COMMISSION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND
PROFESSIONAL FACULTY AFFAIRS
SEPTEMBER 20, 2001

The meeting was called to order by Susan Angle, Chair.

Members present: Susan Angle, Pat Hyer, Linda Woodard, Judith Jones, Bea Mahan, Cathy Sutphin, Elaine Matuszek, Glenda Scales, Ruby Cox, Darrell Cain and Natalie Hennessy.

Members absent: Janet Leigh, Gail Hanie, Mike Roberts, Sharon McCloskey, Paul Knox, and Becky Barlow.

The first item on the agenda concerned salary adjustment differences between A/P and T&R faculty. After some discussion a motion was made, seconded and approved to request that Minnis Ridenour or his designee contact representatives of SCHEV to discuss problems of designating merit adjustments for administrative and professional faculty as Òcost-of-living adjustmentsÓ as was done in a September 12th SCHEV document titled "2002-04 Systemwide Operating Budget Recommendation for Faculty Salary Increases". Specifically the statement reads: "Cost-of-living adjustments: 3.5% cost-of-living adjustments for administrative faculty, part-time faculty, and graduate teaching assistants." The Commission notes that referring to adjustments for part-time or adjunct faculty as "cost-of-living" adjustments creates serious problems for the university since all salary adjustments have been awarded on the basis of merit. Establishing a pattern of cost-of-living adjustments for faculty of ANY type - A/P or adjunct - is highly problematic and undesirable since it would suggest that all employees be granted equal raises, something the state and the university have moved away from for all employee categories, including classified staff.

Also, the Commission requests that university administrators vigorously pursue elimination of the differential between administrative and professional faculty salary adjustments and T&R adjustments with the State Council and other state officials. The differential remains highly corrosive for morale of these employees and makes recruitment and retention of these faculty members more difficult.

Linda Woodard reported on the differences in leave policies for faculty and classified staff. Classified staff leave policies are defined by the stateÕs Department of Human Resource Management, whereas faculty policies are approved by the administration and the Board of Visitors. Some examples of changes for classified staff are Community Service Leave (previously called School leave), which has been extended to two days per year, and Disaster Relief, Bone Marrow or Organ Donation leave. One additional type of leave, which state policy now allows agencies to consider, is an Exceptional Recruitment and Retention Incentive which means an employer can advance additional annual leave to newly hired employees with a stipulation on years of service. This incentive would be available only for positions that are critical to the universityÕs mission and very difficult to recruit. The policy is under development. Another recent state policy also provides for Òrecognition leaveÓ which may be awarded as part of an approved Awards Recognition Program for staff, where up to 5 days of annual leave can be awarded in recognition of special efforts. A university Recognition Policy for classified staff is also under development.

Commission members indicated some reservations about replicating all of these different types of leave programs for faculty, given that AY faculty do not have annual leave and CY faculty earn more annual leave when first hired (8 hours per pay period for faculty compared to 4 hours per pay period for classified), and typically have more flexible schedules than classified staff. In addition, there is some danger in mirroring all classified policies for faculty in that we have been trying to make the argument that A/P faculty are FACULTY, not classified staff. To the extent that we develop policies that make them look the same, we have undermined our own arguments.

There was some discussion on the maximum number of carryover hours for annual leave for faculty and classified staff. Last year, the stateÕs leave policy increased the maximum carryover for classified staff but not for CY faculty. The state policy did not change the limit on payout of leave when the employee separates. Despite the concerns expressed above, Judith Jones asked that the Commission consider recommending the same amount of leave carryover for CY faculty since this could have positive effects on morale. This item will be discussed at the next meeting.

Another related issue that may be considered by the Benefits Committee and CFA is adoption of a policy or practice of allowing a reduced load during personal crises in exchange for overload at a later point, especially for teaching faculty. However, it may be difficult to find a way to make a similar accommodation possible for A/P faculty whose load usually could not be deferred in this way.

