

**Commission on Faculty Affairs
Commission on Graduate and Professional Studies and Policies
Commission on Research**

**RESOLUTION TO FORM A UNIVERSITY MISSION INITIATIVE COMMITTEE TO
RECOMMEND UPDATED POLICIES FOR FUNDING DOCTORAL RESEARCH AT
VIRGINIA TECH**

UC 2024-25A

First Reading by Commission of Faculty Affairs	October 18, 2024
Approval by Commission on Faculty Affairs	November 1, 2024
First Reading by Faculty Senate	October 25, 2024
Approval by Faculty Senate	November 8, 2024
Staff Senate Comment	November 11, 2024
Administrative and Professional Faculty Senate Comment	October 30, 2024
Graduate and Professional Student Senate Comment	October 27, 2024
Undergraduate Student Senate Comment	None Received
First Reading, University Council	Date
Approved, University Council	Date
Approved, President	Date
Effective Date	Upon Approval

WHEREAS, engagement in research is a core element of the tripartite mission of Virginia Tech; and

WHEREAS, in the pursuit of global distinction, an opportunity exists to elevate and transform the operations at the university related to increasing graduate student enrollment; investigating changes to funding policies related to graduate students; studying how faculty allocate extramural funding to graduate trainees and research faculty; and establishing a new vision for the role that research plays in the training of graduate students; and

WHEREAS, policies must be examined and funding strategies need to be developed to ensure continued financial support for current graduate students and increased to provide for increased enrollment; and

WHEREAS, faculty and graduate students have unique and essential roles in conducting research and disseminating its outcomes as part of doctoral training; and

WHEREAS, the quality of research conducted at the university is central to future success in all domains of activity in which faculty and graduate students participate and in the future careers of graduate trainees; and

WHEREAS, the University Council Constitution, Article II, defines that the goals of the university include “provid[ing] an environment conducive to the pursuit of learning, teaching, scholarship, research, and service;”

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that under the provisions of the University Council Constitution, Article XII and its associated bylaws, the Provost and the Faculty Senate President shall sponsor, in accordance with the Guidelines for the Creation of Work Groups, Task Forces, and other ad hoc Committees,¹ and with the advice of all constituent groups, a University Mission Initiative Committee tasked with developing recommendations to enhance the research enterprise of the university via increased doctoral student training and revisions to policies and practices associated with funding graduate trainee research activities. The University Council Cabinet and the co-sponsors shall choose the chair of the Committee, outline the charge of the Committee, and empanel its members according to the University Council Bylaws; and

THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the function of this University Mission Initiative Committee is to provide evidence-based recommendations for elevating research and research-related activities at the university. In formulating the Committee’s charge, the University Council Cabinet and the co-sponsors should consider a broad goal of increasing enrollment of doctoral students, and related topics including revisions to policies and procedures to encourage expanding the number of graduate research assistantships; studying the use of teaching assistantships; supporting fellowship applications by graduate students; assessing expenditures of extramural funding attained by faculty, particularly in the balance between training graduate students and employing postdoctoral associates and other research faculty; the potential need for hiring additional instructional faculty to reduce graduate student teaching demands and account for increased enrollment; and any other such topics that it deems relevant to its charge. Specific recommendations related to financial impacts to the university will be central to the report produced by the University Mission Initiative Committee. The chair of the University Mission Initiative Committee shall submit budget projections related to graduate student compensation, graduate candidacy status, and extramural funding levels that are relevant to the FY2026 budget to the University Council Cabinet by the conclusion of the spring semester of 2025, and additional policy recommendations by the conclusion of the fall semester of 2025.

