



## Meeting Minutes

**November 15, 2018**  
**Fairmont State University**  
**3rd Floor, Falcon Center Board Room**  
**9:00 a.m.**

### MEMBERS PRESENT

Verne Britton	West Virginia Network for Educational Telecomputing
Michael Caplinger	WVU-Parkersburg
Anita Davis	Pierpont Community and Technical College
Jane Fouty (Proxy)	BridgeValley Community and Technical College
Sheri Goff	Glenville State College
David Hays	West Virginia State University
Tim Melvin	Marshall University
Becky Miller	Fairmont State University
Amy Pitzer	Concord University
Jessica Porter	WVU – Institute of Technology
Dee Preston	Mountwest Community and Technical College
Shirley Robinson	West Virginia University
Barbara Sanders	West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine

### MEMBERS ABSENT

**(EXCUSED)** Jayne Angle – Shepherd University  
Darryl Clausell – West Virginia Northern Community College  
Chris Gray – Southern WV Community and Technical College  
Lisa Neel – Bluefield State College  
Scottie Samples – WVU – Potomac State College  
Kelly Taber – New River Community and Technical College  
Carrie Watters – West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission

**(UNEXCUSED)** Diane Blady – Blue Ridge Community and Technical College  
Tammy Ours – Eastern WV Comm. and Technical College  
Janene Seacrist – Comm. and Technical College System of WV  
Bob Wise – West Liberty University

### GUESTS

Amanda Hawkinberry	Pierpont Community & Technical College
Bob Long	Emeritus
Mirta Martin	President, Fairmont State University
Sherry Mitchell	Fairmont State University
Dennis Mitchell	Fairmont State University

**I. CALL TO ORDER & ESTABLISH QUORUM**

Amy Pitzer, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 am. Welcomed President Martin, and other guests to today's ACCE meeting.

**II. GREETINGS FROM MIRTA MARTIN, PRESIDENT OF FAIRMONT STATE UNIVERSITY**

President Martin welcomes ACCE to the campus in Fairmont. Classified staff are the unsung heroes for institutions and students. This year will be interesting for higher education.

- a. President Martin discussed her proposal of a "Recalibration of Funding Formula Model" to the Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC) intended to bring financial parity among institutions. The BRC recommendation will provide us time to have another year to explore, through evidence, a more equitable funding formula. The BRC Finance Sub-committee has submitted the Recalibration Model recommendation to Governor Jim Justice. The BRC hopes to secure a meeting with Governor to discuss the model.
- b. **Recalibration Funding Model** [see attached draft proposal *\$10,000,000 Additional Funds for Recalibration – Methodology*] – \$10 million from the current state surplus of \$350 million – would be one-time payment, distribution among the four-year institutions, based on Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) in-state students only. See table below:

RECOMMENDED \$10mil Allocated for Recalibration	Annualized 2017-2018 Year FTE (1)							Current Funding (18/19 Budget) (4)		Proposed Recalibration Allocation (5)		
	Non Dual Enroll (2)	Weighted* Dual Enroll (3)	Total FTE Weighted I/S	%	FTE Out-of-State	%	Weighted FTE Combined	Dollars	Per W/S FTE	Dollars	New Total	Per W/S FTE
	Glennville State College	927	22	949	82.0%	208	18.0%	1,157	\$ 5,885,700	\$ 6,201	\$ 40,000	\$ 5,925,700
Concord University	1,661	5	1,666	81.6%	377	18.4%	2,043	\$ 8,552,843	\$ 5,133	\$ 1,625,000	\$ 10,177,843	\$ 6,108
West Virginia State University	1,596	159	1,755	84.6%	320	15.4%	2,075	\$ 9,861,240	\$ 5,618	\$ 860,000	\$ 10,721,240	\$ 6,108
West Liberty University	1,433	14	1,447	64.3%	804	35.7%	2,251	\$ 7,823,727	\$ 5,406	\$ 1,015,000	\$ 8,838,727	\$ 6,108
Bluefield State College	1,004	4	1,008	85.0%	178	15.0%	1,186	\$ 5,600,993	\$ 5,559	\$ 553,000	\$ 6,153,993	\$ 6,108
Shepherd University	1,989	5	1,994	64.8%	1,081	35.2%	3,075	\$ 9,671,542	\$ 4,851	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 12,171,542	\$ 6,105
Fairmont State University	3,035	4	3,039	87.5%	436	12.5%	3,475	\$ 15,111,777	\$ 4,972	\$ 3,407,000	\$ 18,518,777	\$ 6,093
<b>Total Four-Year Institutions</b>	<b>11,645</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>11,859</b>	<b>77.7%</b>	<b>3,404</b>	<b>22.3%</b>	<b>15,263</b>	<b>\$ 62,507,822</b>	<b>\$ 5,271</b>	<b>\$ 10,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 72,507,822</b>	<b>\$ 6,114</b>