Other Business: Cathy Sutphin reported that the grievance committee has received one grievance and the panel will make a decision today (9/20/01).

The next two meetings will be October 18, 2001 and November 29, 2001 in 325 Burruss Hall at 1:30.   A December meeting has not been scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,
Sheila Norman, recorder

COMMISSION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROFESSIONAL FACULTY AFFAIRS
November 29, 2001

The meeting was called to order by Susan Angle, Chair.

Members present: Susan Angle, Pat Hyer, Linda Woodard, Bea Mahan, Cathy Sutphin, Elaine Matuszek, Ruby Cox, Natalie Hennessy, Sharon McCloskey, Becky Barlow and Darrell Cain. By phone: Mike Roberts.

Members absent: Judith Jones, Paul Knox, Janet Leigh, Gail Hanie, and Glenda Scales.

Guest: Dwight Shelton

1. A/P Faculty Salary Adjustments:
Dwight Shelton addressed concerns raised at an earlier CAPFA meeting related to merit adjustments for A/P faculty. As requested by CAPFA, he investigated a reference in a SCHEV document to Òcost-of-livingÓ adjustments for A/P faculty members. Amy Sebring, a SCHEV finance staff person, assured him that no meaning was implied by this reference. It was an oversight on their part and they would correct it. The later summary did not show the phrase; however, it is possible that the Department of Planning and Budget may still use it.

The GovernorÕs budget will be announced on December 19th. SCHEVÕs recommendations have been submitted. There had been some hope that salary adjustments for state employees might be addressed in a Òcaboose bill,Ó which is a clean-up bill affecting the current biennium. However, the state revenue picture has deteriorated significantly and it seems unlikely that the General Assembly would be able to enact salary increases retroactively. The General Assembly session will be a 60-day period, from January 9 until March 9.

The gap in recent appropriations for salary adjustments for T&R (teaching and research) faculty members compared to A/P faculty is an issue that Virginia Tech administrators have tried to address repeatedly with state officials and legislators. Since other colleges have many fewer A/P faculty (they do not have extension agents for example) and the gap between their T&R raise and their A/P raise may be negligible, Tech administrators have not had much support from other public institutions in getting attention to this issue. Recommendations for T&R faculty salary adjustments derive from the ÒbenchmarkingÓ process where average faculty salaries at Virginia Tech are compared to salaries at a negotiated set of peer institutions. The stated goal is to be at the 60th percentile. Since Virginia TechÕs T&R salaries are considerably below this percentile, higher T&R faculty salary adjustments would be appropriated until they reached the 60th percentile. (Faculty members at other Virginia universities may receive less because their T&R salaries are more competitive in comparison with their specific peer group.) There are no comparable studies or benchmarking process for A/P faculty, nor any stated commitment to maintain a particular level of competitiveness for salaries of these employees. This makes it far more difficult to make a persuasive case on behalf of A/P faculty salary increases.

Commission members discussed a number of strategies about how to make a difference on this issue, but there continue to be few points of leverage.

2. Annual Leave Accrual Maximums

Effective July 2000, the state increased the amount of annual leave and the maximum carryover balances for classified staff. Linda Woodard provided an analysis of annual leave and holidays available to classified staff, Administrative/Professional (A/P) and calendar year teaching and research faculty. (Teaching and research faculty members on academic-year appointments do not earn or accrue annual leave.) The comparisons are not entirely straightforward since A/P faculty earn larger annual leave allowances when first employed than classified staff, with classified staff having more paid holidays than faculty members (12 for staff compared to 6 for faculty). Annual leave balances beyond the maximum carry over are lopped off at the end of the leave year each January 9th. The state policy allows staff to carry over larger leave balances, a maximum of 384 hours after 20 years of service and 432 hours after 25 years of service compared to the existing maximum for faculty of 336 hours after 20 years of service. However, the state has NOT increased the maximum number of hours for payout at the time of separation or retirement (336 hours) for both staff and faculty.

