

Minutes of ACCE Meeting
September 26, 2013
Eastern Community and Technical College
Moorfield, West Virginia

ATTENDANCE

Members in attendance:

Amy Pitzer, Concord University
Anne Wilmoth, Blue Ridge Community and Technical College
Melanie Whittington, Bridgemont Community and Technical College
Lacey Koontz, Eastern West Virginia Community and Technical College
Mary Alltop, Glenville State College
Carol Hurula, Marshall University
Beverly Jones, Pierpont Community and Technical College
Kenneth Harbaugh, Shepherd University
Carrie Watters, West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission
Verne Britton, West Virginia Network for Educational Telecomputing (WVNET)
Deborah Harvey, West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine
Timothy Beardsley, West Virginia University at Parkersburg

Excused:

Fred Hardee, Bluefield State College
Sherry Mitchell, Fairmont State University
Lee Ann Porterfield, Kanawha Valley Community and Technical College
Chris Stevens, Mountwest Community and Technical College
Mary M. Igo, New River Community and Technical College
Teri Wells, Southern West Virginia Community and Technical College
Mary Ann Edwards, West Liberty University
Melanie Eberhart, West Virginia Northern Community College
William H. Porterfield, West Virginia State University
Barbara Boyd, West Virginia University Institute of Technology
Paul Martinelli, West Virginia University
Johnna Beane, West Virginia University Robert C. Byrd Health Sciences Center Charleston

Unexcused:

Janene Seacrist, Council for Community and Technical College
Dixie Heavener, Potomac State College of West Virginia University

Guests:

President – Charles Terrell – Eastern West Virginia Community and Technical College

Deb Nelson- Asst.to Financial Aid Director –Classified Staff

Ann Degan – Part-time to Workforce Development Officer – Classified Staff

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairperson, Ms. Amy Pitzer from Concord University convened the meeting at 9:20 a.m.

Welcome from President Terrell.

Lots of changes happening across the state. One just this morning signed off on Obama Care documentation. Bracing for another potential seven and a half percent cut. Looking at institutions growing enrollment. Looking at tuition increases. Prepare for results and outcomes with SB 330. Prime interest to staff, faculty and colleges and universities. Mark Toor will be making the commitment to get details of SB 330. Excited about enrollment growth at Eastern, which is causing some growing pains at the college. Recognizing how Classified Staff can be a part of the leadership of the institution is very important.

Question from Ken Harbaugh – what is scarier SB 330 or Obama Care or is that you don't have enough information yet?

President – Not enough information on Obama Care yet and the big impact it might have on adjunct faculty as it relates to credit hour, grading papers and advising. IRS hasn't clarified. Nervous in defining part-time and adjunct faculty. Eastern has complete dependency on adjunct faculty. Looking at how that will impact budget on providing benefits.

SB 330 how to define classification system and pay with also looking at 7.5% cut (145,000 at Eastern). How to begin to move forward and maintain classified staff scale. Eastern has a Board Policy that when they're able to keep the classified scale up-to-date that also have to provide same increase to faculty and administrators. Average what happens with classified staff which was 2.5% in FY13, that means faculty and administrators also receive 2.5% increase. Eastern was able to provide salary increase even with the cut in funding due to increased enrollment.

Information Ken Harbaugh and Amy Pitzer on the perception of SB 330 being a classified employee bill only and it's not.

President – challenge with intent being slow start on discussion of details of each component for the bill. We're now seeing some details coming forward with discussion points which might be creating some anxiety from some groups as there really wasn't anything happening with SB 330 after it was passed. Hopefully with Mark Toor creating more dialogue and discussions.

Information from Amy Pitzer on communication and cooperation between constituency groups – faculty ACF and ACCE requesting some type of unity group for communications.

Question from Bev Jones on the proposal last year on increasing tuition on credit hours above 12 hours.

President – He was in the Virginia system for 25 years and students paid for every hour enrolled. He was surprised WV students only paid for full-time 12 credits. He thinks this may eventually stick as Senator Plymale was making reference that if there's any time to start this conversation, it's now with the significant cuts in Higher Ed. He thinks the bill will be presented again.

Thinks "outcomes" based funding will also be presented and hopes reducing current allocations to fund isn't the method to use. Thinks if it's a bonus type funding he would be excited to see. Institutions have to begin looking at being entrepreneurial and using those models in operating the universities. Other revenue strategies will be necessary.

MINUTES: Carol Hurula distributed copies of the August 6th meeting minutes in draft form. Ken Harbaugh from Shepherd University moved to accept the minutes as reflected with changes that were noted by members. Tim Beardsley from WV Parkersburg seconded the motion. Motion unanimously approved.

