h) number of employees receiving step increases
- i) number of employees receiving other types of increases not relative to step or performance
- j) track movement of institutions relative to the market salary schedule
- k) provide comparable data relative to the annual market progress for classified, non-classified and faculty groups and to each other

#### **Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #8:** The Commission, Council and institutions, except West Virginia University, should utilize a single human resources technology platform for position management, including hiring; classification and compensation; and performance management.

**ACCE Position:** ACCE believes that ALL institutions should use the same human resources technology platform for position management, hiring, classification, compensation, and performance management, among others. PeopleAdmin, interfaces with Banner HR and Oracle. WVU doesn't currently have a structure already in place, however, it is our understanding that they are in process. ACCE does not feel WVU should be exempted. Having all institutions participate in PeopleAdmin would allow for the HEPC to run reports whenever they feel the need and to keep a closer watch on HR functions. The legislature may want to consider supplementing the budget of the Commission/Council to pay for the maintenance of PeopleAdmin. (FISCAL NOTE).

#### **Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #9:** The practice of awarding public higher education faculty a ten percent salary increase upon promotion should be restored – an action that was taken by the West Virginia Legislature through a modification of West Virginia Code in 2008.

**ACCE Position:** Should limit the promotional increases to the ranks:  
Instructor to Assistant Professor

Asst. Professor to Associate Professor

Associate Professor to Professor

for a total of 30% for rank promotions. There should not be an automatic increase for any faculty ranks above professor or below instructor as some institutions have created. (Professor Sr. or Instructional Technologist)

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #10:** Higher education institutions need to monitor institutional faculty to assure that there is not an over-reliance on adjunct or part-time faculty in delivery of the instructional program.

**ACCE Position:** ACCE suggests that the recommendation include the monitoring of part-time classified employees/positions given that the current statute says these positions should not exist solely for the purpose of denying benefits. Institutional and program accreditation requirements should address to some degree the staffing issues relative to faculty.

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE**

**Priority-Low**

**RECOMMENDATION #11:** Institutions should be permitted to assimilate individuals filling temporary, grant-funded positions into the classification and compensation system without triggering “bumping” rights for those employees upon termination or reduction of the grant if those employees receive formal written notification at the time of initial hire or transfer.

**ACCE Position:** Mandate that any employee hired on or after July 1, 2009 have a letter placed in his/her official personnel file notifying the employee that if they are hired through a grant or temporary funding source, they are employed only for the term of that funding and are not eligible to bump. The legislature should also take into consideration the ability of the institutions to change the source of funding salaries without notice to the employee and for no apparent reason other than to meet payroll at certain times throughout the year. Any currently employed grant funded (but not temporary) are grandfathered, so as not to be retroactive. All non-state part-time, and contract workers should be considered for reduction in force BEFORE a full-time state employee is considered. Define how seniority would be defined and occur for reduction in force at Potomac State, WVU-Tech, MUGC, Health Sciences Centers, etc. Many institutions are not following state code directives now for bumping, including WVU, so why should we allow them flexibility in this area? SWVCTC makes employees either fill a vacancy if there is one or go on a recall list—they are not permitted to bump. WVU utilizes a placement



program, again not permitting employees to bump. Classified employees want a uniform RIF policy in state statute and agree that this area needs further study and that ALL recommendations relative to bumping be taken off the table until the study is complete. (By June 2010)

**A minimum of ten years of service would be required by grant-funded employees to gain privilege to “bump” with letter upon hire was consensus of group.**

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #12:** Within strict parameters, West Virginia University and Marshall University should be allowed to designate units for “bumping” purposes if there is a reduction in force at those institutions.

**ACCE Position:** Should NOT permit flexibility to WVU/MU or any other institution prior to the completion of further study on the issue of bumping.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #13:** The Commission and Council should continue to study the issues surrounding reductions in force as required in Senate Bill No. 603 and prepare and submit a report to LOCEA no later than June 1, 2010.

**ACCE Position:** Again, all recommendations relative to bumping/RIF should be taken off the table until the study has been completed.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #14:** The Commission and Council should study outsourcing as required in Senate Bill No. 603 and prepare and submit a report to LOCEA no later than December 1, 2009.

**ACCE Position:** All recommendations relative to outsourcing should be taken off the table until the study has been completed. LOCEA should identify key individuals to serve on study group and mandate information necessary from each institution to appropriately study this topic. Study should include ALL public higher education institutions. The committee should develop training for institutions to evaluate and assess the feasibility of outsourcing based on a cost-benefit analysis rather than “train institutions on how to evaluate outsourcing opportunities.”

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #15:** The Commission, Council and institutions should utilize a common set of terms and definitions for classification and compensation and other human resources functions that align with terms and definitions utilized nationally.

**ACCE Position:** OK

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #16:** The Commission, Council and institutions should be allowed to phase in the recommendations contained in this report over time, rather than being mandated to implement everything at once.

**ACCE Position:** If the legislature agrees that the system should phase in recommendations over time, specific dates should be noted for each component(s) to be phased in. ACCE recommends the following order:

- a) classification
- b) performance management
- c) compensation
- d) professional development

ACCE also recommends that “best practices” be implemented with each component. And following proper completion of the outsourcing and reduction in force areas, best practices also accompany implementation of any recommendations arising from the study with consensus.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATIONS #17:** The Legislature, Commission and Council, and institutions all should know generally how faculty, classified employees and non-classified employees are paid in comparison to their respective markets and to one another

**ACCE Position:** OK

**Status-Statutory, HEPC/CCTCE and institutions**

**RECOMMENDATION #18:** The point factor methodology currently in use to classify jobs and positions should be retained.

**ACCE Position:** Should read that the point factor methodology should be retained with improvements recommended by the classification committee.