\* Dual Enrollment weighted at:

The four-year institutions listed above would receive additional funding from the \$10,000 million allocation, ranging from \$5,200 to \$6,200 per FTE student. Martin explained that the three exempt schools would not receive funds from the \$10 million, nor would Glennville State College, which is already funded at a higher FTE per student. All schools, except Glennville State College support the motion to send the recalibration model forward to the Governor.

- c. **Recalibration Fund Budget Distribution Timing.** The \$10 million comes from contingency funds of the Governor's Office, so the WV Legislature just has to confirm for the states' current fiscal year budget. Then, the \$10 million allocated to institutions rolls over into next year's state budget 2019-2020.

- d. President Martin encourages employees to provide feedback to the Blue Ribbon Commission to endorse Recalibration Funding model. In order for regional institutions to get funding, it is important to use the term “recalibration” to distinguish from the previous funding models (original model, 3 from HEPC, Gilbert Plan, and then BRC asked for their model). Recent article of WV higher education has lost 20% of percent of funding in the past few years.
- e. ***The \$10 million compared to 20% lost – does that make a dent? Can we have figures?*** Martin – Yes, it helps with deferred maintenance of building. FSU is second lowest funded institution in WV. The HEPC annual budget request also asks for \$10m in capital improvement funds. If approved, those funds will be allocated by the HEPC with health and safety issues taking priority. Institutions must provide matching funds
- f. ***At that point, do we or do not count out of state students for new recalibration formula or funding model?*** Martin - Recalibration is just to bring parity of FTE of in-state students. A new funding model for all students would be based on the evaluation on what makes each institutions unique, and then assign a weight to this uniqueness in a new funding formula.
- g. ***The HEPC already exists to work on funding models. Why was the Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC) created solely for political purposes? What does all this mean?*** Martin – Yes, you are correct. New to WV for past 11 months. Surprised how political this small state is. Legislators would say “not the right time politically” to examine finance variables and funding models for higher education. I come from the finance industry, numbers do not lie, but variables can be manipulated. The HEPC is a professional body of skillsets, data, much larger staff, but the reality is that the BRC was charged by Governor to do this work. Regional institutions must have representations at the table. What attributes does each institution bring to the state and students?
- h. ***When do the community colleges come into the picture when new funding models are discussed and proposed for higher education?*** Martin – During the very first meeting of the BRC, I proposed community college involvement and asked Governor Justice, but he declined. On the second meeting, I brought up the issue again, asked the Governor again, but he did not comment.
- Bob Long commended President Martin to request data to make evidence-based decisions. The WV state legislature refuses to make decisions based on data.
  - Martin – I am an objective, newcomer to this state. The challenge we have is being a divided state, not evidence-based model to fund institutions. Squeaky wheel gets the oil. WVU lobbying efforts has been successful for their university interests, but other institutions do not have the same resources to devote to state legislatures and representatives. If we do not act together now, then we lose opportunity to gain funding parity.
- i. Martin – In other countries, such as China, are diverting 10% overall GDP to educating their nations’ workforce. Comparatively, WV invests just 17% of state GDP; the United States invests 33% of GDP into higher education and workforce

training. By 2025, the overall workforce must reach at least 69% of 4-year graduates in order to meet industry and job requirements.

