

Commission on Faculty Affairs
Minutes of September 12, 1997 meeting
Approved as amended on September 26, 1997

Present: Sigrid Gustafson (Chair), Kathryn Albright, Bob Bates, Donna Dunay, Tom Hergert, Pat Hyer, Deborah Mayo

1. Call to order. The meeting was called to order by Chair Gustafson at 3:05 PM.
2. Agenda. Introductions were made and the agenda was adopted.
3. Minutes. The minutes of the 25 April 1997 meeting were approved.
4. Donna Dunay agreed to take minutes for this first meeting. Tom Hergert agreed to be the CFA representative to the EO/AA Committee.

5. Report on BOV actions taken in August

A. B. C. Hyer reported that the ethics revisions, the Post Tenure Review (PTR) severe sanctions language, and emeritus status for extension agents were approved by the Board during their August meeting. The ethics revisions will be incorporated in the Faculty Handbook.

D. Request to pay teaching overload for wireless communications electrical engineering Masters approved two year pilot project (Lucent) Hyer reported that the Board had also given approval to develop a pilot project for the wireless communications electrical engineering masters.

The project is being given the status of pilot project so the program may be offered while the university addresses the questions that such programs might pose. She mentioned three questions arise when considering these offerings: How to pay faculty? How to resolve the question of tuition charges and the placement of revenue received? How to address organizations that cannot afford full cost?

6. New Action Items for 1997-98

A. Overload compensation policy issues

Hyer suggested that the pilot project mentioned before brings up questions the commission should address during the year. Specifically, she mentioned pay for teaching credit courses as overload. The university is able to pay non-credit overload presently and will need to address the situation of credit courses as an overload. She suggested that the commission review policies at work in other institutions to assist in the development of new university policy in this area.

Bates suggested that the initial question is what is load? Another question that emerges is what is outreach, as a part of the job? Mayo wondered if a model exists within the university presently with courses in place that are broadcast. Hyer said Institutional Research is collecting examples from institutions

that deal with these issues and will bring examples of what others are doing to the October meeting.

B. Promotion Adjustments

Hyer reported the Board has asked the university to look into salary adjustments when promotions occur. The Board is concerned that ours are not keeping pace. Presently, faculty receive a \$1500 increase on promotion to associate from assistant and a \$2000 increase on promotion to professor from associate. This should be studied in the upcoming year by CFA.

C. Report on minimum standards document

Hyer updated CFA on Post Tenure Review(PTR). Last year the CFA watched the PTR policy move forward. Since all departmental policies are not finalized, Pat will present the policies together to CFA when all are completed,

D. "Collegiality"

Gustafson suggested there was concern with collegiality being used as a subtext and that there was a need to define its use in promotion and annual review decisions. She mentioned two areas of concern -- first, using lack of collegiality against someone, without documented evidence, and second, documenting a person's lack of interpersonal skills when this lack is destructive to departmental functioning (e.g., intimidation, bullying).

Several members of CFA spoke of concerns. It was suggested that collegiality brings along with it the discussion of climate. The Faculty Senate officers have discussed with the President and Provost faculty concerns over civil behavior and misbehavior in class. There was some discussion as to class size relative to these problems. There is a need to know if an outline exists that discusses faculty's options; if not, guidelines should be prepared.

Hyer reported that Terry Wildman may be developing workshops regarding maintaining class discipline.

E. Right to appeal negative promotion decision to Full Professor if faculty member has been in present rank fewer than six years.

Gustafson introduced an issue that came to CFA at the end of last year. If a faculty receives a negative decision for promotion before 6 years in rank, present policy does not permit an appeal. CFA has been asked to look into the right to appeal a negative promotion decision before 6 years. Most of CFA discussion related to the difference between tenure and promotion: Tenure is mandatory after 6 years, and promotion is not. After 6 years, faculty can appeal a promotion decision. There was concern that, without a means of appeal, negative decisions before 6 years might

become
grievances.

Gustafson said she would contact colleges to find out the prevalence of this problem and bring the information back to CFA.