¹ <https://policies.vt.edu/assets/Guidelines-for-Creation-of-Work-Groups-and-Other-ad-hoc-Committees.pdf>



Renee J. LeClair, Ph.D., M.A.E.d., Chair, Commission on Graduate and Professional Studies and Policies

October 17th, 2024

Memorandum: Letter of Support for UMI 2024-25

Dear Members of the Commission on Faculty Affairs,

As Chair of the Commission on Graduate and Professional Studies and Policies (CGPSP), I am writing to express our support for the draft **Resolution to Form a University Mission Initiative Committee to Recommend Updated Policies for Funding Graduate Research at Virginia Tech** (UMI 2024-25).

This resolution is crucial to advancing the university's mission and ensuring resources for graduate research and education are explored as part of the Global Distinction initiative. The establishment of this University Mission Initiative Committee represents an important step toward ensuring that our policies are aligned with the evolving demands of research and graduate education.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter. I look forward to seeing the progress and outcomes from this initiative, which will undoubtedly strengthen Virginia Tech's commitment to research excellence.

On behalf of the CGPSP,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'R. LeClair', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Renée LeClair, Ph.D. M.A.Ed. (her/she), Associate Professor

Department of Basic Science Education

Virginia Tech Carilion School of Medicine

1 Riverside Circle, Office 241

Roanoke, VA 24016

Office: 540-526-2607

Cell: 207-730-0546

rlclair@vt.edu

November 18, 2024

Memorandum: Letter of Support for UMI 2024-25

To: Vice President of Policy and Governance

From: Commission on Research

As Chair of the Commission on Research (COR), I am writing to express our support for the draft Resolution to Form a University Mission Initiative Committee to Recommend Updated Policies for Funding Graduate Research at Virginia Tech (UMI 2024-25).

This resolution addresses a critical issue for the university's research mission and the pursuit of the Global Distinction priority. Expanding graduate training, especially doctoral research, is important to expanding the impact of our research programs and raising the global prominence of the excellence of our scholarly efforts.

The COR is grateful for Justin Lemkul's time in discussing the resolution at our meeting on November 14. During that conversation, the commission recognized the complexity of the goals of the UMI and the need to focus the scope of the committee's work. In that spirit, the COR had a few areas where additional clarity is recommended in establishing the UMI committee's specific charge:

- The resolution refers to research faculty as a monolithic body; we recommend specifically calling out "postdoctoral scholars" or "postdocs" everywhere research faculty are listed. Postdocs fill a unique position in the training of future independent scholars, and they have very different requirements and considerations from other categories of research faculty. For example, the phrase "postdocs and other research faculty" could be used to replace the phrase "research faculty."
- The charge should specifically identify the goal of the UMI, while also identifying the various areas that should be studied to meet that goal. If the primary goal is to increase the total number of graduate students or specifically the number of Ph.D. students, that should be stated explicitly.
- Because the resolution explores how faculty choose to fund graduate students, postdocs, and research faculty on sponsored programs, we recommend ensuring the perspectives of research faculty – particularly postdocs – are represented on the committee.
- We suggest the charge to the committee provide clarity on the meaning of "assessing demands on extramural funding attained by faculty, particularly in the balance between training graduate students and employing research faculty." It is not clear what is meant

by "demands". Further, we believe faculty's sponsored program budget decisions should not be framed as a zero-sum, adversarial consideration between graduate students and postdocs. Both groups are essential to our burgeoning research enterprise.

Signed:



Nicole Pitterson, PhD.,
Associate Professor,
Assistant Department Head for Undergraduate Programs
Department of Engineering Education, Virginia Tech
email: pitterson@vt.edu
cell: 432-788-7097

Comment on UC 2024-25A:

The Graduate and Professional Student Senate requests some additional clarifications regarding UC 2024-25A RESOLUTION TO FORM A UNIVERSITY MISSION INITIATIVE COMMITTEE TO RECOMMEND UPDATED POLICIES FOR FUNDING DOCTORAL RESEARCH AT VIRGINIA TECH.

