

## MINUTES

### WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY REVITALIZATION COMMITTEE

September 20, 2012

**1. Call to Order**

Chairman David Hendrickson convened a meeting of the West Virginia University Institute of Technology Revitalization Committee at 1:30 PM on the campus of West Virginia University Institute of Technology in the Tech Center Ballroom, 405 Fayette Pike, Montgomery, West Virginia and by conference call. The following Committee members were present: George "Matt" Edwards, Robert Griffith, David Hendrickson, Paul Hill, Bill Hutchens, Carolyn Long, Dorothy Phillips, Ed Robinson, Garth Thomas, and Bruce Walker. Absent: John Estep.

**2. Approval of July 17 Minutes**

Mr. Edwards moved approval of the minutes from the July 17, 2012 meeting. Mr. Robinson seconded the motion. Motion passed.

**3. Welcome by Chairman David Hendrickson**

Chairman Hendrickson welcomed the Committee members and the campus community. Chairman Hendrickson highlighted the importance of focusing on the needs of the students, which are central to the work of the Committee and the institution. Although the work of the Committee is on-going, Chairman Hendrickson noted that tremendous strides have been made across campus. He thanked the faculty, staff, and students for their on-going support.

**4. Subcommittee Activity**

**a. Overview of Recent Activity by Academics Subcommittee Chair Robert Griffith**

Academics Subcommittee Chair Robert Griffith reported on recent activity including the on-going program reviews, the Mountain State University teach-out plan partnership, and collaboration with Bridgmont Community and Technical College.

Chairman Hendrickson indicated that a number of students from Mountain State University may be interested in taking online courses from the institution. He inquired regarding the current number of students enrolled in online courses. Campus Executive Officer Carolyn Long noted that enrollment was less than 100 students. Chairman Hendrickson strongly

encouraged the institution to find ways to expand online offerings. He noted that online education was a strong area of growth for the institution and the state's higher education system.

Chancellor Hill asked for an update regarding the transfer of any Mountain State University students. Dr. Stephen Brown, Dean of the College of Business, Humanities, and Social Sciences, indicated that there has been a smooth transition of students from Mountain State University to West Virginia University Institute of Technology including the entire forensic investigation program.

**b. Overview of Additional Review/Study Areas by Facilities Subcommittee Chair Ed Robinson**

Facilities Subcommittee Chair Ed Robinson asked current students to stand and be recognized for their work. He applauded the Committee members and the institution for making investments in students through expanded services including wi-fi, microfridges, and free laundry. In addition, Mr. Robinson noted that the Student Success Center will be renovated and operational by November 1.

Mr. Robinson discussed the status and operation of Ratliff Residence Hall and Hi-Rise Residence Hall. He indicated that both facilities need significant investments in order to maximize the use of space for modern student amenities and services. He noted that investments have already been made to Ratliff Residence Hall in order to partially update the facilities, but that significant investments still needed to be secured. Regarding Hi-Rise, he noted that the building is structurally sound and can be renovated floor by floor as needs are identified and funding becomes available.

Dr. Griffith moved approval of the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the West Virginia University Institute of Technology Revitalization Committee approves maintaining Hi-Rise Residence Hall in its current state pending further review and study.

Mr. Thomas seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

**c. Overview of Purpose and Scope by Efficiencies Subcommittee Chair Marcia Bastian**

Efficiencies Subcommittee Chair Marcia Bastian reported that collaborations with Bridgemont Community and Technical College and the City of Montgomery are being examined. Benchmarks for faculty/student ratios and staffing levels will also be examined. Dr. Bastian noted that the work is on-going and the Subcommittee's findings and/or

recommendations will be included in the Committee's final report.

## **5. Comprehensive Update by Campus Executive Officer Carolyn Long**

Campus Executive Officer Long thanked everyone in the audience for participating in today's meeting. She presented a comprehensive update based on activity since the creation of the Revitalization Committee in early 2012. She began the update by discussing the recent on-site visit from the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). She thanked the faculty and staff for participating in the meetings and providing feedback. Ms. Long noted that the HLC report should be available in late November.

During her presentation, Campus Executive Officer Long noted that much progress related to academics, facilities, and efficiencies has occurred. She highlighted the institution's on-going academic program review, participation in the Mountain State University teach out plan, revisions to freshman orientation, and creation of the Student Success Center. She also highlighted many student-centered activities including: the addition of intramurals, new schedule for the Bears Dean, a student-designed class ring, and the soccer team's undefeated season.

Campus Executive Officer Long stated that finance changes have occurred including the creation of budgets with monthly reporting requirements, which accurately reflect institutional and departmental spending. Ms. Long reported that the institution is more financially responsible and, as a result, more financially stable.