7. Action items continued from 1996-97

A. Hyer passed out a packet that detailed the severe sanctions resolution as it stood at the end of last year in CFA with a severe sanctions process chart. It included the draft of a proposed article for Spectrum to invite comment on the policy draft. She suggested that the commission collect comments and make a final discussion and vote on the policy. The Policy will be placed in 2.11(dismissal for cause).

Mayo questioned if the difference in the placement would cause the need for more detail in each section of the faculty handbook. Sigrid proposed that the article be published in Spectrum while CFA reviews the Faculty Handbook to determine the detail of policy placement.

B. Administrative Review

Gustafson presented the question of administrative review that had been a part of the agenda of CFA last year. She said that there must have been a confusion because Deans and Department Heads are reviewed every 5 years according to faculty guidelines. If this is not occurring then current policy is not being followed. Gustafson had spoken to the President and he mentioned that a very thorough review will be conducted every five years for those in administration, using an instrument developed by the Center for Creative Leadership.

8. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Donna Dunay

Commission on Faculty Affairs
Minutes of September 26, 1997 meeting
Approved as amended, October 10, 1997

Present: Sigrid Gustafson (Chair), Kathryn Albright, Trina Doran, Donna Dunay, Tom Hergert, Pat Hyer, Janet Johnson, Mario Karfakis, Deborah Mayo, Mary Moore, Sue Tolin.

Absent: Chelsey Atkin, Bob Bates, Hara Misra.

I. Administrative issues

Donna Dunay and Trina Doran will work together on the minutes.

II. Severe sanctions policy

A. Gustafson opened the discussion by reporting on two responses to the Spectrum article on severe sanctions.

B. With regard to the placement of the policy in the handbook the discussion involved placing the severe sanctions policy under the "Dismissal for Cause" section, with a changed heading. There was a continuing discussion as to listing or not listing in the handbook those actions that could trigger the sanctions. Many thought that the listing on p.2-51 adequately defined the range of actions if one addition were to be made: It was suggested that, along with changing the heading of 2.11.1 "Due Process for Dismissal for Cause," an additional point should be included " (7) abridgment of university policy."

There was some discussion that investigative procedures be included between "Adequate cause can include, but is not restricted to..." (p. 2-51) and "Dismissal will be preceded by..." (p. 2-52).

Concern was raised as to the implementation procedures with this policy or with similar policies (e.g., scholarly misconduct). What happens if the time frames are not followed? Who would then be responsible for following these procedures with regard to time limits?

C. After this discussion Hyer agreed to make the following adjustments for the commission to review:

Revision of section 2.11 of the Faculty Handbook (FH).

1. Re-name the section to include "severe sanctions"

2. Cross-reference other FH sections when enumerating causes for dismissal-for-cause

3. Add text to 2.11.1 that deals with who brings charges and who investigates them BEFORE the hearing process starts

4. Begin with imposition of severe sanctions and flowing to dismissal

5. Remove all material related to RIF dismissals

6. Provide a copy of what the new "Ethics" section of the FH will look like now, in its entirety

7. Hyer agreed to make a flow chart of 2.11 (similar to the one in the "Scholarly Misconduct" section) that we can use for a presentation to the Faculty Senate.

IV. Denied promotion to "full"

The commission was briefed by Gustafson on her informal phone survey in departments around campus regarding difficulties with promotions denied prior to six years being unable to find recourse to appeal by current

policy. She said she had not found this to be a problem in speaking to those on campus. There was a concern mentioned that denial without recourse had been a problem in the past for some. Gustafson said she would investigate further.

V. Senate view on administrative review.

Gustafson mentioned there was a concern in the Faculty Senate that Deans and Department Heads are not evaluated more frequently. She stated that something will be coming from the Senate regarding

VI. Adjournment at 5:00PM

Respectfully submitted,
Donna Dunay

Commission on Faculty Affairs
Minutes of October 10, 1997 meeting
Approved: October 24, 1997

Present: Sigrid Gustafson (Chair), Jonathan Fisher, Pat Hyer, Bob Bates, Tom Hergert, Mario Karfakis, Trina Doran, Donna Dunay, Deborah Mayo, Kay Heidbreder (Associate General Counsel)

Absent: Hara Misra, Mary D. Moore, Kathryn Clarke-Albright, Peter Shires, Janet Johnson, Darlene Grega, Sue Tolin

I. Minutes

The minutes of the September 26th, 1997 meeting were approved, provided that certain editorial changes were made.