- j. Martin - Recently, Amazon chose Northern VA as the site for their new headquarters because the local area reports 80% graduation rate of 4-year degree programs. We are not exporting coal; we are exporting talent. How did they get so high a number? In Virginia, we shifted our method of reporting graduation rates. IPEDS requires graduation of first-time freshmen only, but the demographics has changed for college students, most have some college, take a break for work or family reasons, then continue their education later. Industry wants an educated workforce, not really looking for first-time freshmen data. In Virginia, we shifted graduation data of the state, no longer at 30% graduation of first-time freshman; instead, we promoted the number of 10,000 graduates per year from our institution. The trouble is that the Higher Learning Policy Commission is in limbo and unable to affect any changes to state reporting of graduates.
- k. ***Is there a separate funding proposal for deferred maintenance on institutional buildings and grounds?*** Martin – We need a rainy day funding model, one for performance, and another separate budget for building maintenance. Institutions would put forward a list of priorities, since it is a one-time budget item. Older institutions, such as Fairmont State University, are at a disadvantage because our facilities are on the National Registry of Historical Buildings, which makes it difficult for renovation and maintenance permits and raises costs.

Chair Amy Pitzer thanked President Martin for her candid discussion with ACCE representatives. The mission of ACCE has always been to advocate for better funding of higher education. Now, we understand that ACCE can contribute by supporting recalibration as the first step to gain funding parity when talking with the members of the WV Legislature.

### III. MINUTES (*Anita Davis*)

Review of October minutes. Discussion. Motion to approve minutes by Shirley Robinson, seconded by Barbara Sanders. Vote all in favor. Motion carried.

### IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS/DISCUSSION

#### a. Benefits

- PEIA plan coverage taskforce meets today.
- PEIA Taskforce will not make December deadline.
- There is no scheduled meeting for PEIA benefits full committee.
- Regular PEIA meeting in November is postponed until December.
- Governor Justice has said the \$100 million financing of PEIA will come from Governor's contingency funds, which does not require legislature approval. However, pulling this money will affect bonds, such as for construction of highways, which drives the cost rating for bonds.
- Recently, some employees have received mailings regarding a new weight loss plan. HR Benefits coordinators have not been notified of a new weight loss plan.

#### b. Legislative – No report at this time.

- c. **Web/Communications** –ACCE representatives’ photos uploaded to [www.wvacce.org](http://www.wvacce.org) website. Not necessary upload photos for each institution’s classified staff council members.
- d. **Student Advocacy** – No report at this time.
- e. **Retreat** – No report at this time.
- f. **Ad-hoc Bylaws Committee** – Postponed until after presentations.

Chair Amy Pitzer directed sub-committees to meet and have a report ready for ACCE’s December meeting.

## V. FINALIZING ANNUAL PRESENTATIONS

- a. Review and discussion of ACCE PowerPoint Presentation content for upcoming meetings of HEPC, CCTC, and LOCEA. Concerns and issues addressed towards HEPC, CCTCE and LOCEA groups, depending on the scope of responsibility. Is LOCEA actually reviewing policies of institutions?

Concerns/Issues	Targeted to
Blue Ribbon Commission – appropriate funding for public higher education, treating all institutions fairly, BRC-no constituency reps allowed	HEPC, CCTCE LOCEA
PEIA – Need permanent fix	LOCEA
Concerns with schools making ALL employees non-classified	HEPC, LOCEA
Concerns with institutions allowing ACCE to meet	LOCEA
Concerns with 26 separate entities with no direction and no accountability.	LOCEA
Blue Ribbon Commission – appropriate funding for public higher education, treating all institutions fairly, BRC-no constituency reps allowed	LOCEA
Appropriate level of authority of HEPC- subheading under BRC	HEPC, LOCEA
Retaining Advisory Councils in State Code	LOCEA

- b. Discussion of how institutions previously considered critical or essential employees versus the current debate on critical or essential positions.
- c. What do employees want or what they want to see from staff council at their institution. What about ACCE?
- d. ACCE provides open lines of informative communication to state-level representatives regarding the concerns and interests of higher education employees.
- e. HEPC must develop new guidelines on performance appraisal so everyone is treated the same. At some point, the grievance board will make an issue of having to be familiar with so many different policies on the same issue.
- f. Higher education is moving towards a performance-based evaluation system. However, institutions do not train supervisors, or provide inadequate training, on

how to conduct performance evaluations. No consistency of rating methods, no objectivity.