DISCUSSED RME AND MARKET STUDY SURVEY. RME = Average in Market.

Faculty, non-classified and classified. Experts will go out into market and find out how our job titles match those in the market compared to each school peer list.

- Other higher education institutions.
- Peer Groups is one match. (Each school has their own peers).
- BLS Data (Bureau Labor Statistics) for classified and faculty.
- DATA CUPA (Colleges Universities Professional Association) for faculty, non-classified and some classified jobs can also be looked at.

Match job descriptions – don't look at titles. This is the brief job description, one or two paragraphs on each job that describes the function of the job (summary).

Fox Lawson will then go to market in all salary surveys and match and find out how far away from the average the employee is. Average from marketplace will give a percentage. This percentage is how far way that job title is from market.

Fox Lawson will get market calculator study to arrive at market calculation analysis – once you get averages. (Market calculation is where you are and where you are relative to market).

Fox Lawson will take all surveys and compare to get the market average from the studies.

Midpoint is market.

Fox Lawson will report back on the market studies what the market calculation numbers are for classified, non-classified and faculty for all 23 institutions. From these numbers they will start talking about the RME. How we got to these numbers could be thought of as a separate discussion. Individual level of detail.

RME – means the relative market status of each employee classification at an organization falls within five percent of all other employee classifications within the organization for the preceding three year period.

RMS – means the calculated relationship between the average salary of each employee classification and its peer group.

RMS – determines how the calculation of RME takes place.

Mercer was hired by HEPC to validate the Fox Lawson data and provide any recommendations for what is necessary in moving forward with statutes in SB 330. Outside eyes to use best practice in market study analysis.

Problem is “relative-market” equity is about market – comparison to market. RMS definition using average salaries to calculate. You don’t calculate average salaries to average market other than to get the median.

Midpoint (middle) market means half of the people above, half of the people are below.

Once salary survey complete, Mark Toor wants to adjust each institutions numbers for their region. Shouldn’t the Institution do this instead of HEPC?

Legislation and hopefully the salary rule will give institutions flexibility to adjust salary schedules to take into account for variance in cost of living for your area.

RME isn’t going to be the same at each institution. Depending on how raises have been accomplished over the last few years as compared to the market study results.

Mark Toor wants the salary rule to be written prior to the results so that no one group can say one group is being favored over another because the rule was written to favor a particular group. ACCE agrees.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION: If §18B is open during the legislative session all ACCE members have to be vigilant in checking the web-site each and every day for any updates, changes or movement.

DISCUSSED TALKING POINTS FOR SB 330.

- What problem do you have with paying us fairly in comparison to each other?
- Work together to be equal partners.
- Classified has to understand faculty issues, faculty has to understand classified issues.
- Discuss with ACF the concern that enough salary disciplines aren’t being studied.
- Need better communication within HEPC to all employees.
- Bring non-classified back into classification
- Salary Rule
- Central Office review of the CHRO’s
- Deficiency – violating law, rule in policy

What is JCC’s charge?

What is CPRC's charge?

Faculty are indicating no future raises. Where does it state that in SB 330?

Nowhere in SB 330 does it state that no raises will occur pending the 5% differential.

Primary implementation of SB 330 lies with the HEPC

Amy will put the talking points on the list serve so those not at the meeting can comment.

AMY QUOTE: "Faculty, classified and non-classified employees are equal partners in the success of our students, supporting the mission of our schools and initiatives of the state of West Virginia for Higher Education. Equal partnership."

There's been no action to date with salary rule or common grounds committee.

HISTORY: This is the first market study that includes faculty and non-classified. All previous studies involved classified staff studies only.

Previous studies were system wide for classified employees only. Now they are basing study on 23 different institutions numbers for all employees.

This is the first time faculty and non-classified have been included in a salary survey.

The last salary study had a low margin of error as it was one study looking at one group.

LOOKING AT RME STATUS AS DEFINED IN SB 330. How longevity affects the average salary. Email from Mark Toor as read by Amy.

"You warned at the very first ACCE meeting I attended that using average salary for employee classification would be affected by the tenure of classified employees at that institution as opposed to the markets in which we compete to recruit and to retain those employees. Specifically you mention that at some institutions the majority of classified staff are at or above step 15 on the classified salary schedule and the heavy weighting of classified employees at higher salaries for each pay grade would artificially inflate the average for all employees in that pay grade at that institution. Mark indicated this problem didn't take hold with him until recently but can now articulate the exact nature of the problem and confirms that both Fox Lawson and Mercer have confirmed that the current definition of RMS a component of RME is not likely to measure what the legislature intended for us to measure when it created that theory. He believes the intent behind RME is clear. To create a test and then use that test to require institutions to meet a certain degree of internal pay equity between the three classes of employees at each institution. Legislative intent is also clear that the means by testing this degree of equity is to be based on the recruitment market of which we draw each class of employees. This is why the statute requires the use of peer groups by institutions. It would not be appropriate to test what we're paying a brand new English instructor at a small CTC against what WVU pays to recruit highly sought after full professors in STEM research projects.