**Status-HEPC and CCTCE and Statutory, if necessary Priority-High**

**RECOMMENDATION #19:** The job evaluation plan should be modified to incorporate “unwritten rules” developed over the years for classifying jobs and positions.

**ACCE Position:** OK

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE Priority-High**

**RECOMMENDATION #20:** The job classification system should be reviewed and evaluated at least once every five years.

**ACCE Position:** OK

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and Statutory, if necessary Priority-High**

**RECOMMENDATION #21:** If the classification system’s job evaluation plan is revised, the revisions may be phased in at the time a job family review is completed, rather than all at once.

**ACCE Position:** OK

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and Statutory, if necessary    Priority-Medium**  
**RECOMMENDATION #22:** The Commission and Council should create a Job Classification Committee responsible for managing all aspects of job classification delegated to it by the Commission and Council. The Committee should have equal representation of human resources professionals and classified employees.

**ACCE Position: OK**

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and Statutory, if necessary    Priority-High**

**RECOMMENDATION #23:** The Commission and Council should employ a Classification and Compensation Coordinator who would be responsible for ensuring that the job classification system is maintained properly.

**ACCE Position-OK**

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and Statutory, if necessary    Priority-High**

**RECOMMENDATION #24:** To assist institution human resources administrators, the Commission and Council should create a classification and compensation system manual and include the manual and supporting documents on its website.

**ACCE Position: OK**

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and Statutory, if necessary    Priority-Medium**

**RECOMMENDATION #25:** Jobs should be reviewed regularly to ensure that job descriptions and evaluations are up-to-date.

**ACCE Position:** ACCE recommends that the words “regularly” and “periodically” be given more specificity. Job family reviews should take place so that every job family has been reviewed at least every five years so that when new market studies are completed, all job descriptions have been reviewed at least once.

**Status-Statutory 5 years**

**RECOMMENDATION #26:** Unless special state funding is made available for this purpose, a job review that leads to an upward classification of a job should not automatically produce a base pay increase for an employee in that job. If the employee’s salary is below the salary range for that pay grade, the employee’s base pay should be raised to the minimum of the salary range; otherwise, the employee’s base pay should be rounded up to the closest step in the new pay grade.

**ACCE Position:** ACCE objects to employees not having salary adjustments if it is known that they have been improperly classified (and for some time). This speaks to the importance of having all positions reviewed for proper classification at time of implementation. It is a well-known fact that some employees, some supervisors, and some human resources representatives have used classification in order to address the inadequate compensation structure and give certain employees a salary

increase. This has caused PIQ inflation and needs to be fixed in the new system. ACCE believes all employees should complete the new PIQ form, be properly classified and then properly compensated within the range for that pay grade or rounded up to the closest step if it is not within the range.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #27:** An up-to-date written job description should be in place for every job within the classification system.

**ACCE Position:** OK, however ACCE recommends that a position description should exist for ALL classified and non-classified positions.

**Status-Statutory, HEPC/CCTCE and institutions**

**RECOMMENDATION #28:** Once up-to-date written job descriptions are in place for all jobs in the classification system, highly qualified classification and compensation professionals should be allowed to slot positions into those jobs, instead of applying the point factor methodology to each position.

**ACCE Position:** ACCE does not trust the HRAs to slot. That equates to the system we had in the 1980's called "whole job comparison" and ACCE considers that to be a step backward. If institutions have to determine if 70%-80% or more of the duties and responsibilities match, they may as well point factor the PIQ anyway. If job descriptions are not properly maintained, then we have integrity issues. ACCE also feels that if the legislature grants this flexibility, it should be earned, monitored and audited, and taken away if found to be lacking. This recommendation, as was presented to LOCEA, was contrary to the classification committee recommendation and did not have consensus.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #29:** Once up-to-date written job descriptions are in place for all jobs in the classification system, the minimum qualifications contained in a job description presumptively should be the minimum qualification for any position that can be classified within that job.

**ACCE Position:** ACCE is not sure what the presumptions will be so we cannot comment at this time.

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and Statutory, if necessary**                      **Priority-Low**

**RECOMMENDATION #30:** A highly qualified classification and compensation professional, working with the Classification and Compensation Coordinator, should be allowed to create a job and job title for inclusion in the classification and compensation system without obtaining formal approval from the Job Classification Committee; other human resources professionals should have to obtain the Job Classification Committee's permission before doing so.

**ACCE Position:** ACCE recommends removal of the language following the semi-colon. We should not allow HRAs who are not “highly qualified” to create a job or job title. This makes the system weak. Creation of jobs and job titles should be controlled and monitored through the Job Classification Committee with the advice and assistance of the Classification and Compensation Coordinator who would speak for those institutions not having highly qualified classification and compensation professionals.

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and Statutory, if necessary** **Priority-Low**

**RECOMMENDATION #31:** The Classification and Compensation Coordinator should assist institutions that do not have highly qualified human resources professionals to classify positions.

**ACCE Position:** Highly qualified human resources professional should read “highly qualified classification and compensation professional.”

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE** **Priority-High**

**RECOMMENDATION #32:** Where appropriate, the Job Classification Committee should permit the creation of job career ladders.

**ACCE Position:** OK

**Status-No Position**

**RECOMMENDATION #33:** Every classified employee should have an up-to-date PIQ.

**ACCE Position:** OK

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #34:** The PIQ form currently in use should be simplified.