II. Administrative Issues

It was suggested that editorial changes to the minutes of previous meetings be made to the text of the relevant minutes, without further approval, if there is agreement concerning these changes.

III. Commission Concerns

A. Adequate Cause

A.1. Discussion focused on the sentence "Adequate cause can include, but is not restricted to:" followed by a list of seven items in Section 2.11.1 of the Faculty Handbook. Some felt that the list should not be restrictive so that situations that have not been imagined, or those that fall rather ambiguously under the rubric of one of the items, could still be considered adequate cause for dismissal. Others felt that the faculty should know in advance what behaviors could be considered adequate cause for dismissal. Those in favor of making the list nonrestrictive felt that the process was thorough and cumbersome enough so that arbitrary charges would either not be brought forth or would be subsequently dropped. Those who wanted an all-inclusive list felt that if specious or not-sufficiently severe charges were more likely to be brought under a non-restrictive list, such charges would not be dismissed without the effort of the accused party. This effort would be both time-consuming and anxiety-provoking.

A compromise was suggested. It was proposed that the sentence be changed to "Adequate cause may include" and that the phrase "but is not restricted to" be deleted.

In addition, it was suggested that item #4 be changed to read "willful violation of university and/or state or federal policies,"
The motion to make the suggested changes was approved unanimously by the Commission.

A.2. The Commission discussed issues concerning the sentence beginning, "Such procedures, where available, will be shared with faculty members" in the final paragraph of section 2.11.1 entitled "Adequate Cause". Hyer and Heidbreder explained that the procedures are not documented in writing in every circumstance and that in certain cases (e.g., embezzlement) it would not be possible to let the faculty member know the procedures beforehand. The Commission agreed, however, that whatever procedures are used to make a decision should be shared with the faculty member under investigation. This communication does not necessarily have to be written, nor does it have to occur before action is taken.

It was suggested that the sentence beginning "Policies and procedures for conducting" be deleted. It was also suggested that the sentence beginning "Generally, these investigations" be changed to "Generally, these investigations result in a report of findings which will be shared with the faculty. In some cases, the report will also contain a recommendation to the relevant administrator(s) for sanctions if warranted."

B. Minor vs. Severe Sanctions

The Commission discussed concerns over the distinction between minor and

severe sanctions and whether or not it was awkward and confusing to discuss the issue of minor sanctions in Section 2.11.2 of the Faculty Handbook. It was concluded that the discussion of minor sanctions was adequately covered in other areas of the handbook and that any mention of minor sanctions should be removed from this part of the handbook.

It was agreed that:

The title of section 2.11.1 change to "Imposition of Severe Sanctions"

Item #1 under this section remain titled "Definitions and Examples:"

The first paragraph beginning "Minor sanctions include" be eliminated.

Item #2 entitled "Process for Imposing a Minor Sanction:" be eliminated

Item #3 entitled "Process for Imposing a Severe Sanction:" be

re-numbered

#2.

C. Gustafson mentioned a letter written by Leon Geyer, who was concerned with when and how principal investigators should be removed or suspended. Hyer thought that this matter had been referred to the Research Commission last spring and was not a matter to be considered by the CFA. Gustafson is re-checking this matter.

D. The Commission decided that the paragraph at the end of the ethics policy should have the heading, "Committee on Faculty Ethics."

E. Gustafson told the members that she had contacted several department heads regarding whether or not denied promotion to full professor prior to six years as associate professor had lead to problems because no recourse for appeal exists in current policy. The results of the informal and small telephone survey have indicated that no policy problem exists. Gustafson also informed the Commission that Provost Meszaros was going to announce the quest for information on this topic to both the University Department Heads/Chairs and the University Deans at their upcoming meetings and ask them to contact Gustafson if they had experienced any difficulty in this area.