A community member in the audience inquired about funding in the budget for facilities. Ms. Long responded that facilities will be maintained and issues will be addressed. She pledges that the institution will not go backwards in terms of progress that has already been made.

Chairman Hendrickson applauded the work of Campus Executive Officer Long and the progress that has been made. Chairman Hendrickson pledged the Commission's continued support to maintain current facilities. He announced that he has successfully secured half of the funding needed to paint the David Long Alumni Center. He indicated that he believes he has raised the remainder of the funding as well, but that is pending confirmation from a potential donor.

## **6. Final Survey Report by Chancellor Paul Hill**

Chancellor Paul Hill reported that, due to concerns that community members were unaware of the survey, advertisements were placed in the Montgomery-Herald throughout the month of June. These advertisements generated 13 additional responses for a total of 99 responses. He highlighted several areas of strength including: qualified faculty and staff; dedicated alumni; small campus/class sizes; and strong academic programs, especially engineering. He

also highlighted several areas of improvement including: upgrading technology; increasing library resources; increasing student activities and service; making campus improvements (beautification); updating campus infrastructure (physical plant, student housing, classroom buildings, roads/sidewalks, etc.); increasing communication among campus (departments, administrators, faculty, staff, etc.); and increasing collaboration with local schools.

Chancellor Hill noted that the institution must find a way to harness the commitment, pride, compassion, and creativity evident in the thoughtful survey responses in order to build a brighter future for the institution.

## **7. Next Steps**

Chancellor Hill noted that recommendations and/or findings from the Committee will be included in a report. He noted that the report will be finalized prior to the December 7 Commission meeting. Ms. Phillips inquired regarding who would compose the report. Chancellor Hill responded that Commission staff will compose the report pending an opportunity for full Committee review.

Chancellor Hill asked Senator Laird if he would like to address the Committee and those in attendance. Senator Laird thanked Chancellor Hill for the opportunity to speak and the Committee for their work. He provided several general observations including the importance of speaking with one voice in regards to institutional needs and requests.

Ms. Phillips requested to address the Committee and those in attendance. Her complete remarks are included as an appendix to the minutes. As a result of Ms. Phillips remarks and subsequent Committee discussion, Chancellor Hill charged legal staff to examine the process and requirements outlined in Senate Bill 486. He also charged Mr. Robinson to reconvene the Facilities Subcommittee to reconsider the \$7.8 million request for facilities.

## **8. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

\_\_\_\_\_  
David K. Hendrickson

Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert Griffith

Academics Subcommittee Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ed Robinson

Facilities Subcommittee Chair

**APPENDIX TO THE MINUTES  
SUBMISSIONS FROM MS. DOROTHY PHILLIPS**

**WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
REVITALIZATION COMMITTEE**

**September 20, 2012**

I wish that I could stand before you today and declare that I feel comfortable with how the Tech Revitalization Committee, of which I am a member, is handling the revitalization of Tech and its physical facilities. However, I cannot.

As a concerned individual and a representative for the community and many Tech alumni and present and past Tech employees, I must lay out for you in some detail the way the Tech Revitalization Plan is being ignored in this revitalization process.

In truth, the WVU Sightlines Report which deals with facilities upgrades only is being substituted for the Tech Revitalization Plan which deals with revitalization of all aspects of the campus. The amount of money that the Tech Revitalization Committee has approved to be requested from the Legislature for the Tech Revitalization Plan has been based entirely upon WVU's Sightlines Report (Sightlines). Essentially, the Tech Revitalization Committee is being used to implement WVU's Sightlines Report rather than the legislatively mandated Tech Revitalization Plan which is supported by Senate Bill 486.

The Tech Revitalization Plan presents recommendations to revitalize Tech's academic programs and its physical plant at an estimated cost of \$35-37 million over a period of several years, about 50% of the \$71 million Sightlines suggests — and this Sightlines figure does not include expenses for any of the essential academic revitalization needs of this school.

A collection of buildings does not make an institution of higher learning.

The Tech Revitalization Plan was the outcome of a study mandated by the West Virginia State Legislature, and it is the only plan authorized and supported by Senate Bill 486. Yet actions of the Tech Revitalization Committee so far have been driven by the Sightlines plan (commissioned by WVU), not by the Tech Revitalization Plan. The WVU system is essentially ignoring the Tech Revitalization Plan.

The May 2, 2012, meeting of the Tech Revitalization Committee provides a good example of the way the Tech Revitalization Plan is being ignored and Sightlines is being implemented instead. In this meeting, WVUIT's director of facilities presented a document listing particular projects and the funds needed for these projects. All of us voted to request funding totaling \$7,832,000. I assumed — and possibly others did too — that the facilities upgrades voted upon were those recommended in Tech Revitalization Plan.