**ACCE Position:** ALL institutions should use the same PIQ form. If we use PeopleAdmin, that would not be an issue.

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE**

**Priority-High**

**RECOMMENDATION #35:** An institution should have two months from the date on which an employee requests a review of his or her PIQ to complete the review. If the institution fails to meet the deadline, the employee should be entitled to back pay from the date of the request if the classification is upgraded.

**ACCE Position:** OK, but ACCE prefers we use the number of working days instead of two months.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #36:** Grievance evaluators should be allowed to refer classifications to the Job Classification Committee for resolution if the grievance evaluator believes classification expertise would be beneficial. Additionally, institutions should be encouraged to utilize

alternative dispute mechanisms to resolve classification issues outside the grievance process.

**ACCE Position:** The classification committee recommended an on-campus appeals process prior to an employee being able to grieve his/her classification. ACCE believes the appeals process should be the same for all institutions.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #37:** The Commission and Council should create a Compensation Committee responsible for addressing compensation issues delegated to it by the Commission and Council.

**ACCE Position:** ACCE believes this committee should also have the authority to review the compensation of non-classified employees to ensure proper analyses are performed and used in determination of those salaries as well. See also recommendation #38. Presidents should be held accountable for how non-classified compensation is determined and that written evaluations of non-classified employees are performed annually and used in determining salary increases.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #38:** The Commission and Council should prepare a base pay market salary report, to be updated annually, that summarizes how current employees are paid in relation to the market.

**ACCE Position:** Strongly agree.

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and Statutory, if necessary**                      **Priority-High**

**RECOMMENDATION #39:** The Commission and Council should conduct a more extensive market salary study utilizing an external vendor at least once every five years.

**ACCE Position:** Strongly agree.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #40:** The Job Classification Committee or Compensation Committee should be allowed to approve base pay enhancements for jobs in which application of the point factor methodology would dictate a significantly lower salary than would external market pricing. The Committee should be required to examine market salary data annually to verify that market data supports the continued enhancement.

**ACCE Position:** ACCE thinks it should be a joint effort among the Job Classification Committee, the Job Compensation Committee, and the Classification and Compensation Coordinator.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #41:** The current “years-of-service” system for paying classified employees should be replaced with a step system that considers more than years of service.

**ACCE Position:** First it is important that it be understood that while the 2001 salary schedule for classified employees was a “years of service” salary schedule, that is true in theory only. No employee moved a step based on another year of service, but rather employees moved by a percentage determined by the institution toward closing the gap to where the employee should have been for his/her years of service. It should also be noted that all faculty pay policies currently include a years of service component, though many go to extremes to hide it. And most institutions can point to no defined way of determining non-classified compensation. It certainly isn’t “merit” if all get the same percentage raise year after year, after year. Classified Employees and ACCE want the minimum salary schedule to be placed in statute as a percentage of “current market” which causes all institutions to aspire to reach, and to give the Commission/Council the authority to update a market schedule annually based on appropriate data, and that institutions have to publish their institutional salary schedule in an institutional rule and HR plan which details in a meaningful way, their plan for progressing toward current market.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #42:** Classified employees should be paid in a manner that is consistent with an institutional salary schedule approved by the institution’s governing board and that is consistent structurally with the market salary schedule.

**ACCE Position:** ACCE recommends that it be mandated that all classes of employees must be at an equal percentage of their respective markets. In other words, you can’t pay non-classified at 95% of market and faculty at 90% of market and classified at 80% of market. The legislature should consider lifting the tuition and fee caps or some other way of freeing up institutional funds to be used for maintaining adequate salaries and benefits for employees. Institutions should have the flexibility in the lower pay grades of the classified system to enact measures that provide for a “living wage.”

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and Statutory, if necessary**                      **Priority-High  
with ACCE wording**

**RECOMMENDATION #43:** Institutions should have the flexibility to collapse jobs in pay grades 4 and 5 into pay grade 6 if they want to do so.

**ACCE Position:** Institutions should have the flexibility in the lower pay grades of the classified system to enact measures that provide for a “living wage.” The method in the recommendation is acceptable.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #44:** The Commission and Council should have the authority to establish a minimum salary below which no higher education employee at each pay grade and step may be paid.

**ACCE Position:** OK

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #45:** Institutions should be allowed to start new hires whose education and/or experience exceeds position requirements at a step in the first tertile of the salary schedule.

**ACCE Position:** OK

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #46:** Institutions that employ highly qualified classification and compensation professionals should be allowed to start new hires at a step up to the midpoint of the salary schedule if at least two searches have produced no qualified candidates or external market data clearly demonstrates that a lower salary would not be competitive.

**ACCE Position:** Institutions should have to show they did valid searches by listing where advertised and for how long, the number of applicants, number of minimally qualified applicants, the affirmative action determination regarding the applicant pool, the reason for not being able to fill the position, etc.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #47:** Current employees should begin the new institutional salary schedule at whatever step is next highest based on their current base salary. The Legislature should fund this “rounding up” of classified employees’ salaries to the next highest step.

**ACCE Position:** ACCE opposes the delineation in the recommendation on the grounds that more experienced employees are being under-valued in favor of less senior employees. Instead, ACCE recommends that the years of experience per each tertile be modified to reflect the following: move one step across the salary schedule for each two years of experience in the first tertile, for each one and one-half years of experience in the second tertile, and for each year of experience in the third tertile.