Adjournment at 4:45PM

Respectfully submitted,
Trina Doran

Commission on Faculty Affairs Minutes

Meeting: October 24, 1997

Approved: December 12, 1997

Present: Sigrid Gustafson (Chair), Pat Hyer, Robert Bates, Hara Misra, Peter Shires, Mario Karfakis, Sue Tolin, Mary D. Moore, Deborah Mayo, Trina Doran, Jonathan Fisher

Absent: Janet Johnson, Kathryn Clarke-Albright, Donna Dunay, Tom Hergert, Darlene Grega

I. Minutes

The Commission approved the minutes of the October 10, 1997 meeting.

II. Severe Sanctions Issue

The Commission reviewed the proposed revisions to Section 2.11 of the Faculty Handbook.

A. Incompetence

1. A new issue was brought forward at this time. The question put forth was whether or not "Incompetence" should be included in the list of the seven behaviors that may be considered adequate cause for dismissal. Some members of the committee felt that the issue of incompetence is covered in the section on post-tenure review (PTR) in the handbook. They felt that they would rather have their peers determine incompetence in a PTR. There was some confusion as to who would decide on a faculty member's incompetence if the issue was placed under section 2.11 "Imposition of a Severe Sanction or Dismissal for Cause." Further, this group felt that the other items in the list adequately covered the issue of incompetence and that incompetence should not be determined based on a single incident.

2. Other members of the committee felt that incompetence should remain on the list under Adequate Cause. They felt that although 99% of the time dismissal due to incompetence is determined in the PTR, the door should be left open for cases where incompetence issues needed to be acknowledged before two years of unsatisfactory performance (required to trigger a PTR) had elapsed.

3. After much discussion, the committee decided to guard against incompetence's being judged prematurely and spontaneously. The following changes were proposed:

a. Section 2.11.1 Adequate Cause, #2 will now read, "incompetence (as determined through post-tenure review and departmental minimum standards),".

b. The final paragraph in Section 2.11.1 will now begin, "Adequate cause is usually determined by a thorough and careful investigation by an appropriately-charged faculty committee (as in the case of allegations of ethical or scholarly misconduct), through a post-tenure review, or by the relevant administrator (for example, the department head, EO/AA Officer, Internal Auditory, or Campus Police).

4. The motion to make the suggested changes was approved unanimously by the Commission.

B. The Commission voted unanimously to cease revising the Severe Sanctions policy and to submit the approved revisions to the Faculty Senate for their consideration in the November 18, 1997 meeting.

III. Promotion to Full issue

Gustafson reported that there were no new reports from the department heads/chairs that faculty are concerned with the issue that professors may

be denied promotion to full professor prior to six years as an associate professor and have no recourse for appeals. The Commission voted unanimously to drop this issue and not to raise with the Faculty Senate.

IV. Hyer's update on the issue of Pay for Credit Overload

The issue was postponed for discussion and put on the agenda for the next CFA meeting.

V. Meeting adjourned 4:45 PM

Submitted by:
Trina Doran

Commission on Faculty Affairs
Meeting: December 12, 1997
Approved: January 23, 1998

Present: Sigrid Gustafson (Chair), Pat Hyer, Robert Bates, Hara Misra, Mary D. Moore, Tom Hergert, Trina Doran, Janet Johnson, Sue Tolin, Darlene Grega, Donna Dunay, Deborah Mayo

Absent: Jonathan Fisher, Mario Karfakis, Kathryn Clarke-Albright, Peter Shires

I. Minutes

The commission approved the minutes of the October 24, 1997 meeting.

II. Severe Sanctions Policy

The Commission received an explanation of the discussions held during the last meeting of the Faculty Senate (11/17), regarding the proposed Severe Sanctions Policy. Gustafson also notified the Commission (1) that University Counsel Kay Heidbreder had accepted both amendments that the Senate had passed and that (2) the policy met AAUP guidelines. Hyer then explained what was discussed regarding the Administrative and Professional Faculty's parallel Severe Sanctions policy.

The Commission passed the resolution, Imposition of Sanctions Other Than Dismissal; it will be forwarded to the to the University Council.

It was suggested that the entire document, including those sections on dismissal for cause which do not change, be mailed as printed hard copies to University Council members for consideration, rather than being transmitted electronically.