Judith Jones had raised the question at a previous meeting whether it would improve faculty morale if we increased the leave accumulation balance for 12-month faculty to match that now available for classified staff, but again without changing the maximum payout at time of termination. A large leave balance would be an Òinsurance policyÓ of sorts if the employee needed extensive time off to deal with a family illness or other major event. While several commission members thought it might be nice, it is hard to tell how important this benefit would be to 12-month faculty. Pat Hyer suggested that it would be helpful if Personnel Services would prepare a report that would tell us how many 12-month faculty have large leave balances which are reduced back to the maximum carryover each year. If this happens for a significant percentage of the 12-month faculty, it would seem that increasing leave balances may be an important benefit. Woodard pointed out that this report may not provide a full picture of leave usage and balances because of the program that allows faculty to donate annual leave to staff for purposes of sick leave. Linda Woodard will request a report that might give us more insight into leave usage. It might also be helpful to get more employee opinion about such a change. Cathy Sutphin said she would take the issue to the Virginia Extension Service Association Board. Hyer also asked Sheila Norman to check with Judith Jones about other extension-related committees that could give some input on the subject.

3. Membership on the Commission:
Susan Angle will call Glenda Scales regarding her replacement from the Academic Support area to CAPFA during her maternity leave.

Dates for future meetings: No December meeting, January 17, 2002; February 14, 2002; March 21, 2002; and April 18, 2002.

Motion to adjourn at 2:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Sheila Norman, recorder

COMMISSION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROFESSIONAL FACULTY AFFAIRS
FEBRUARY 14, 2002

Members present: Susan Angle, Pat Hyer, Judith Jones, Linda Woodard, Bea Mahan, Natalie Hennessy, Sharon McCloskey and Becky Barlow.

Members absent: Cathy Sutphin, Elaine Matuszek, Ruby Cox, Darrell Cain, Paul Knox, Janet Leigh, Gail Haynie, Glenda Scales and Mike Roberts.

Guest: Ben Dixon

I. The meeting was called to order by Susan Angle, Chair.

II. Ben Dixon gave an overview of the proposal for a new commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity prepared by the EOAA Committee and the Advisory Council on Diversity and Multicultural Affairs. These committees have similar concerns but both are advisory in nature and elevation of diversity issues to commission status would allow a policy making role that does not currently exist. The charge of the new commission would be to study, formulate, and recommend to University Council policies and procedures as they relate to the universityÕs responsibilities for equal opportunity, affirmative action, accessibility, and compliance; diversity planning and evaluation; diversity training and education; assessment of institutional climate; and similar matters of equity and diversity that affect the university. The commission will be composed of 30 members.

Creation of a new commission requires amending the University Council Constitution, which must first be ratified by the Faculty and Staff Senates, and then the President and Board of Visitors. Membership of the commission would require an amendment to the University Council By-Laws. The proposal has been distributed through Spectrum, meetings have been held with a variety of commissions and groups, and an open forum will be conducted on February 20th for interested members of the university community. If the proposal were approved by University Council this spring, it could be reviewed by the Board of Visitors in June, and established in Fall 2002.

The new commission would be appropriately involved in active monitoring of the institutionÕs progress in relation to the goals established in the university strategic plan and the diversity strategic plan. Ohio State is using a Òdiversity councilÓ on their campus in that way, holding briefings with the deans concerning progress in their units and then preparing a summary report for the Provost and President.

It was suggested that Òselection byÓ be substituted for the word Òrecommendation byÓ for the community representatives being chosen by groups or offices since they were making the final decision on the member to serve on the commission rather than the President. Ben and Pat agreed to make that change since it reflected the intent of the selection process for the community representatives.