In the proposed structure, employee movement through the salary schedule is predicated on the theory that new employees reach the market salary (midpoint on the salary schedule) more quickly than veteran employees move from market salary to the top of the salary range. This conclusion was derived from the assessment of labor market compensation patterns (likely factors influencing the development of the above model are loyalty, commitment, seniority, longevity, etc.) that occurred during the last century. Such employment profiles may have been the norm of the twentieth century market place, but we question their continuation in the information and technology economy of the twenty-first century. A more



mobile population combined with a differing mindset of the prospective employees of the twenty-first century as compared to the twentieth century employees necessitate that a differing configuration model (thinking outside the box) may need to be instituted. The proposed modification to the above structure is to adjust the length of experience in moving through the steps. An inversion would be instituted with more time needed to move through the steps within the first tertile but decreased at each subsequent tertile.

Factors in support for change:

Current matrix of classified employees in the system-40 plus percent of employees are currently at Step 15.

Based on data compiled by HEPC from institutional submission, there are 5,079 classified employees (FALL 2008 DATA)

Of those 5,079 classified employees, 1,122 or 22.1 percent are over age 56

Of those 5,079 classified employees, 2,265 or 44.6 percent are over age 50

Of those 5,079 classified employees 802 or 15.8 percent are below age 35

Average years of service of classified employees at their institution are 13.2 years

Current number/percent of classified employees will fall in the third tertile of the proposed plan. The over-weighted in the third tertile will be a short-term phenomena that will be resolved within the next ten years as the baby boom generation leave the work force.

Highly unlikely future tertile pattern will ever be similar to the current matrix should the employee profiles of the Xers and Millennials be the norm for the twenty-first century (unlikely to remain with same organization for more than 10 years)

Major employee attrition takes place during the first five years of employment. Thus why reward the short-timers at the expense of more senior employees who are dedicated and loyal to the organization?

Highly likely the first tertile will replace the third tertile where the major portion of employees will fall during this century.

Current employees with over fifteen years of service have a “major” reason to stay and that is to bank sick leave to pay for health care premiums whereas such incentive will not be available to the “new” employees.

The proposed plan compensates “new” employees at the expense of more experienced employees and secondly, will be a disincentive for employees to stay beyond the first tertile. More experienced employees will be disgruntled which is likely to result in a morale problem.

The current plan appears similar to the “zero step” issue wherein entry-level salaries were increased to attract and retained qualified staff at the expense of more experienced employees. Funding constraints resulted in experienced employees accepting smaller salary increases to allow funds to be used to bring both “new” and recent hires to the “zero step” at the

expense of more senior employees. We perceive a similar pattern with the current allocation.

The Legislature should consider granting authority to the Commission and Council to develop a rule that allows institutions to adopt a structure that allows salary increases to moderately escalate as employees' years of service increase. The Commission and Council should adopt a modified version of the step system proposed by the Compensation Committee which provides for a gradual escalation of salary increases as employees' years of service increase.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #48:** In contrast to the current system in which more than 40 percent of employees are at the same step (step 15), proper step dispersion of employees generally should be ensured in the new system.

**ACCE Position:** OK

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #49:** The Legislature should consider providing funding to support one-time salary increases for classified employees with more than fifteen years of experience to create greater step dispersion.

**ACCE Position:** Again, ACCE feels the more senior employees are devalued somewhat by the percentages in this recommendation when they are translated into dollars.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #50:** An employee with more than fifteen years of experience should be able to continue to move across the salary schedule, albeit at a slower rate than an employee with fewer years of experience.

**ACCE Position:** Seems to discriminate against more senior classified employees. Is it the intention to slower the rate at which more senior non-classified and faculty salaries increase as well? If not, then why would this be fair for classified employees?

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #51:** Subject to certain exceptions, an employee should be allowed to move one step across the salary schedule for each year of experience in the first tertile, for each two years of experience in the second tertile, and for each three years of experience in the third tertile.

**ACCE Position:** We've been advised that the theory is that once you learn the job, you are not gaining any more knowledge in that area, devaluing seniority while at the same time requiring these same employees to EXCEED performance expectations while the newer employees only

have to MEET performance expectations and move more quickly through the salary range than more senior employees do. We want a definition of “exceed” performance expectations and “meet” performance expectations in the rule. Many institutions include in their current performance management training modules that “no one exceeds expectations” stating that we can always do better. This system not only requires that more senior employees exceed expectations, but that we exceed for three consecutive years before being allowed to move one step. ACCE feels this is unfair and discriminatory to the more senior employees AND institutions can use this as a loophole to hold back on salary increases for more senior employees. No employee should lose salary due to the implementation of this plan.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #52:** An employee who earns a degree that is above position requirements in a directly-related field should receive an adjustment in base pay.

**ACCE Position:** Look at the public education model. Either we value education above requirements or we don't. Why would one be base building and the other not? A code change would be required to allow for a “bonus.”

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #53:** Institutions should have the flexibility to reward an employee who earns a degree above position requirements in a field that is not directly related to his or her work with a one-time bonus.

**ACCE Position:** Look at the public education model. Either we value education above requirements or we don't. Why would one be base building and the other not? A code change would be required to allow for a “bonus.”

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #54:** The Job Classification Committee should identify and approve certifications the acquisition of which would produce a one-time, non-base-building bonus.

**ACCE Position:** Required certifications are taken care of on the classification side of the house and ACCE feels that additional compensation for those required certifications would be double-dipping. However, if an employee attains a certification valued by the institution in any way that may not be a requirement of the position, then the institutions should be asked to compensate for that milestone. Gaining more knowledge should always be valued.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #55:** The legislature should consider providing funding for a one-time salary increase or bonus for current employees whose education and/or certifications exceed position requirements.

**ACCE Position:** Required certifications are taken care of on the classification side of the house and ACCE feels that additional compensation for those required certifications would be double-dipping. However, if an employee attains a certification valued by the institution in any way that may not be a requirement of the position, then the institutions should be asked to compensate for that milestone. Gaining more knowledge should always be valued.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #56:** Institutions should be required to fund the current salary schedule that appears in the West Virginia Code fully before moving to a new system or taking advantage of any of the flexibility provisions contained in these recommendations.