But I was wrong.

When I researched these facilities upgrades we'd requested funding for, I discovered that they'd been taken directly from WVU's Sightlines, not from the Tech Revitalization Plan. In a few instances, the Tech Revitalization Plan and Sightlines objectives coincide, such as roof replacement for Orndorff Hall and upgrade of the HVAC system in Ratliff Hall, as shown in the handout, but the Sightlines plan has nothing to do with Senate Bill 486, and has not been approved by the Legislature.

Because of my concerns about the way the Committee is handling the Tech revitalization process, on July 10, 2012, I sent Chancellor Paul Hill an e-mail stating those concerns. As chancellor of the Higher Education Policy Commission, Dr. Hill is in charge of the revitalization plan for Tech. This e-mail was copied to every member of the Tech Revitalization Committee. As of today, I have received no official, written response related to that e-mail sent more than two months ago.

In addition, I sought feedback from a man who has extensive experience leading universities and working with legislatures, Dr. Constantine Curris. Dr. Curris served as Tech's Vice President and Dean of Faculty from 1971-73 under former President Leonard C. Nelson, has served as president at three other universities (combined time: 26 years), and is Chair of the Murray State University Board of Regents.

Dr. Curris served as chair of the Tech Revitalization Team.

On July 18 I sent Dr. Curris the documents that I had e-mailed to Chancellor Hill and members of the Committee. Dr. Curris responded the same day. Here is what he said in response to my concerns:

"I am not surprised that the focus is on the Sightlines report. The folks in Morgantown 'own' it and they questioned our priorities. Our focus was on what improvements were needed to insure that a revitalization plan would succeed. Sightlines was not so focused. Sightlines called for \$70 million — as I recall — in physical plant improvements, about double from what we recommended. Candidly, the important concern is the need for a major infusion of resources, and which plan they follow, it seems to me, is secondary.

"Of course, if the decision is to follow Sightlines, the community should hold decision makers fully accountable to fund the full program.

"It seems to me that you and the Save Tech committee should take great satisfaction in what your long and arduous labors have achieved. From my vantage point the key individual to insure that revitalization is fully implemented is the new Provost. I believe her name is Carolyn Williams (sic), but I don't have that info at hand. Hopefully she will drive the agenda forward. Given her background, I believe the folks in Morgantown will back her recommendations.

"Good Luck! Deno"

When Dr. Curris says, “Of course, if the decision is to follow Sightlines, the community should hold decision makers fully accountable to fund the full program,” I interpret that to mean that if WVU makes the decision to follow Sightlines, it is also putting itself into the position of fully funding the changes specified under that program.

Now, you may ask “Beyond who pays the bills, what difference does it make whether revitalization of Tech goes forward under the Revitalization Project for West Virginia University Institute of Technology Team Report or under the Sightlines Report requested by WVU independently of the Legislature’s and WVHEPC’s sponsorship.”

According to the Revitalization Plan, one of the main concerns that the Team had about the Sightlines report is (I quote) “There were no architectural/engineering firms or technical designers used by Sightlines in developing the WVU Tech report. The experience and knowledge of the campus facilities group is critical to the information in the Sightline report but architects and engineers should drive the facilities examination and proper estimations.”

The term “estimations” refers to financial estimations for the purposed projects on the campus.

I’ve already mentioned that the Sightlines plan does not include academics. But more than that, it was not sponsored by HEPC and the Legislature. Somebody in an office at WVU requested it.

The Tech Revitalization Plan is different. It was a product of the work and thought of a lot of people who care about Tech and higher education, not just the facilities.

Former Chancellor Noland was gracious and understanding enough to find monies to finance this revitalization project for Tech through HEPC.

The Legislature was concerned and gracious enough to work diligently for the creation/passage of SB486, revitalization project on the Montgomery campus.

The Team, headed by Dr. Curris, was concerned and gracious enough to work diligently in its endeavors for the revitalization of the Tech campus per SB486.

Since it well appears that Tech will be relying upon the generosity of the Legislature to finance a large portion of these expenses, we, the Tech Revitalization Committee, should make every effort to acknowledge and honor the Legislature’s intent for Senate Bill 486 as presented through the Revitalization Project for West Virginia University Institute of Technology Team Report.

As a member of Take Back Tech and as a representative for the community and a large segment of the Tech alumni, I have watched the association between the WVU/Tech administrative infrastructure and the Legislature for almost seven years.

That association between the two has been complicated and hindered by the decision-making bodies' lack of adherence to the mandates of legislative bills. For example, House Bill 4690 mandated creation of a plan through which the WVU Board of Governors would address support of engineering, increases of faculty salaries, and renovations for the Tech campus — things necessary to ensure the longevity of the institution.