III. Report on Promotion Bonus Policies at other universities (Pat Hyer)

Hyer discussed the results of the survey conducted by the Office of Institutional Research concerning salary adjustments for faculty recommended for promotion. The results showed that some institutions use a fixed amount whereas others use a percentage formula to calculate promotion adjustments. Hyer stated that a proposal will be made to the Board of Visitors in February and asked for suggestions from the Commission.

The Commission felt that a greater jump in reward should accrue to being promoted to Full Professor from Associate than to Associate from Assistant.

Accordingly, the Commission recommended to the Provost that

1) the adjustment for promotion to Associate Professor be \$2500 (currently \$1500) and promotion to Full Professor be set at \$3500 (currently \$2000). This is the preferred option.

An alternative recommendation was that

2) the salary increase for promotion to either Associate or Full Professor should equal the current average of other states using fixed amounts, that is, \$2300 and \$3200, respectively.

The Commission made no changes in the recommendation of adjustment from Instructor to Assistant Professor, proposed as \$2000 (currently \$1000).

IV. University Committee on Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action

The Commission unanimously passed the minutes of the University Committee on Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action for their October 7 and November 6, 1997 meetings.

V. Report on University Benefits Committee

Hyer reported on the work of the University Benefits Committee. The Committee is concerned with the issue of a long-term care policy for university employees. The committee has investigated types and typical terms of such policies and has made initial recommendations for the kind of coverage which may be appropriate for university employees. An RFP will

not be issued, however, until it is known whether or not the General Assembly will be taking action on long-term care for all state employees. A state-wide plan would undoubtedly be cheaper because it would cover a larger pool of insured employees. If there is no action during the upcoming session, the committee may proceed with requesting bids from various companies for long-term care coverage to be paid by employees.

VI. Re-Visiting the Severe Sanctions Policy

Mayo, who was not present for the vote on the resolution, Imposition of Sanctions Other than Dismissal (her vote was taken when she arrived), discussed the possibility that there may be an inconsistency in the wording of the revised policy on severe sanctions. The Commission was alerted to the fact that the Faculty Senate amendments may make the pre-amended version confusing. The Commission decided that this issue, if it were to be addressed, would have to be raised at University Council.

VII. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 PM.

Submitted by:
Trina Doran

Commission on Faculty Affairs
Minutes of January 23, 1998, meeting
Approved: February 13, 1998

Present: Sigrid Gustafson (Chair), Pat Hyer, Robert Bates, Hara Misra, Sue Tolin, Tom Hergert, Trina Doran, Kathryn Clarke-Albright, Mario Karfakis, Mary D. Moore

Absent: Darlene Grega, Janet Johnson, Peter Shires, Donna Dunay, Deborah Mayo, Peggy Meszaros, Jonathan Fisher

I. Minutes

The minutes from the December 12, 1997 meeting were unanimously approved.

II. Trigon Health Plan Update

Members of the CFA who are also members of the Benefits Committee reported on the issue of the Trigon Health Plan's possible elimination of Montgomery Hospital as an approved provider for VT employees. It was reported that this issue was resolved until 1999 in favor of continuing to allow faculty and staff to receive health care from Montgomery Hospital.

III. Promotion Raises

Hyer reported that the proposal which recommended promotion adjustments in the amount of \$2,500 for Associate and \$3,500 for Full Professor will be reviewed by the Board of Visitors at their February 3rd meeting.

IV. Possible Policy Revision

It was suggested by the assessment working group in the Faculty Senate that the CFA may want to examine Section 3.9 in the Faculty Handbook for possible revisions. This section concerns the five year reviews made for Deans. The group was concerned that five years may be too long to wait between reviews, given that many Deans do not hold their positions for this length of time. A second concern centered around the kinds of faculty who would be included in the review process.

Hyer stated that a policy already in existence might already address the above-mentioned issues. She further suggested that because it takes nine months to evaluate Deans and three months to evaluate Department Heads, more frequent evaluations might be cumbersome. Gustafson will find the relevant policy statement and share Hyer's concerns with the Senate's assessment working group.