**ACCE Position:** The recommendation should be revised to read ...”or taking advantage of any of the flexibility provisions provided in these recommendations or existing already in statute.” Institutions should come to realize that funding the 2001 schedule is a priority NOT a mere suggestion. Any institution not able to move to the new system by July 1, 2011 will lose ALL current or future flexibilities afforded until such time they are compensating their employees at no less than 95% (or some agreed upon fair percentage) of current market. And the president of any such institution will have all salary enhancements ceased and this deficiency will be noted in the president’s written evaluation.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #57:** Institutions at which 95 percent or more of classified employees receive annual performance reviews should be allowed to deny an employee credit for a year of experience beyond the midpoint of the first tertile if the employee’s performance does not meet expectations and beyond the midpoint of the third tertile if the employee’s performance does not exceed expectations.

**ACCE Position:** See #51 above. Also ACCE feels that some employees may possibly be punished for “meeting” expectations by only being allowed to move if there is a market salary schedule movement.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATIONS #58:** The Legislature should consider allowing a limited number of institutions with a strong history of performance management to pilot a “points-for-performance” system for employees.

**ACCE Position:** ACCE feels these recommendations devalue classified employees. Classified employees believe we are equal partners with faculty and non-classified employees in the success of students, and in running the institution. One group is as essential as the other and cannot

function without the other. ACCE does not want classified employees to be made to feel or judged by other groups to be a lower class of employee. This recommendation “cheapens” us with the offer of a T-shirt or some other trinket being offered to us, while faculty and non-classified employees are given only monetary rewards. This recommendation should be given careful thought.

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and institutions**

**Priority-Low**

**RECOMMENDATION #59:** Institutions should be allowed to provide certain employees with one-time bonuses in a limited number of situations on a pilot basis.

**ACCE Position:** ACCE feels these recommendations devalue classified employees. Classified employees believe we are equal partners with faculty and non-classified employees in the success of students, and in running the institution. One group is as essential as the other and cannot function without the other. ACCE does not want classified employees to be made to feel or judged by other groups to be a lower class of employee. This recommendation “cheapens” us with the offer of a T-shirt or some other trinket being offered to us, while faculty and non-classified employees are given only monetary rewards. This recommendation should be given careful thought.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #60:** The Public Employees Insurance Agency Finance Board should include a representative from higher education.

**ACCE Position:** Strongly agree. It should be someone with the appropriate background and knowledge of higher education PEIA requirements/problems/complaints.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #61:** Institutions should be permitted to purchase additional benefits above those that are statutorily mandated on behalf of some or all of their employees.

**ACCE Position:** Strike the word “some.” Including “some” allows for preferential treatment of some employees over others. If the institutions decide to provide additional benefits, they should be available to all employees who chose to participate.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #62:** Institutions should be permitted to move a non-classified employee into the classification system, while allowing that employee to continue to accrue leave at the rate he or she accrued it as a non-classified employee.

**ACCE Position:** The job classification committee or the classification and compensation coordinator at the central office should determine which non-classified positions are to be brought back into the classified system.

Employees should not lose annual days already accrued, but should then, from the date moved to the classified system, accrue leave at the appropriate rates for other classified employees based on the years of service to the institution. Or the institution could “buy out” their leave above the accrual rate they would fall into under the classified system to bring them in line.

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and institutions** **Priority-Medium**

**RECOMMENDATION #63:** Absent having a better system in place, institutions should utilize the performance management system developed by the personnel study performance management committee for classified and non-classified employees.

**ACCE Position:** OK

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and institutions** **Priority-Low**

**RECOMMENDATION #64:** Each public higher education institution should provide adequate information to faculty and staff on evaluation of their performance as part of the annual review procedures and define the review process in their faculty and/or staff handbook.

**ACCE Position:** All institutions should have to be required to have an up-to-date handbook for each class of employee.

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and institutions** **Priority-Medium**

**RECOMMENDATION #65:** All supervisors should be required to attend performance management training as part of the process of implementing the performance management system.

**ACCE Position:** This seems a little vague. ACCE wants stronger requirements for training. The training should be provided by the Commission/Council to assure all get the same training and the training should be mandatory for all supervisory personnel. The method of delivery could be on-line or in person, but something similar to the p-card training or the driving training might work best.

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and institutions** **Priority-High**

**RECOMMENDATION #66:** All supervisors should be required to conduct performance reviews of all employees at once annually and new hires immediately in advance of their six-month anniversary dates. Additionally, supervisors should be required to discuss employees’ strengths and weaknesses with them at their three-month anniversary dates.

**ACCE Position:** Eliminate “some type” of performance review and replace with a written evaluation of strengths and weaknesses at 3 months and add to be filed in the personnel file. In the last sentence, the word “them” should be replaced with “new employees” for clarity.

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and institutions** **Priority-High**

**RECOMMENDATION #67:** Incorporate the higher education disciplinary policy into Commission and Council rules.

**ACCE Position:** The only disciplinary procedure that exists is in the old 1987 classified employee handbook. ACCE recommends that the disciplinary policy be another item for further study and that whatever policy results from the recommendations be applicable to ALL employees, not just classified. Reasons for disciplinary action and the process for taking action should be the same at all institutions.

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #68:** The Commission and Council should hire a statewide Training and Professional Development Coordinator to support training and professional development across public higher education.