- I. The current language of the resolution mentions that *“policies must be examined and funding strategies need to be developed to ensure continued financial support for current graduate students and increased to provide for increased enrollment;”* but does not provide any context to how this conclusion was reached. Including specific data as evidence, what is the specific problem this resolution seeks to address, and what circumstances prevented the university from acting on them till now?
- II. One of the clauses in the resolution mentions, *“WHEREAS, policies must be examined ... to ensure continued financial support for current graduate students and increased to provide for increased enrollment”*, while the resolution itself states that, *“THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the function of this University Mission Initiative Committee is to provide evidence-based recommendations for elevating research and research-related activities at the university, including increasing enrollment of doctoral students ...”*. It sounds like the recommendation for increased enrollment has already been made, and the committee is being formed around the assumption that enrollment will be increased, and the proposed committee will find a way to financially justify it. This raises the following questions:
 - a. Why is the assumption already made before the introduction of the resolution?
 - b. What other alternatives were considered and/or attempted for resolving the underlying issue prior to introducing this proposal? Why were those rejected/why did they fail? If none, what are some such alternatives?
 - c. Does this also imply that the current living/working/earning standards of existing graduate students is deemed “acceptable” to the university to an extent that it can be expanded to more students?
- III. The resolution also mentions, *“encourag[ing] expanding the number of graduate research assistantships; ... assessing demands on extramural funding attained by faculty”*, which raises additional questions:
 - a. How would the recommendations work when there is no language supporting an increase in getting extramural funding on the faculty’s behalf?
 - b. Does an increase in graduate students (with or without assistantships) mean that the university will freeze its plans on increasing student wage to numbers deemed “livable” for the Blacksburg (or the respective campus) area?

- c. Given there is no language that indicates a demand for increasing the extramural funding attained by faculty, how can the same amount support more students – does that translate to increasing tuition for those without an assistantship or an increase in comprehensive fees (which is already higher than that of other institutions) paid by students?
- IV. The language of the resolution, “encourage expanding the number of graduate research assistantships; studying the use of teaching assistantships; ... the potential need for hiring additional instructional faculty to reduce graduate student teaching demands and account for increased enrollment” seems to suggest the proposed committee may recommend reducing GTA funding in favor of increasing GRA funding opportunities. If that is the case, or if the potential for such a recommendation exists:
- a. How have/will the resolution sponsors determine that the core element of engagement with research is more important to the tripartite mission of the university than the other two elements: teaching and outreach? How will the proposed committee balance these three core elements of the university's mission?
 - b. By the nature of the work, some programs, especially in social sciences and humanities, have less opportunity for external funding. Given this, how will the committee ensure their recommendations reflect an equitable distribution of university resources so that these programs are not adversely impacted?
 - c. In advocating for the college reorganization, Provost Clarke told the Board of Visitors that one anticipated outcome was an increase in GTA opportunities for graduate students in CLAHS. Has this been the case? Might this proposal adversely impact that anticipated outcome, on which the BoV partially based their decision to vote in favor of the reorganization?
 - d. Is there any specific reason why the study of teaching assistantships is cited but assistantships and fellowships in administrative offices or through extracurricular programs are not? Might the study of those assistantships also help to encourage the expansion of GRAs without impacting GTAs?
- V. What is the proposed makeup of the committee? Will various fields have equitable representation, or will the committee be dominated by those colleges, departments, and programs that already have the most power, resources, and access to external resources?
- VI. Will the data collected include information about doctoral students who would like an assistantship but do not have one (current Graduate School data does not capture students in this category)? How can the university guarantee that they wouldn't be worse-off with the increased enrollment and its financial impacts to the university?
- VII. Finally, the language “*and any other such topics that it deems relevant to its charge*” leaves a huge space for (mis)interpretation and (mis)use. How does the committee decide which topics are relevant to its charge? Given the charge is not wholly specified, what are the checks and balances for this committee? How would stakeholder input affect the decision-making of this committee? How does the committee ensure that conflicts of interest do not arise, or one stakeholder group is not prioritized over

another? What role, if any, do external experts or advisors play in helping the committee determine the relevance of topics?