V. Overload Compensation Policy vs. "Collegiality" Issue

Gustafson suggested two possibilities for CFA's next project. One issue concerned the overload compensation policy. Although the Lucent contract is currently "on hold," it was suggested that the CFA should establish some basic policy parameters regarding overload compensation. If this project were undertaken, it would allow ample time for the CFA to think about what strategy would be best and to draft a policy before it was needed, instead of being rushed by an immediate necessity when the Lucent or a similar contract materialized.

A second potential area concerned constructive interpersonal relations - specifically, whether or not interpersonal effectiveness could or should be used as a criterion for faculty promotions and evaluations. The overload compensation issue was discussed first. Hyer explained that Virginia Tech, at this point in time, does not have a policy to pay faculty to teach extra courses if they are already being paid the maximum amount allotted by VT. One problem with entertaining the possibility that VT may begin paying for overload work is that defining a "full load" will be difficult. Also, the faculty who are currently working more than a full load will want to be compensated as well, which will result in huge costs for the university.

The Commission discussed the possibility of working on this issue until May. By this time, the group would want to have agreed upon certain definitions and to have put their initial thoughts in writing, perhaps in the form of some "Guidelines for Consideration" to be used in next year's policy-making decisions.

CFA members decided in favor of addressing the overload compensation issue.

Dixon Hanna and Bruce Chaloux will be invited to come to the next CFA meeting to present information pertinent to this issue, and Hyer will circulate some background material for CFA members to read in preparation for that meeting.

VI. The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 PM.

Submitted by:
Trina Doran

Commission on Faculty Affairs
Minutes of February 13, 1998 meeting
Approved: February 27, 1998

Present: Sigrid Gustafson (Chair), Pat Hyer, Hara Misra, Tom Hergert, Trina Doran, Kathryn Clarke-Albright, Mario Karfakis, Donna Dunay, Deborah Mayo, Darlene Grega, Janet Johnson, Peter Shires, Mary Moore

Absent: Sue Tolin, Jonathan Fisher, Robert Bates

I. Minutes

The minutes from the January 23, 1998 meeting were unanimously approved.

II. Sickness and Disability Program Update

Doug Martin spoke to the members of CFA on the issue of the Senate Bill 126:

A Sickness and Disability Program for State Employees. He gave the group an overview of the bill which proposes some changes to the current program offered to state employees. The new program offers a plan for sick leave, family and personal leave, and short term and long term disability for classified employees and faculty who are members of the Virginia Retirement System (VRS). The program is currently optional, but will be required for new employees after January 1, 1999. Current employees will have the option of keeping their current plan, exchanging their existing sick leave to sick leave under the new program, or converting their existing sick leave to VRS service credit. The new plan will cover 60% of salary for long-term disabilities that last for more than 6 months. Individuals may remain on long-term disability until the age of 65. Martin reported that the bill has a good chance of passing when the General Assembly votes on this issue. Martin will send Gustafson information on the bill to pass along to members of the Faculty Senate so that he may address any concerns they might raise.

III. Compensation for Overload Policy

Dixon Hanna spoke to the CFA about the circumstances that precipitated the need for establishing an overload pay policy. He explained that last year Lucent Technologies expressed an interest in having a masters program in electrical engineering available to its employees in several states via distance learning. In this case, the company wanted a specific faculty member to teach part of the program. Hanna stated that since this professor was already heavily committed, there was no way to take on the course dedicated to Lucent employees as part of his load and the university has no way of compensating faculty for credit overload. University policy allows additional payments to faculty teaching non-credit continuing education programs, but a policy is now needed to handle situations in which the course is offered for credit in an asynchronous, or synchronous, distance-learning mode, or in which the professor travels to another location to teach a course that qualifies as overload. In order to pursue this possibility with Lucent, the Board of Visitors authorized university officials to provide overload pay as needed during a two-year period during which guidelines would be piloted and formal policy developed through the Commission.

Several issues came up during the ensuing discussion. Under the current policy for payment for non-credit instruction, individuals may earn up to 33.3% of their academic year (AY) salaries during the academic year and another 33.3% of their AY salaries during the summer months. It was suggested that this cap on supplemental earnings be extended to cover payment for credit overload as well as non-credit continuing education. It was thought that department heads should be given basic rules to follow when making compensation decisions, but that they should also be allowed a certain amount of flexibility to deal with individual situations.