**ACCE Position:** Strongly agree

**Status-Statutory**

**RECOMMENDATION #69:** The Commission and Council should continue to provide professional development opportunities for human resources professionals through WorldAtWork and other applicable organizations.

**ACCE Position:** The training should be “worthy” training. It should be noted that many institutions are not currently providing training and development opportunities to employees due to funding concerns.

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and institutions**

**Priority-High**

**RECOMMENDATION #70:** Higher education institutions should develop a series of online training modules for new managers and supervisors, and such courses should be provided at no cost to such personnel.

**ACCE Position:** OK if all supervisory employees are required to participate.

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and institutions**

**Priority-Medium**

**RECOMMENDATION #71:** Institutions should ensure that new-hire orientation programs include information about training and professional development resources and opportunities.

**ACCE Position:** Most institutions do not currently have any new employee orientation program. They usually just go over benefits with new employees. ACCE recommends each HR department develop a new employee orientation program with the advice and assistance of staff council and faculty senate.

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and institutions**

**Priority-Low**

**RECOMMENDATION #72:** Institutions should incorporate professional development plans into their performance management systems.

**ACCE Position:** Who will ensure this is done? Institutions should lose flexibilities in the recommendations if this isn't done.

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and institutions** **Priority-Low**

**RECOMMENDATION #73:** Institutions should track the overall amount, as well as the cost, of all training and development provided to staff.

**ACCE Position:** OK. Track and report annually in the HR Report.

**Status-HEPC/CCTCE and institutions** **Priority-Low**

**RECOMMENDATION #74:** The Commission and Council should study whether to alter current internal promotion preferences.

**ACCE Position:** Agree to continue to study.

**Status-Statutory**

### **Summary of Priority Recommendations**

**High Priority:** Recommendation Numbered #1, #18, #19, #20, #22, #23, #31, #34, #38, #42, #65, #66 and #69.

**Medium Priority:** Recommendation Numbered #21, #24, #62, #64 and #70.

**Low Priority:** Recommendation Numbered #10, #29, #30, #58, #63, #71, #72 and #73.

**ACCE Priority List:** Recommendation Numbered #17 through #24 merged with #31 through #34 (PIQ and Classification with Compensation), #38 and #65, #66 and #69 (Supervisor training, Performance evaluations and Human resources training).

### **COMPENSATION STRUCTURES/LIVABLE WAGE ISSUES**

1. Fairness, seniority and valued employees
2. Compensation for duties performed
3. Increased state appropriations for higher education
4. Tertiles-years of experience, education and training
5. Tuition assistance
6. Fairness
7. Credit for training and experience and years at institution
8. Years of service
9. Steps important as is years of service How to quantify?
10. Equal percentage among all groups (across the board)
11. Livable wages (step system) equalizes with other two groups certain circumstances where bonuses are possible
12. Retirement incentives
13. Change whole system
14. Remove cap on years of service (current system 15 years)



15. No merit raises unless awarded fairly education and experience related to job
16. Equal pay for equal work
17. Livable wage and equity with other two categories of higher education employees and small compensation for employees beyond 15 years of service
18. Years of service with extension to 40 years
19. Fix dispersion problem, schedule has to move

ACCE is not adverse to a step system but maintains that years of service must be a component of any step system. A sample of a new salary schedule (based on steps or some variance) needs to be developed with the inclusion of the mandated annual updates. A prerequisite must be a general agreement on how steps will be defined and how employees will move through the steps.

It was discussed and a decision was rendered that ACCE should form a Compensation/Step Committee. The members of that committee are:  
 Cathy Stevenson from Bridgemont Community and Technical College  
 Amy Pitzer from Concord University  
 Lee Ann Porterfield from Kanawha Valley Community and Technical College  
 Mike Dunn from Marshall University  
 Bo Sellers from Pierpont Community and Technical College  
 Robert E. Long from West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission  
 William H. Porterfield from West Virginia State University

#### ESTABLISH PRELIMINARY 2010 LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Ms. Pitzer initiated the discussion relative to the issues of importance to ACCE in 2010. She stated that the continuation of the Personnel Study was by far the most important issue. A discussion ensued as to other issues of importance to ACCE. The following list of items was presented:

1. Resolution or bill to permit one year bonuses for taking on additional duties-will likely require code change
2. Right to run for public office-will likely require constitutional amendment
3. Restore funding of higher education to level prior to recession
4. Increase increment from \$60 to \$100
5. Personnel Study continuation
6. Retirement equalization issue
7. Correct inequity that exists over nine (9) months equals twelve (12) months
8. Restructure higher education governing system

#### GRIEVANCE TRAINING

Ms. Margaret Buttrick, Human Resources Administrator at the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission, provided an updated

report on the West Virginia Public Employees Grievance Procedure. The revised grievance procedure was the result of legislative action during the 2008 legislative session, Senate Bill 780 Revision. The power point presentation included the history of the state grievance procedure, the current steps in the process which consists of Level I-Chief Administrator, Level II-Mediation or Arbitration and Level III-Grievance Board with hearing before Administrative Law Judge, Composition of Grievance Board, 2008 Grievance Procedure Provisions, procedures at each of the three levels and contact information. A copy of the power point presentation was distributed to ACCE members. Ms. Buttrick also distributed a copy of the Classified Employees Salary Schedule Report that was presented to the Legislative Oversight Commission on Education Accountability (LOCEA) in January 2009.