- g. Discussion of Gov. Jim Justice refusing the request of the BRC to involve community colleges.

**Executive Order No. X-18 by the Governor establishing the scope of work for the Blue Ribbon Commission:** <https://wvblueribbonhighered.org/about/executive-order>  
 ".....4. The Commission shall review, study and assess the current state of four-year higher education in the State, including but not limited to:

- a. The adequacy of current funding levels for four-year institutions of higher education;
- b. The current governance structure relating to four-year institutions of higher education;
- c. The role and value of the Higher Education Policy Commission;
- d. The identification of bureaucratic inefficiencies that cause a negative impact;
- e. Measures to be taken to facilitate the long-term viability of higher education delivery in communities across the State; and
- f. Anything else the Commission deems necessary to provide a thorough evaluation in preparation of its report."

- h. Discussion on WVU considering a Paid-Time-Off (PTO) structure for leave. PTO does not differentiate between sick and annual leave. Question on how a PTO leave structure will affect incumbent employee with loads of leave, previously grandfathered to allow accumulated sick leave for paying for insurance at time of retirement. Employees hired after July 1, 1988 could no longer use 100% their accumulated sick leave to pay for health coverage costs in retirement; reduced to 50%.

- i. After July 1, 2001, new hires of classified staff cannot accumulate any sick leave to pay for health insurance costs in retirement. Now, accumulated, or "banked" sick leave has no benefit unless you take it.

*[The follow information is from the PEIA website under Members – Non-Medicare Retirees-Eligibility – Extending Employer-Paid Insurance Upon Retirement:*

*Before July 1, 1988*

*If you are an employee who has been continuously covered by PEIA since before July 1, 1988, then your additional coverage is calculated as follows:*

- *2 days of accrued leave = 100% of the premium for one month of single coverage*
- *3 days of accrued leave = 100% of the premium for one month of family coverage.*

*Between July 1, 1988 and June 30, 2001*

*If you were hired after July 1, 1988 and before July 1, 2001, or if you had a lapse in coverage during this period then your additional coverage is calculated as follows:*

- *2 days of accrued leave = 50% of the premium for one month of single coverage*
- *3 days of accrued leave = 50% of the premium for one month of family coverage*

On or After July 1, 2001

If you were hired on or after July 1, 2001, or if you had a lapse in coverage during this period, you are not eligible for extended employer-paid insurance upon retirement.

**Extending Coverage for Higher Education Faculty**

If you are a full-time faculty member employed on an annual contract basis for a period other than 12 months, you may extend your employer-paid insurance coverage based on your years of teaching service. Your benefit is calculated as follows:

- 3 1/3 years of teaching service = 1 year of single coverage
- 5 years of teaching service = 1 year of family coverage

This benefit is not available to faculty hired on or after July 1, 2009.]

- j. Discussion on supporting Recalibration Methodology.
- 1.) No funds directed towards CTC, but will be planned for future funding model;
  - 2.) Will supporting this \$10 million be a reason for the state legislature to refuse any more funding for higher education;
  - 3.) Rare that 9 out of 10 institutions support Recalibration;
  - 4.) Opportunity for ACCE to support Recalibration, raise our profile;
  - 5.) Take the money while government is offering;
  - 6.) Next governor unknown until next election;
  - 7.) Anytime you see a legislative proposal three times, the more likely it will pass into state law. [Amy's Words of Wisdom]
- k. Motion to endorse recalibration model and ACCE formal statement by David Hays, seconded by Becky Miller.
- "In order to encourage parity per FTE, ACCE endorses the adoption of the recalibration methodology and formula, as a first step to a more extensive performance based funding model."*
- Voting all in favor. Motion carried.
- l. Discussion on CTC funding addressed in a future funding model.
- "Once recalibration is implemented for the 4-year institutions, ACCE strongly recommends the inclusion of the Community and Technical Colleges in an overall, permanent funding formula."*
- Motion to add the above statement in support of community colleges into future funding models by Jane Fouty, seconded by Dee Preston. Voting all in favor. Motion carried.

**VI. §18B-6-5 REVISIONS FOR CONSIDERATION**

Motion to discuss, review, and replace revisions via email by Becky Miller, seconded by Dee Preston. Voting all agreed. Motion carried.