But instead of a plan as mandated in HB4690, the WVU Board of Governors and the decision-making bodies for this institution tried to submit the transitional plan for converting Tech from the regional to divisional governance under WVU, completely bypassing the spirit and the letter of HB4690.

Take Back Tech, financed through Tech alumni, was forced to take WVU Board of Governors to court to obtain the mandated plan. Judge Irene Berger ruled in our favor and ordered that WVU reimburse the plaintiffs for all legal fees. But even then, the plan submitted by WVU in response to the verdict did not address the things it was supposed to address — it was an intentional evasion of the provisions of HB4690.

Today, Tech has been given another opportunity for advancement through the Tech Revitalization Plan as set forth in Senate Bill 486. Will this plan result in another lost opportunity for the campus?

I myself cannot fully understand why the decision-making bodies for this institution continue endeavors to sidetrack or even bypass the clear intent and the specific mandates of those legislators who have so diligently worked for improvements on the Tech campus.

Tech cannot afford to take many more twists and turns. We know full well that we must all work together for the future of this campus.

The community has tried and continues trying.

Tech alumni have tried and continue trying.

Multiple former and present Tech employees — including several former presidents — have tried and continue trying.

The Legislature has tried and continues trying.

Now, it's WVU's turn. WVU must give Chancellor Hill the leverage and support to move Tech forward through this revitalization plan in accordance and in compliance with Senate Bill 486.

Anything less than that is unacceptable and will be unacceptable.

**Projects/Expenditures approved by the  
Tech Revitalization Committee  
Total, \$7,832,000**

Total amount for projects listed in both the Tech Revitalization Plan per SB486 and Sightlines*	<b>\$2,359,000</b>
Total amounts for projects listed only in Sightlines	<b>\$5,473,000</b>

**❖ ALL OF THESE PROJECTS/EXPENDITURES WERE TAKEN FROM THE SIGHTLINES REPORT**

<b>Building</b>	<b>Deferred Maintenance Project Title</b>	<b>Project Cost</b>
-----------------	---	---------------------

**The following projects were included only in the Sightlines Report**

Baisi Center	Install Sprinkler System (includes asbestos abatement)**	\$1,043,000
Baisi Center	Upgrades to Fire Alarm System**	\$435,000
Baisi Center	Replace boilers and separate domestic Hot water and pool heater – place on separate boilers**	\$350,000
Ratliff Hall	Install Sprinkler System (includes asbestos abatement) and upgrade fire alarm system; accessibility improvements**	\$789,000
Ratliff Hall	Upgrade Main Electrical System**	\$500,000
Ratliff Hall	Replace Roof**	\$140,000
Ratliff Hall	Replace exterior windows, doors Gutters and leaders**	\$440,000
Ratliff Hall	Install new elevator**	\$350,000
Ratliff Hall	Update/renovate interior Restrooms/showers**	\$768,000
Ratliff Hall	Renovate interior, resident rooms, Floors, walls, etc.**	\$658,000
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>\$5,473,000</b>

**Projects/Expenditures approved by the Tech Revitalization Committee  
Total, \$7,832,000, Page 2**

**The following projects were included in both the Tech Revitalization Plan per SB486 and in the Sightlines Report\***

Ratliff Hall	Upgrade HVAC System*	\$886,000
Orndorff Hall	HVAC System & Control upgrades*	\$650,000
Orndorff Hall	Roof Replacement*	\$175,000
Engineering Classroom Bldg.	Replace 2 elevators*	\$300,000
Engineering Classroom Bldg.	HVAC*	\$348,000
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$2,359,000</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b><u>\$7,832,000</u></b>

\*Duplicate of recommendations as set forth in the Tech Revitalization Plan per Senate Bill 486 for Year One. The expenses for recommended projects in the Tech Revitalization Plan were approved because the expenses coincided with those presented and approved through the Sightlines project/expenditure listings.

\*\* Recommendations that were NOT set forth in the Tech Revitalization Plan per Senate Bill 486 for Year One

**PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR YEAR ONE THROUGH THE TECH REVITALIZATION PLAN, BUT NOT ADDRESSED BY THE TECH REVITALIZATION COMMITTEE**

- Immediately start a full design build renovation for Orndorff
- Re-commission/Retro-commission the HVAC system for Vining Library to reduce energy cost, provide better occupant comfort and minimize the maintenance
- Complete aesthetic upgrades to the Vining Library
- Immediately make a determination if Co-Ed Hall is to be razed or renovated
  - Immediately following the October 2011 LOCEA meeting, WVU made the decision to raze Co-Ed during the summer of 2012. However, the Revitalization Team had recommended to “start the design build renovation or demolition/design-build replacement of Co-Ed” during Year Two.