

**WEST VIRGINIA STATE UNIVERSITY  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF JANUARY 27, 2011**

The Academic Policies Committee of the West Virginia State University Board of Governors met at 11:00 a.m. on Thursday, January 27, 2011, in the Cleveland Room of the Erickson Alumni Center on the University campus. Dr. John Thralls had been asked by Board of Governors Chair Eric Coleman to chair the Committee meeting. Other member attending was Dr. Thomas Guetzloff; Dr. Thomas Boston and new Board member (assigned to this Committee) Larry Rowe were absent. Others attending the meeting were Dr. John Teeuwissen, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs (representing Vice President for Academic Affairs Dr. R. Charles Byers); Dr. Barry Pelphrey, Director of Institutional Research & Effectiveness; and Mrs. Patricia Shafer, Office of Academic Affairs.

The only action item on the committee's agenda was consideration of the Year 2 Report of the Institutional Compact to present to the full Board for its approval. The Compact Report was initially presented to the Higher Education Policy Commission on November 1, 2010 (its due date) but WVSU was notified the Commission wished additional information and request for its approval was removed from the November Board of Governors meeting agenda. Dr. Thralls asked Dr. Teeuwissen whether or not we had any reason to think that the present Compact Report (which was submitted on January 15, 2011) will not be accepted. Dr. Teeuwissen responded that there was never any discussion of the substance of the report being unacceptable, it was all in the formatting. In a meeting at the HEPC Central Office attended by Dr. Bruce Flack, Dr. Kathy Butler, Dr. Pelphrey, and Dr. Teeuwissen, they indicated they seemed to want us to draw together the first and the second years rather than reporting only on the second year, as we had done. In November, 2009 when the Year 1 report was submitted, we reported on our accomplishments for that year only. With this second year, we followed the same format rather than making the report cumulative for the two years.

Dr. Teeuwissen noted that the Compact reports are to be approved by the Board of Governors but obtaining that approval prior to the submission date is sometimes problematic since the Board of Governors meeting schedule does not always follow HEPC-imposed due dates. Board Chair Eric Coleman, who joined the group for a brief time, asked the Committee to supply him with major due dates that are already known so the Board could consider scheduling its meetings to take required action prior to those dates. Dr. Teeuwissen noted that at the HEPC Meeting the preceding week, comment was made regarding several institutions needing to provide evidence of Board approval of their Compact reports. P. Shafer said that when the WVSU report was submitted on January 15, it was noted that it would be presented to the Board at the January 27 meeting and results of the Board action would be communicated to HEPC.

Dr. Thralls emphasized the seriousness with which the Legislature views these reports and that there is some discussion about them tying funding to performance. He then ask Dr. Teeuwissen whether or not there were other institutions that were asked to resubmit their reports and he said he did not know. However, he said the HEPC Chair urged the HEPC staff in the future to resolve all outstanding issues that prevented all Compact Reports from being presented at the same time; WVSU was the only institution whose report was not presented at the January 21 meeting.

Dr. Guetzloff observed that he did not receive his copy of the Year 2 Report in his Agenda packet so he has been unable to read it. He talked with Dean Katherine Harper and with Vice President of Academic Affairs R. Charles Byers who both told him it was a good report but he did not see it until he came to the meeting on January 27. During the meeting it was not known whether or not the other members of the Board received their copy of the report. (It was later determined that this was an isolated error; all other members received the Report in their agenda packet.) Dr. Guetzloff said if other members received their report and read it, he was comfortable with the action going forward and he would just abstain from the vote.

Dr. Pelphrey noted that added to the resubmitted report were the summary tables beginning on page 3 of the Compact Report which indicated the completion of each of the elements together with an assessment of the element's effectiveness. While that was very helpful, Dr. Thralls indicated, it was a bit difficult to keep flipping to the appropriate page where that element was discussed. This report was submitted to the HEPC in electronic format and each element item on the graph was a hyperlink that when clicked took the reader to that element in the Compact Report, and then back to the Effectiveness table. Dr. Pelphrey further noted that every element in the Table of Contents was a hyperlink in the electronic format to take the reader to discussion of that element within the document. Both of those benefits were lost on the printed copy of the report. Dr. Teeuwissen noted that information required of reports such as this is being collected and stored in the LiveText data management system so that it can be retrieved for reporting purposes not only for the Compact but also for the various other plans (strategic, institutional academic, Mission Statement, etc.) for University reporting.

Dr. Pelphrey elaborated that within the LiveText system we are coding each program outcome, course outcome, etc., so we will be able to meld all of these goals, plans, and aspirations into a set of outcomes that can be tracked to the University's Mission Statement, to the Compact, to the various Plans, etc. We are further assessing the student assignments in which these particular program and course outcomes are embedded to document how and where we are accomplishing what we assert we are doing.