**VII. SURVEY OF EMPLOYEES**

Bob - Ask employees what they want? Try to get input from our constituents, both classified and non-classified staff. What are the priorities? What would you like us to do? Try to give us 1-3 items, and prioritized. This input may affect ACCE constitution and bylaws. If things

in the past are not a priority, then remove from ACCE. Brainstorming ideas, the more input we get, the more effective we will be for employees.

Tim – Any employee survey should have consistent questions and ratings throughout all institutions. Conduct survey through Qualtrics. ACCE will make an official report of survey results.

David motion to recommend questions over ACCE email list-serve next couple of weeks by David Hays, seconded by Tim Melvin. Discussion at the campus-level that this is our intent, see if there are any objectives to proceed with a survey for classified and non-classified staff. Tim – IRB approval? Deadline for submitting questions by November 30. Voting all in favor. Motion carried.

## VIII. CAMPUS CONCERNS

### Shirley - What has ACCE done for WVU?

- David – any accomplishments by ACCE is for all of higher education, not just for one institution.
- Bob – ACCE has advocated for the entire system of higher education, for example, attempts to stop SB 439 that removed bumping rights and what little benefits classified staff has left. Remember, WVU switched people to Mountaineer Temps Before SB 439, lawsuits and grievances against WVU, concerning bumping rights, won by employees. ACCE advocacy benefits WVU and Marshall significantly, because these two institutions have the most employees affected; seniority rights, etc.
- Bob – When the first salary increase increment approved for state employees [2001 Legislative Session, Senate Bill 703, Increased Increment Pay From \$35 To \$50], ACCE advocated for classified staff to be included, since other higher education employees are governed under a different state code. Legislators reassured ACCE that classified staff employees were already covered and would receive the same increase as other higher education employees, however, this proved not to be the case. The state legislature refused paying the salary increase to classified staff, but proceeded to pay increases to non-classified employees. Classified staff lost a year of increment pay due to legislators not taking action on the state code issue identified earlier by ACCE in an attempt to resolve. [2006 Legislative Session, Senate BILL 587, Faculty Receives Increment Pay Passed in the 2001 Legislative Session]
- Bob - ACCE advocates for all higher education employees, pro-bono, and use our own time. We do not have professional lobbyists or resources to influence legislators and representatives. We try to protect all classified employees. WVU employees should ask their administration what they have done for us. Remember, the last salary schedule for classified employees, WVU was the last institution to fund minimum pay rates and still paying employees 75 cents on the dollar.  
*[When the 2001 salary schedule was last updated, it was discovered that WVU was not paying employees at the zero step. They were paying a significant number of employees below the minimum in state code. WVU was paying higher wages to Mountaineer Temp employees than their own WVU employees. ACCE advocated strongly on behalf of WVU classified employees to be brought up to the zero step. Even WVU's own staff council chair at the time and ACCE rep at the time sided with WVU. WVU responded with a lawsuit which went all the way to the state supreme court and resulted in WVU creating their own salary*

*schedule which appeared to be more favorable to employees on the surface, but did little to help employees with future increases. ACCE again responded which contributed to WVU's most recent salary plan being enacted by their governing board and recent increases by WVU to move employees toward market compensation. WVU has since responded by using their exemption to do their own thing with compensation of employees.]*

**Discussion of Campus Carry.** ACCE advocated against Campus Carry. The HEPC sent letters to legislative leadership against campus carry but did little in the way of lobbying legislators during the session. ACCE strongly advocated against guns on campus.

#### **IX. UPCOMING MEETINGS**

WV Higher Education Policy Commission (HEPC) Meeting – ACCE Presentation,  
November 16, 9:00 a.m., WV Regional Tech Park, South Charleston

WV ACCE Meeting – December 12, 9:00 a.m., Marshal University Graduate College (MUGC),  
WV Regional Tech Park, South Charleston

WV Council for Community and Technical College Education (CCTCE) Meeting –  
ACCE Presentation, December 13, 9:30 a.m., Embassy Suites, Charleston

#### **X. ADJOURN**

Motion to adjourn made by Anita Davis, seconded by Becky Miller. Voting all in favor.  
Motion carried. Meeting adjourned.