Overall, the resolution seems very vague from the graduate students' standpoint, and as evident from the past few years, transparency and accountability is something the graduate students have had disagreements about with the administration. The sentence *"faculty and graduate students have unique and essential roles in conducting research and disseminating its outcomes as part of doctoral training"* seems to point towards the importance of both parties in the process of research in an academic institution. However, the resolution, while important in its scope and justifiable in its intention, seems to reverberate the long-held perception among graduate students that the university regards them as "too important to ignore, but too fleeting to enshrine".

We understand that the intent of this resolution is to work toward making the financial aspects of doctoral funding better and more just for both the faculty and the students. While we respect and agree with the sentiment, the language of the resolution doesn't reflect that. The vague language, while important to some degree, makes the resolution seek to set some sweeping policies for everyone under the guise of a financial issue.

This is a resolution that will affect the graduate and professional student community as much (if not more) as it will the faculty. In the spirit of collaboration in the shared governance, we request these be addressed before the resolution goes to the University Council for discussion and voting. We hope to resolve these concerns and share in the important work that this resolution seeks to address.

On behalf of the Graduate and Professional Student Senate,
Ronnie Mondal
President



October 30, 2024

Ronnie Mondal
President, Graduate and Professional Student Senate
Virginia Tech

Dear Ronnie:

I am writing in response to the comment you filed regarding resolution UC 2024-25A on behalf of the GPSS on October 27, 2024. As the Commission on Faculty Affairs is the lead commission of this joint resolution, I will respond to the questions posed and the concerns you raised.

Most importantly, the Commission appreciates the detailed comments of the GPSS; clearly the graduate and professional students are thinking deeply about this issue. It is a testament to shared governance in action that we can collaborate on the key issues proposed by the resolution. In the attached document, I have provided a point-by-point response to the concerns raised. I hope that these responses provide the answers that the GPSS seeks.

I would like to conclude by saying that the Faculty Senate greatly values the contributions of graduate and professional students to the university. It is precisely for this reason that we seek to advance this University Mission Initiative. We wish to provide opportunities for more graduate students to engage in doctoral training, and to have that training be robustly and reliably supported by sufficient funding. In doing so, the university will be able to engage in more cutting-edge research that will undoubtedly be driven by graduate students.

If you have additional comments, concerns, or questions, I am happy to address them, and you are always welcome to attend Commission on Faculty Affairs and/or Faculty Senate meetings during the deliberations on this resolution. We look forward to further engaging with you on this effort and others.

Sincerely,

Justin A. Lemkul, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Biochemistry
Chair, Commission on Faculty Affairs

Comment on UC 2024-25A:

The Graduate and Professional Student Senate requests some additional clarifications regarding UC 2024-25A RESOLUTION TO FORM A UNIVERSITY MISSION INITIATIVE COMMITTEE TO RECOMMEND UPDATED POLICIES FOR FUNDING DOCTORAL RESEARCH AT VIRGINIA TECH.

- I. The current language of the resolution mentions that *“policies must be examined and funding strategies need to be developed to ensure continued financial support for current graduate students and increased to provide for increased enrollment;”* but does not provide any context to how this conclusion was reached. Including specific data as evidence, what is the specific problem this resolution seeks to address, and what circumstances prevented the university from acting on them till now?

The stated goal of the UMI resolution is to increase graduate enrollment, particularly in doctoral programs. The statement should not be viewed as “why has the university not acted yet,” rather “what is necessary to continue advancing the mission of the university and increasing access to doctoral training that Virginia Tech can provide?” To do so requires an examination of what administrative policies there are in place that could be improved, particularly with regards to payment of tuition and candidacy tuition discounts, among others. The quoted statement defines an overarching framework in which the UMI committee will operate.