#### DISCUSSION OF ACCE POSITION RELATIVE TO FURLOUGHS/LAYOFFS

Ms. Pitzer reported that the governor had introduced a bill that would have authorized state agencies and potentially higher education institutions the ability to furlough/layoff public employees. Fortunately, the legislature failed to approve the legislation. However, speculation was that a similar bill may be introduced during the next regular legislative session. A discussion ensued about the ramifications of such action. Employee concerns about the legislation centered on the ability of the governor to dictate to institutions on how the process would work as well as potential loss of employee benefits due to a disruption in state employment. The possibility of the loss of life, health, increment and retirement benefits was of major concern. For higher education equitability was a concern. Furloughs/layoffs would need to be applicable to each of the three categories of employees-faculty, non-classified and classified and each category would need to be treated equally. No unit on campus can be excluded from participation.

#### DISCUSSION OF INSTITUTIONAL BY-LAWS

Ms. Pitzer had requested that members bring sufficient copies of their local Staff Council Constitution/By-Laws to the meeting to be shared with other ACCE members. She asked members to share those materials. Once the distribution was completed the meeting was suspended for the day to reconvene on Tuesday at 8:15 am.

#### REVIEW OF ACCE BY-LAWS

Ms. Pitzer called the meeting to order on Tuesday morning. She raised the issue as to whether the ACCE Constitution/By-Laws addressed the procedure for the selection of a presiding official to oversee the election of officers. Her concern related to the fact that an official from the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission (usually Ms. Margaret Buttrick, Human Resources Administrator or Mr. Dennis Taylor, Vice Chancellor) had normally presided over the election process but

neither person would be available to perform such services. After reviewing the Constitution/By-Laws, Mr. Long, Secretary, reported that such issue was not specifically addressed. Ms. Pitzer subsequently indicated that consideration should be given to amending the Constitution/By-Laws to address this oversight prior to the next election cycle.

#### ACCE OFFICER ELECTIONS

Per the provision of the ACCE Constitution/By-Laws Ms. Pitzer appointed Ms. Barbara Boyd from West Virginia University Institute of Technology and Ms. Cathy Stevenson from Bridgemont Community and Technical College as tellers. Mr. Kenneth Harbaugh from Shepherd University volunteered to preside over the nomination and voting process as it related to the election of ACCE Officers for 2009-2010. He opened the nominations for Chairperson. Mr. Larry Bloom from Eastern West Virginia Community and Technical College nominated Ms. Amy Pitzer from Concord University. Mr. Paul Martinelli from West Virginia University seconded the nomination. Mr. Paul Martinelli from West Virginia University made a motion to close the nominations for Chairperson. Mr. William H. Porterfield from West Virginia State University seconded the motion. Ms. Cathy Stevenson from Bridgemont Community and Technical College made a motion to approve Ms. Pitzer as Chairperson by acclamation. Ms. Lee Ann Porterfield from Kanawha Valley Community and Technical College seconded the motion.

**MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

Mr. Harbaugh opened the nominations for Vice-Chairperson. Mr. William H. Porterfield from West Virginia State University nominated Mr. Mike Dunn from Marshall University. Mr. Paul Martinelli from West Virginia University seconded the nomination. Mr. Larry Bloom from Eastern West Virginia Community and Technical College made a motion to close the nominations. Mr. Paul Martinelli from West Virginia University seconded the motion. Ms. Lee Ann Porterfield from Kanawha Valley Community and Technical College made a motion to approve Mr. Dunn as Vice-Chairperson by acclamation. Mr. Kenneth Moon from West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine seconded the motion.

**MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

Mr. Harbaugh opened the nominations for Secretary. Ms. Cathy Stevenson from Bridgemont Community and Technical College nominated Mr. Robert E. Long from the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission. Mr. Paul Martinelli from West Virginia University seconded the nomination. Mr. Paul Martinelli from West Virginia University made a motion to close the nominations for Secretary. Mr. Larry Bloom from Eastern West Virginia Community and Technical College seconded the motion. Ms. Mary Alltop from Glenville State College made a motion to approve Mr. Long as Secretary by acclamation.

Ms. Ellen L. Moore from Blue Ridge Community and Technical College seconded the motion.

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

#### COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Ms. Pitzer reported that the Executive Committee of ACCE has created the following committees for 2009-2010 with the make-up of those committees as follows:

##### LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Co-Chaired by Mr. Mike Dunn and Mr. Kenneth Harbaugh  
Fred Hardee from Bluefield State College  
Larry Bloom Eastern West Virginia Community and Technical College  
Mary Alltop from Glenville State College  
Mike Dunn from Marshall University  
Mary M. Igo from New River Community and Technical College  
Deborah Cruse from Potomac State College of West Virginia University  
Kenneth Harbaugh from Shepherd University  
Mary Ann Edwards from West Liberty University  
William H. Porterfield from West Virginia State University  
Paul Martinelli from West Virginia University

##### BENEFITS COMMITTEE

Co-Chaired by Mr. William H. Porterfield and Ms. Johnna Beane  
Fred Hardee from Bluefield State College  
Cathy Stevenson from Bridgemont Community and Technical College  
William H. Porterfield from West Virginia State University  
Timothy Beardsley from West Virginia University at Parkersburg  
Johnna Beane from West Virginia University Robert C. Byrd Health Sciences Center Charleston Division

##### RETREAT COMMITTEE

Co-Chaired by Ms. Ellen L. Moore and Ms. Lee Ann Porterfield  
Ellen L. Moore from Blue Ridge Community and Technical College  
Lee Ann Porterfield, Kanawha Valley Community and Technical College  
Natasha Robinson from Marshall Community and Technical College  
Mary M. Igo from New River Community and Technical College  
Bo Sellers, Pierpont Community and Technical College  
Deborah Cruse from Potomac State College of West Virginia University  
Kenneth Harbaugh from Shepherd University  
Terri M. Wells from Southern West Virginia Community and Technical College