Problem is that by using the average salary of each employee classification as one side of the RME calculation we are injecting a non-market force into the formula that is intended to measure the position of their pay structure into a market based pay structure.

*Let's assume for a moment that the Chancellors decide they no longer want to have to leave our building to get lunch every day so they create a HEPC cafeteria. At present, the Commission employs about 24 classified staff with a total payroll of just over \$1,000,000 for an "average salary of (that) employee classification" of about \$42,500/year. If the Chancellors create this cafeteria, however, we may then hire five (5) new classified employees onto the Commission's payroll but these jobs would come in at Job Grade 8 entry rates, or about \$18,500/year. When we roll these five new employees into the classified staff average salary at the Commission, the effect is to drop that average salary from \$42,500 down to less than \$38,500, more than a 10% change. **Whether the Commission (or any institution) has its own food service function has nothing to do with what the market says we should be paying our accountants, contract specialists or administrative assistants.** For that matter, whether we have a cafeteria should have even less to do with what we have to pay to recruit and to retain the many PhDs we have working at the Commission but—because RME ties the "average salary of each employee classification" to the average salaries of the other classifications—this is exactly what is going to happen. "*

Example Mark gave was:

i.e. 24 staff = one million
Average salary is 42,500

5 new classified employees at 18,500 year

Average then drops from 42,500 to 38,000

Moving non-classified back to classified – no data being maintained / tracked and that will affect our average salary for classified in the salary study.

Discussed how salary rule should address those non-classified that are moved back into classified positions and how they should remain at that salary (red-line) until their experience catches up with the salary for the pay grade.

Non-classified positions are to be policy making at the departmental level – departmental policy.

Discussion on seniority as it affects averages.

Question on paying on bell curve. Bell curve is based on duties & responsibilities. Classified should not see anything of this type based on how our system is. Classified are paid for duties & responsibilities. To pay on a bell curve, you would have to push down the duties & responsibilities or not adequately pay for duties & responsibilities.

In depth discussions on opening 18B in legislative session. No decision made due to lack of clear information to make an informative decision by the committee. Can Mark ensure us that Mercer can give us what we need before legislative session so that the group can discuss.

MERCER INFORMATION: Requested Mercer's charge, statement of work to be performed (outline), expected date of report, and copy of recommendations.

ACCE MEMBER INFORMATIONAL ITEMS: Unless an emergency at the institution, they can't deny an ACCE member travel as mandated in code. Includes travel time. Discussion on particulars.

Discussed the lack of quorum at meeting and how it impacts our effectiveness, our voice, important and timely decision making. Representatives need to decide what is important and consider stepping down if time doesn't permit attendance and allow someone else to assume the position if not able to do so. Each representative is representing 6,000 employees across the state. Meetings are established in July at the retreat, a year in advance for a reason. Understanding that some may have to miss an occasional meeting. But if you're missing the majority of the meetings, then you aren't making an impact. Meetings are alternated among campuses so that we each share in drive time and opportunities to visit each campus. Need to select a proxy when you can't attend as a proxy can vote except on an election.

Ken Harbaugh made a motion to change the meeting in Huntington from October 24th to October 22nd and vote to occur by email due to lack of quorum. Discussion: Interims begin Monday, October 21st and LOCEA meets with Higher Education for reports. A few ACCE members will need to be in Charleston to be at LOCEA on this day. Carrie Watters second motion. Amy will put this request on the list serve if all guests and accommodations can be rescheduled to the 22nd.

Discussed that next month might be a two-day meeting. Need to get information on the salary rule from Mark and where we're at. Many items to be outlined including the annual presentation to HEPC, CCTC and LOCEA.

Mark Toor has been charged in SB 330 with reviewing all CHRO's annually. He has asked the CHRO's to provide him with a list of the types of things they think they should be reviewed on. Each CHRO will have their own evaluation. By asking for information he will develop a tool to use for the evaluation since this has not occurred in the past. He has also asked ACF and ACCE to weigh in on the review list / evaluation. He

requests this information back as quickly as possible. Please be thinking on this and submit your ideas to Amy.

There being no further business to come before the members, meeting adjourned at 2:45 pm.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,
Carol Hurula, Secretary