- II. One of the clauses in the resolution mentions, *“WHEREAS, policies must be examined ... to ensure continued financial support for current graduate students and increased to provide for increased enrollment”*, while the resolution itself states that, *“THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the function of this University Mission Initiative Committee is to provide evidence-based recommendations for elevating research and research-related activities at the university, including increasing enrollment of doctoral students ...”*. It sounds like the recommendation for increased enrollment has already been made, and the committee is being formed around the assumption that enrollment will be increased, and the proposed committee will find a way to financially justify it. This raises the following questions:
 - a. Why is the assumption already made before the introduction of the resolution?

The university has compared its undergraduate and graduate enrollments among peer and aspirational peer institutions and given a body of approximately 30,000 undergraduate students, a typical number of graduate students would be 10,000. The university currently enrolls approximately 8,000 graduate students, which leads to an imbalance in the GTA:undergraduate ratio and a lower faculty:graduate student ratio than is typical. Hence, the goal of the UMI is to determine the extent to which graduate (principally doctoral) enrollment can be increased to match peers.

- b. What other alternatives were considered and/or attempted for resolving the underlying issue prior to introducing this proposal? Why were those rejected/why did they fail? If none, what are some such alternatives?

The undertaking a massive one and requires input from all constituencies across campus. It is the very purpose for which the UMI vehicle was implemented.

- c. Does this also imply that the current living/working/earning standards of existing graduate students is deemed “acceptable” to the university to an extent that it can be expanded to more students?

That issue is related to increasing enrollment and should be considered by the committee.

- III. The resolution also mentions, “*encourag[ing] expanding the number of graduate research assistantships; ... assessing demands on extramural funding attained by faculty*” , which raises additional questions:
 - a. How would the recommendations work when there is no language supporting an increase in getting extramural funding on the faculty’s behalf?

The quoted language is not a recommendation; it is a stated purpose of the study that the committee is tasked with carrying out. We must understand the factors that constrain faculty use of extramural funding to see how they can be improved to encourage allocation to more graduate students. For example, it is well known that tuition is a major cost on faculty grants; further reducing or eliminating tuition for doctoral students who have advanced to candidacy would free up money to fund additional students. This is but one example.

- b. Does an increase in graduate students (with or without assistantships) mean that the university will freeze its plans on increasing student wage to numbers deemed “livable” for the Blacksburg (or the respective campus) area?

The committee will be tasked with investigating all matters under current budgetary plans and make recommendations about feasibility for any proposal that it puts forth. Alternative strategies may be proposed, all of which will be presented to the University Council Cabinet, in accordance with the University Council Constitution and Bylaws.

- c. Given there is no language that indicates a demand for increasing the extramural funding attained by faculty, how can the same amount support more students – does that translate to increasing tuition for those without an assistantship or an increase in comprehensive fees (which is already higher than that of other institutions) paid by students?

Increased demand on faculty extramural support is intrinsic to the proposal, therefore the related points are speculation. Ultimately, an increase in extramural funding will be needed and will be explored during later phases of the UMI process as defined in the University Council Constitution and Bylaws. Many of these aspects are administrative matters that are not subject to the UMI procedures and will be dealt with accordingly.

- IV. The language of the resolution, “encourage expanding the number of graduate research assistantships; studying the use of teaching assistantships; ... the potential need for hiring additional instructional faculty to reduce graduate student teaching demands and account for increased enrollment” seems to suggest the proposed committee may recommend reducing GTA funding in favor of increasing GRA funding opportunities. If that is the case, or if the potential for such a recommendation exists:
 - a. How have/will the resolution sponsors determine that the core element of engagement with research is more important to the tripartite mission of the university than the other two elements: teaching and outreach? How will the

proposed committee balance these three core elements of the university's mission?

There is no such assumption that research is more important than teaching or outreach. It is simply that the subject of this UMI effort is in the domain of research. One cannot address every aspect of the university's mission simultaneously as it is an intractable problem for one, singular effort.

- b. By the nature of the work, some programs, especially in social sciences and humanities, have less opportunity for external funding. Given this, how will the committee ensure their recommendations reflect an equitable distribution of university resources so that these programs are not adversely impacted?