##### WEB AND COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE

Co-Chaired by Mr. Verne Britton and Ms. Pam Woods  
Janene Seacrist from Council for Community and Technical College Education

Deborah Cruse from Potomac State College of West Virginia University  
Mary Ann Edwards from West Liberty University  
Verne Britton from West Virginia Network for Educational  
Telecomputing (WVNET)  
Pam Woods from West Virginia Northern Community College  
Kenneth Moon from West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine  
Barbara Boyd from West Virginia University Institute of Technology

#### COMPENSATION/STEP COMMITTEE

Chaired by Mr. Mike Dunn

Cathy Stevenson from Bridgemont Community and Technical College  
Amy Pitzer from Concord University  
Lee Ann Porterfield from Kanawha Valley Community and Technical  
College  
Mike Dunn from Marshall University  
Bo Sellers from Pierpont Community and Technical College  
Robert E. Long from West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission  
William H. Porterfield from West Virginia State University

#### ACCE MEETING DATES ESTABLISHED

Ms. Pitzer distributed a copy of a calendar for 2009-2010. The calendar provided meeting dates for the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission, the Council for Community and Technical College Education, Legislative Interim Committee Meetings, the start of the 2010 regular session of the Legislature and to record the tentative dates for ACCE meetings. A discussion ensued on the issue of conducting the August ACCE meeting via teleconference due to extensive campus activities and workload during that month. Mr. Bloom suggested establishing a tentative date for the meeting. Mr. Martinelli suggested a date of August 13. Mr. Robert E. Long from the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission made a motion to meet in August. Mr. Bo Sellers from Pierpont Community and Technical College seconded the motion.

#### MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

Based on a straw vote a date in late August was preferred. Thus, a tentative date of August 31st was established for the meeting to be held at the Marshall University Graduate College in South Charleston. Ms. Pitzer proceeded to establish the meeting schedule for 2009-2010 as well as dates of other important events: Following is the tentative schedule:

August

- 7-HEPC meeting
- 10 thru 12-Legislative Interim Committee meetings
- 19-CCTCE meeting
- 21 and 22-HEPC Summit training
- 31-ACCE meeting

September

14 thru 16-Legislative Interim Committee meetings  
30-ACCE meeting at New River Community and Technical College

October

13 thru 15-Legislative Interim Committee meetings  
22-ACCE meeting at Pierpont Community and Technical College  
23-CCTCE meeting at Pierpont Community and Technical College

November

17 thru 19-Legislative Interim Committee meetings  
19-ACCE meeting at Marshall University Graduate College  
20-HEPC meeting at West Virginia University

December

4-CCTCE meeting in Charleston  
4-ACCE meeting at Marshall University Graduate College

January

7-ACCE meeting at West Liberty University  
10 thru 12-Legislative Interim Committee meetings  
13-Legislative Session begins

February

18-ACCE meeting at Marshall University Graduate College

March

12-ACCE meeting at Marshall University Graduate College  
13-Legislative Session ends

April

13-ACCE meeting at Eastern West Virginia Community and Technical College

May

18-ACCE meeting at Marshall University

June

15-ACCE meeting at Concord University

July

19 thru 21-Tentative ACCE Retreat date, location (TBD)

Mr. Kenneth Harbaugh from Shepherd University made a resolution to establish a July 2010 ACCE Retreat date. He recommended the dates of July 19 through 21, starting at 12 noon on the 19th and ending at noon on the 21st. The days are Monday through Wednesday with location to be determined.

#### INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION

Mr. Harbaugh presented the issue of attendees obtaining approval to travel to ACCE meetings. A supportive technique is for the ACCE representative to remind Staff Council and other administrative officials of the fact that ACCE consistently supports increased funding for higher education. Incorporate such message in the Staff Council minutes so that senior staff is made aware of such interest. Ms. Pitzer reinforced that message along with providing advanced scheduling to supervisor and other senior

staff. She also recommended providing appropriate officials with annual meeting schedule.

Mr. Harbaugh reported on the success story of ACCE representatives from West Virginia State University and Kanawha Valley Community and Technical College in inviting local legislators to campus wherein issues of critical importance were addressed. He stressed the importance of each ACCE member taking such initiative and that early contact is critical to establishing a rapport that will assist in reaching the stated objectives.

Ms. Boyd reported on an issue at her institution where employees are moved to positions for which the employee may be unqualified. Ms. Pitzer responded by stating that the supervisor determines the duties and responsibilities of employees and encouraged employees to meet with supervisor to work out differences. She reported that the issue is part of reorganization. Another reorganization issue involves an employee who works eight (8) months in one position and four (4) in a different position.

Mr. Britton reported on IT conference to be held at the Charleston Civic Center on August 3 through 7 and a subsequent IT conference to be held in Morgantown on September 28 and 29.

Ms. Woods asked the question about other duties as assigned on the PIQ and the appropriate percentage for such duties. Normally, the threshold would be no greater than five (5) percent.

Ms. Alltop addressed the issue of critical retention approval and whether the Board of Governors has authority to delegate that responsibility to the President. It was stated that code mandates that individual requests for critical retention positions be presented and each request acted upon independently.

Ms. Moore had an issue about obtaining a timeline for the ending of ACCE meetings as it related to meal allowances. It was mentioned that the ACCE minutes report on the time of adjournment of individual meetings but meal allowances would be subject to the time that the representative arrived at the original destination, normally office or home whichever is closer.

There being no further business to come before the members Mr. Kenneth Harbaugh from Shepherd University made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Mike Dunn from Marshall University seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 12:03 pm.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Robert E. Long, Secretary  
UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED