

Commission on Faculty Affairs

February 8, 2019

10:30 – 12:00 Noon

130 E Burruss Hall

In Attendance: J. Ogorzalek (for GSA), M. McGrath, T. Schenk, J. Spotila, J. Finney, J. Hawdon, R. Blythe, M. Abbas, M. Paretti, Z. Mackey

Absent: L. Brogdon, R. Sebek, B. Hicok, G. Daniel, M. Agah

Guests: M. Lewis, D. Musick (VT School of Medicine)

1. Approval of agenda **M. McGrath**

Meeting called to order at 10:30 a.m.

2. Approval of January 25, 2019 minutes **M. McGrath**

The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Expectations Documents **M. McGrath**

M. McGrath initiated the discussion regarding the development of the expectations documents. As these are developed and altered, there needs to be a level of transparency. J. Finney noted that the Provost office does not approve these documents or monitor the process of development, as this is determined by each college.

M. McGrath posed the question: what is faculty participation in the development of these documents and what is the level of transparency across colleges? Is there a way we can have more transparency throughout this process?

J. Spotila noted that it may be possible to mandate a faculty vote to approve expectation documents. This idea was supported by J. Hawdon and M. McGrath. This vote would occur at the level that the expectations document is development, which varies by college (i.e., college-level versus department-level documents).

M. Paretti added that it could be handled similarly to other process in which the faculty and administration must vote in agreement for the expectations document to be adopted.

R. Blythe posited that a preamble might be most appropriate, which would avoid the development of another policy (i.e., less policy is better). J. Hawdon disagreed with this notion, as he stated that the expectations documents are, in many ways, more important than the faculty handbook. Thus, while less policy is more better in some instances, this matter is too important to not have a policy governing this process. The latter was supported by M. Paretti, as well as others.

Discussion tabled until the next meeting, while J. Finney gathers additional information.

4. Second reading of resolutions FS 2018-19A, B, C, & D **M. McGrath**

The resolutions were approved unanimously.

5. Evaluation of collegiate professor position **J. Finney**

J. Finney reported there is a meeting scheduled with all department heads that have hired collegiate professors that will be focused on discussing the assignments of collegiate professors. Additionally, this will assist in determining how we want to define this position. One issue with current assignments is the lack of research assignment, which is part of the job description of the position at the university-level.

J. Finney noted that a work group, consisting of collegiate professors, department heads, TT faculty, and NTT faculty, is being started that will develop a promotion process for collegiate professor promotions.

M. McGrath reported that this issue also exists for cluster hire faculty. They are reporting that they are in roles that are different than what they were told when hired.

As previously noted, J. Finney stated that there will most likely be a separate P&T committee developed for the determination of promotion and tenure for collegiate faculty rank.

6. Other business **M. McGrath**

M. Abbas brought forth the matter of a delay in the OSP processes, which has resulted in the loss of contracts for some faculty. J. Finney stated he was unaware of this issue and for it to be taken to faculty senate.

7. Adjourn **M. McGrath**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.