Representatives from all domains will be represented on the UMI committee. We recognize that funding mechanisms vary drastically among the different colleges.

- c. In advocating for the college reorganization, Provost Clarke told the Board of Visitors that one anticipated outcome was an increase in GTA opportunities for graduate students in CLAHS. Has this been the case? Might this proposal adversely impact that anticipated outcome, on which the BoV partially based their decision to vote in favor of the reorganization?

The provost will have to comment on the allocation of additional GTA funding lines to CLAHS or any other college, but as is related to point (b), funding within each college differs and that is an intrinsic aspect of this UMI proposal. That is, how do different colleges fund their graduate students, what support is needed, and what kind of funding does the university need to provide (absent an immediate increase in extramural support) to meet these goals?

- d. Is there any specific reason why the study of teaching assistantships is cited but assistantships and fellowships in administrative offices or through extracurricular programs are not? Might the study of those assistantships also help to encourage the expansion of GRAs without impacting GTAs?

The committee can explore aspects of any funding mechanism it deems relevant to the stated charge.

- V. What is the proposed makeup of the committee? Will various fields have equitable representation, or will the committee be dominated by those colleges, departments, and programs that already have the most power, resources, and access to external resources?

Representation on a UMI committee is prescribed by the University Council Constitution and Bylaws. Representation will be inclusive, balancing the value of a relatively small committee membership with broad disciplinary scope in the UMI Development phase. Membership will be expanded in the Adaptation phase in accordance with UC policy.

- VI. Will the data collected include information about doctoral students who would like an assistantship but do not have one (current Graduate School data does not capture students in this category)? How can the university guarantee that they wouldn't be worse-off with the increased enrollment and its financial impacts to the university?

Data will be collected as the committee determines is appropriate. The outcome of this stage in the process will not impact anyone, positively or negatively. The outcome of the committee's work is a proposed set of actions that will be refined over a period of years.

VII. Finally, the language *“and any other such topics that it deems relevant to its charge”* leaves a huge space for (mis)interpretation and (mis)use. How does the committee decide which topics are relevant to its charge? Given the charge is not wholly specified, what are the checks and balances for this committee? How would stakeholder input affect the decision-making of this committee? How does the committee ensure that conflicts of interest do not arise, or one stakeholder group is not prioritized over another? What role, if any, do external experts or advisors play in helping the committee determine the relevance of topics?

The language allows the committee to explore tangential issues, many of which were raised in the earlier questions and comments. If the charge is overly prescriptive without any flexibility, it limits the ability of the committee to do its work. All aspects of proposed changes to any policy will move through the university's system of shared governance, meaning nothing will be a secret before it is implemented and can be debated openly by all constituencies at the university.

Overall, the resolution seems very vague from the graduate students' standpoint, and as evident from the past few years, transparency and accountability is something the graduate students have had disagreements about with the administration. The sentence *“faculty and graduate students have unique and essential roles in conducting research and disseminating its outcomes as part of doctoral training”* seems to point towards the importance of both parties in the process of research in an academic institution. However, the resolution, while important in its scope and justifiable in its intention, seems to reverberate the long-held perception among graduate students that the university regards them as “too important to ignore, but too fleeting to enshrine”.

We understand that the intent of this resolution is to work toward making the financial aspects of doctoral funding better and more just for both the faculty and the students. While we respect and agree with the sentiment, the language of the resolution doesn't reflect that. The vague language, while important to some degree, makes the resolution seek to set some sweeping policies for everyone under the guise of a financial issue.

This is a resolution that will affect the graduate and professional student community as much (if not more) as it will the faculty. In the spirit of collaboration in the shared governance, we request these be addressed before the resolution goes to the University Council for discussion and voting. We hope to resolve these concerns and share in the important work that this resolution seeks to address.