Dr. Teeuwissen felt that presenting the Year 2 Compact report to the Board of Governors and receiving their approval may need some clarification. Is the Board approving the contents of the report, saying that the University has made strides in accomplishing its stated goals or are they approving that the report is well written? Dr. Thralls said he felt the process for the Compact is set and the Board is approving the content of the report, that is, whether or not the institution has articulated its accomplishment of the items on which it was to report. It was decided the Report would be presented to the full Board for Approval if others on the Board had received their copy.

An item presented for discussion in this Committee was a proposal related to calculation of cost data for Program Review Reports. Dr. Thralls said that in the last year Program Review documents had come to this Committee and they failed to include program cost data; that was deemed a serious omission. He observed that staff have been working to develop a plan to provide those data and are bringing to this Committee a proposal for discussion. To begin the discussion, Dr. Teeuwissen noted that formerly Program Review was done at the HEPC level but has since been turned over to the Boards of Governors with only reports of the Reviews in a prescribed format now going to the HEPC. Program Review costs are a state-wide concern and it is an agenda item for the WV Academic Affairs Advisory Council retreat in March, he said. In an inquiry with Mark Stotler at the HEPC in mid-2010, we asked if there was an HEPC-approved formula for calculating Program Review cost data and his response was that the formula was a "local option." Dr. Stotler further responded in an e-mail that "years ago when Program Review

was still at the state level, we utilized a cost program that turned out to be totally ineffective...I do not recommend resurrecting that formula." Dr. Pelphrey, Mrs. Shafer, and Dr. Teeuwissen developed formulas for consideration designed to provide useful information for making decisions regarding academic programs. The Academic Deans Council also reviewed the proposal.

The formulas presented for calculating instructional costs were to address the cost of the program for the majors as well as to recognize that in many departments significant service is provided University-wide to fulfill the general education curriculum. Staff thought the Committee members might be interested in the cost of the program for the graduate as well as interested in the cost for the majors. This was included because majors sometimes change as well as in some departments students take classes for additional teaching endorsements (but are not candidates for graduation) or to fulfill requirements for licensure exams (but are not candidates for graduation). In addition, in many departments there may be a lot more graduates in-stream than graduate at a particular time. The cost pool will contain the salaries and fringe benefits of the full-time and part-time faculty teaching courses required in the major and not those involved in teaching general education courses unless the general education course is part of the major. The second formula is to provide a cost per student credit hour produced and would be obtained by using the cost of the full-time and part-time faculty teaching all courses in the department divided by the student credit hours produced. This would then address the cost of those departments providing courses in the general education curriculum as well as courses that are taken by students in another major because courses in this department are cognates.

The second statistic would provide cost data for operational costs because there is more to providing an education than instructional costs. In consultation with Vice President for Finance Mr. Robert Parker he suggested using the federal grant indirect rate since it had been independently calculated for the University and to apply that indirect rate to the total cost of instruction calculated in the preceding section. The percentage to be used for instructional, on-campus classes would be 56.9%.

Assumptions proposed for these calculations include

- some programs may be more costly than others due to special external accreditation that place certain requirements on the Department;
- most of the costs in the indirect rate are non-controllable at the Departmental level;
- 2009-2010 (the last year of the five-year review period for the two programs under review this academic year) will be 2009-2010 rather than an average of the five years since in some years there were salary increases and in some there were not; also in some departments new hires had to be paid more to obtain them due to market conditions; they will reflect the most current costs going forward;
- some Departments may wish to present supplemental cost data as desired to highlight grants, research, indirect revenue brought to the institution, etc.

Dr. Thralls said his experience in dealing with indirect cost rate discussions have raised questions as to whether some institutions develop an indirect cost ratio in part to maximize the draw of federal funds and it may or may not be realistic in terms of what it really costs to support activities and programs. While we wish to evaluate the cost of providing programs above the instructional costs, we want the operational costs to be realistic. Dr. Pelphrey said we discussed that concern and determined we may need to evaluate whether the costs associated with those rates match what are our actual expenditures and if necessary adjust the rates to more realistically approximate actual costs. We also thought to use something that was

accepted by the federal government would be more defensible. He said likely scrutinizing whether or not the rate is too high (or too low) probably wouldn't come into play unless there was discussion of discontinuation of a program. Dr. Teeuwissen said that as long as the same ratio is used for all programs, it is a level playing field for allocation. But since this issue has come again state-wide, a guideline that all institutions use will be an equalizing factor as well as provide comparability of calculations among institutions.

Dr. Thralls said he was pleased with the proposal presented and suggested it be provided to the other members of this Committee and returned for discussion at the next meeting in March. It was decided we would employ these calculations for the two programs coming to this Committee for review in April but using them on this initial effort would not commit the University to retaining the calculations going forward should another calculation prove more beneficial for decision making. Dr. Teeuwissen suggested that in instituting the initial use of the cost data calculations that we should include similar data for other programs so we are able to establish whether or not the two programs under review this year are outliers or within expected parameters. Dr. Thralls suggested perhaps we should initially focus on cost data for programs currently under review so as not to open up more issues than can be realistically dealt with at the time of program review.

With the business of the Committee completed, the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Office of Academic Affairs