Judith Jones made a motion that CAPFA support the proposed new commission. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

III. The topic of leave carryover was tabled until the next meeting.

IV. The topic of impact of Budget Reductions on A/P Faculty was tabled until the next meeting.

V. CAPFA Elections

Linda Woodard distributed a listing of A/P Faculty. After review and discussion of the list, it was suggested that faculty members in ARECs be moved under Extension and Information Systems be moved under General Administration except for Distance Learning and Institute for Distance & Distributed Learning, which report to the Provost. Pat Hyer made a motion to accept the realignments. Judith Jones seconded the motion. The changes were approved.

Members made several suggestions of A/P faculty members who might be interested and appropriate for nomination to various committee or commission vacancies. Nominations for the election will be sent via email to Susan Angle two weeks prior to the next meeting.

VI. The next meeting will be March 21, 2002 in 325 Burruss Hall beginning at 1:30 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheila Norman, Recorder

Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs
March 21, 2002
325 Burruss Hall

Pat Hyer called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m., announcing that Susan Angle, chair, was ill and unable to attend. There were no additions to the agenda.

Members present: Pat Hyer, Becky Barlow, Cathy Sutphin, Bea Mahan, David Travis (for Judith Jones) and Darrell Cain.
By phone: Gail Haynie and Janet Leigh

I. Impact of Budget Reductions

David Travis and Pat Hyer reported on the alternative severance option approved for use by faculty by the Board of Visitors at their meeting on March 18. The program is based on the stateÕs severance policy for involuntary terminations. It is not a buyout program or an early retirement program, which the state has declined to make available. Authority to offer the program to classified employees has been requested from the Department of Human Resource Management. Because the alternative severance option is based on state policy, some parameters of its management have been dictated by the state. Business plans prepared by colleges (or extension) will define the targeted number of positions to be reduced by type, for example the number of A/P faculty positions on field staff, and the approximate dollar amount of the salaries to be reduced. Employees may then volunteer, in effect, to Òsubstitute for layoffs.Ó If selected for participation, employees will receive a severance benefit or enhanced retirement as defined under the CommonwealthÕs severance program.

The transitional severance benefits include salary payments for up to 36 consecutive weeks depending on years of continuous service, and twelve months of employer contributions for health and life insurance. Employees who are at least 50 years of age and vested in VRS may opt instead for an enhanced retirement benefit. The value of the severance benefit package is divided by 15% of the annual salary, providing the number of years to be added to either service or age, or both. For long-term employees, this usually translates into 5-6 years.

Extension administrators have sought permission for an early retirement window for agents on federal appointments; they expect to have such permission any day. This federal option is for employees who are 50 years of age with 20 years of service, or any age with 25 years of service.

After the collegesÕ business plans are approved, eligible employees will be briefed on the options. Extension will hold sessions on and off-campus. The application window will be relatively short and separation expected to be very soon since the universityÕs budget reductions take effect July 1. Not all employees who apply may be able to participate since the program is meant to be a tool to manage reductions rather than as an employee benefit. The alternative severance option carries a substantial transition cost since the payments for longer-term employees will be about 90% of annual salary, plus accumulated annual leave payouts.

Bea Mahan distributed an overview of the budget. The massive shortfall in revenue at the state level derives from a combination of recession-related revenue reductions and major tax relief measures, primarily car-tax relief but also other tax reductions approved by the General Assembly over the last few years. This has created a structural problem in the stateÕs budget that will not improve immediately even if the economy recovers. The adjustments for all higher education are in the general fund, equipment trust fund, maintenance reserve and research and public service centers. Added together, the reduction for Virginia Tech for 2002-03 will be $35.5 million. The Board approved a 9% tuition increase that will partially offset reductions in the university division. Additional tuition revenue does not offset reductions in the 229 agency however.

II. Elections

Nominations for extension-related slots are still needed from the VESA executive committee. The ballot will then be finalized and sent out.

III. The topic of leave carryover will be tabled indefinitely.

The next meeting will be April 18, 2002, in 325 Burruss Hall beginning at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheila Norman, Recorder