We appreciate the concerns you have raised and we are grateful for your passion about this issue; it is truly shared governance in action. We want to reassure the graduate students that all aspects of this process are prescribed in the University Council Constitution and require input by all constituencies and will be made transparent. Moreover, it is very important to make clear that the present resolution does not “set some sweeping policies,” it merely opens the door to studying issues that require careful study and consideration. What may be viewed as “vague” is actually an attempt at being focused, while remaining flexible to allow the committee to do its work. We wish to reassure the graduate students that this effort is intended to be a positive effort to uplift graduate research, ensure its prosperity at the university, and to open the door for more students

to access doctoral education. It is a commitment by the university to work with faculty, staff, and students to seek their input in transforming the university's mission, as is befitting a University Mission Initiative.

On behalf of the Graduate and Professional Student Senate,
Ronnie Mondal
President



Graduate and Professional Student Senate (GPSS)

25 Graduate Life Center (0186)

155 Otey Street

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

Email: gpss@vt.edu

Website: gpss.vt.edu

November 3, 2024

Justin Lemkul

Chair, Commission of Faculty Affairs

CC: Renée LeClair, Chair, Commission on Graduate and Professional Studies and Policies

CC: Nicole Pitterson, Chair, Commission on Research

Dr Lemkul,

Thank you for your response. We had a discussion on the UC resolution, our comments, and your response during the GPSS Meeting on October 31, and we're all glad to know that CFA and the Faculty Senate took the time to provide a detailed response to our comments. As you mentioned, this truly is shared governance in action.

The Senate provided the following comments, which we expect the resolution sponsors and the chair of the resulting task force to consider during the formation and operation of the task force:

1. Given the significant impact on graduate students, it is essential to ensure adequate representation during both the development and implementation phases of the initiative, as well as in the task forces established thereafter.
2. When recommending policy changes, three critical issues must be contextualized: the availability of affordable housing, the reduction of comprehensive fees for graduate students, and ensuring a living wage for graduate students.
3. The Out-of-State Tuition Differential significantly impacts students with no or partial funding, particularly international students. Therefore, the criteria for waiving this differential should be relaxed ([Policy 6210](#)).
4. The criteria for partial funding should be relaxed and the process made more accessible, allowing more students to benefit from the differential waiver, particularly through the use of partial GTA assignments.

Thank you for maintaining open communication. We look forward to collaborating with the task force to enhance graduate student life and make the environment more conducive to the pursuit of learning, teaching, scholarship, research, and service.

On behalf of the Graduate and Professional Student Senate,

Ronnie Mondal

President



Administrative and Professional Faculty Senate

<https://governance.vt.edu/ap-faculty-senate.php>

2024-2025 Officers & Committee Chairs

President:

Janice Austin
Graduate School

Vice President:

Marlena McGlothlin Lester
College of Engineering

Secretary/Treasurer:

Enrique Noyola
Human Resources

Parliamentarian:

Jennifer Jones
Agriculture and Life Sciences

Immediate Past President:

Holli Gardner Drewry
TLOS

Communications Committee Chair:

Julie Carlson
Hokie Wellness

Elections and Nominations

Committee Chair:

Scott Weimer
VT Roanoke Center

Policies and Issues Committee Chair

Nikki Connors
Analytics and Institutional Research

October 30, 2024

To: Vice President of Policy and Governance

From: A/P Faculty Senate Polices and Issues Committee

The A/P Faculty Senate Polices and Issues Committee has reviewed and approves/endorsees University Council Resolution 2024-25A to Form a University Mission Initiative Committee to Recommend Updated Policies for Funding Doctoral Research at Virginia Tech (formerly CFA Resolution 2024-25F).

The following comment was received:

- How will a university mission initiative differ from current presidential priorities Virginia Tech Advantage and Global Distinction? Will this initiative be a subcommittee of Global Distinction? Will the members of the university mission initiative be the same members as Global Distinction or will it include different perspectives? Will there be clear boundaries defined between the work of the Graduate Compensation task force and this mission initiative around graduate research work?

We have no further comment.