One issue at hand is the problem of defining what constitutes "overload"

since "load" is not always specified in the contracts of employees. Employees' course teaching obligations differ across departments and depend, in part, on whether or not there is a graduate program in the department and how many graduate students the professor is supervising, etc. Other issues that will have to be considered in writing the policy will be how much time does it really take a professor to teach a course when it is delivered electronically and who will make the decisions concerning when a professor has taken on too much "overload". Another point made was that overtime commitments by classified staff involved in developing or delivering such courses must also be compensated.

Further, there are budget implications inherent in all decisions concerning compensation for overload. Hyer discussed some options for the amount of pay for overload in credit situations. One option might be to use the summer school formula for determining the rate of pay, which is 3.75% per credit hour up to a specified cap. However, this pay rate is substantially higher than the rates paid by other institutions documented in the Institutional Research (IR) report. Such costs might "price VT out of the market". The IR report of practices at other institutions shows that a number of them are using adjunct professor rates (e.g. \$2500-5000 per course, depending on field). Again, the flat rate structure which seems to fit the standard lecture course format is not very appropriate for asynchronous web-based courses.

Commission members agreed that the creation of an overload pay policy was important and that the context for this discussion should be focussed on providing overload pay as an incentive for the expansion of our extended campus programs, rather than trying to provide additional compensation for traditional campus coursework.

Bruce Chaloux will attend the February 27th meeting to give the group more information concerning this issue. The discussion will be continued at that time.

IV. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Submitted by:
Trina Doran

Commission on Faculty Affairs
Minutes of February 27, 1998 meeting
Approved: March 27, 1998

Present: Sigrid Gustafson (Chair), Pat Hyer, Trina Doran, Kathryn Clarke-Albright, Mario Karfakis, Peter Shires, Janet Johnson, Deborah Mayo, Mary Moore, Sue Tolin

Absent: Donna Dunay, Jonathan Fisher, Robert Bates, Tom Hergert, Hara Misra

I. Minutes

The minutes from the February 13, 1998 meeting were unanimously approved.

II. Compensation for Overload Policy

Bruce Chaloux spoke to the CFA about issues the CFA should consider when preparing a policy to cover payment for credit instruction when that instruction constitutes a teaching "overload."

Chaloux recommended that if the CFA would like to write some basic guidelines for how to compensate individuals in overload situations, the guidelines should be limited to situations in which the professor and the students are not in the same physical location, whether the course is taught synchronously or asynchronously.

Chaloux advised the CFA that such a policy should begin by stating general criteria to be used in assessing the typical "full load" of a full time faculty member in any given department. The CFA should examine several departments to be used in creating "load baselines" in every department. The areas of teaching, service, and research should be used in creating such a list of general criteria. In the future, faculty would have to request to be considered for compensation for overload by demonstrating that the addition of another course constituted an instance of "overload".

The CFA discussed the fact that, due to the extreme variability among departments across campus, final decisions regarding what constitutes a "load" versus an "overload" will lie with Department Heads/Chairs. It was suggested that constructing a policy general enough to account for the variability across departments might not be possible and that, since every case would have to be considered on an individual basis anyway, perhaps the sole decision should reside within departments. Some members felt that it would be very difficult to define a typical "load" and that there are no good measures of research and service contributions.

Chaloux advised the group that, although difficult, constructing such a general policy will ultimately be necessary due to demands from Richmond for research universities such as Tech to provide documentation that faculty members are carrying a "full load". He felt that the University should have its own criteria for what constitutes a full load because if decisions are made by Department Heads/Chairs, virtually all faculty requests to teach additional courses would qualify as overload, given that all faculty are assumed to be working to full capacity. Gustafson suggested that the CFA conduct some pilot research by gathering data from several Departments who have expressed interest in using a compensation for overload policy.

There are several issues which the CFA wants to consider as they write a draft or outline of such a policy. One is the difficulty in calculating hours spent in advising and research for faculty members. However, if four courses a semester is considered a full load, and faculty members may take time off from teaching by filling this slot with research hours, it may be possible to arrive at guidelines to be used in defining a typical load. The CFA must also consider the amount of compensation that will be offered to faculty and paid by the university in instances of overload. The amounts paid to faculty for overload instruction by institutions included in the Institutional Research report show adjunct rates of \$2,500-5,000 per course as typical--a relatively low amount. This range probably reflects a cost structure for these courses but may also

suggest that the payment may not be much of an incentive for certain faculty to become involved.

It was suggested that the amount of compensation remain flexible within a range so that faculty could be paid more if the contract was with a company that was willing to increase the pay. Chaloux recommended that the University stay away from payment plans based on the number of students enrolled in the course. He suggested a percentage-based payment plan tied to the faculty's base salary with a maximum and minimum payment specified. He also suggested that a "revenue-sharing" mechanism be proposed, whereby any profit be shared with the departments, which bear the cost of course development and delivery.

Chaloux left the CFA with several issues to consider when creating guidelines for this policy. He said that any policy must consider that, at times, having a faculty member travel from his or her home base or teach a course in an asynchronous format may not be considered an overload situation. It may be the case that, due to shrinking work loads in other areas, this type of teaching would be expected of faculty members and should be considered part of their regular work load.

Chaloux also felt that the difficulty of and time devoted to course development should be considered when deciding whether or not the addition of another course would place the faculty member in an overload situation. For instance, especially, with courses offered over the Web, a considerable amount of time is needed for course development, over and beyond that which is required if the course were to be taught in a synchronous manner.

Chaloux felt that guidelines for such a policy should include a statement concerning Continuing Education. It should state that the university already has mechanisms for dealing with these situations and that the new procedure expands existing policy to account for "overload" situations.

In summing up, the CFA decided to write a draft of a policy or an outline of a future policy, to pay faculty for teaching courses offered for credit in "overload" situations. Hyer stated that she has already written a one page document on this issue and will bring it to the next meeting.

III. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Submitted by:
Trina Doran

Commission on Faculty Affairs
Minutes of March 27, 1998 meeting
Approved: April 24, 1998

Present: Sigrid Gustafson (Chair), Pat Hyer, Peter Shires, Janet Johnson, Donna Dunay, Tom Hergert
Absent: Sue Tolin, Jonathan Fisher, Robert Bates, Hara Mishra, Trina Doran, Kathryn Clarke-Albright, Mario Karfakis, Deborah Mayo

Discussion began at 3:00.

I. Continuing discussion of pay-for-credit-overload policy issues

Hyer reported on her conversation with her counterpart at UVA regarding their guidelines and experiences with overload. UVA has had an overload policy for 10 years with no serious abuses. It seems to be used infrequently for on-campus (on-grounds) overload; the administration strongly discourages this. Most overload payments are for off-grounds teaching. At UVA the definition of load is left to the department head and dean. The pay rate for an overload, off-grounds credit courses is typically 120% of the faculty member's "daily rate." For example, the daily rate for a faculty member with an AY salary of \$50,000 would be calculated by dividing \$50,000 by 195 days (39 weeks times 5 days/week) to obtain the daily rate of \$256/day. A 3-credit course with 45 contact hours is calculated at the equivalent of 15 days. Thus the course payment would be \$4608. The total pay for overload may not exceed 33% of salary. In addition, overload activities are controlled by amount of time and effort and included within the overall limitations for consulting; that is, consulting, plus continuing education non-credit, plus overload credit may not exceed the total time available for consulting as defined in the policy. Deans must report to the Provost who and why any earnings exceed the limitations of the policy.

Hyer further reported that questions related to overload pay are being discussed on campus by the business plan subcommittee of the Institute for Distance and Distributive Learning. The policy recommendations coming from CFA will feed into that sub-committee.

Gustafson recommended that CFA continue with preparation of a guidelines regarding pay for overload. After discussion of various means for establishing ceilings and floors for pay, Hergert suggested that the scale for overload be based on the summer school formula of 11.25% of salary with three designated averages at the assistant, associate, and professor level.

CFA members present thought that would be an acceptable solution with the addition of the instructor level. There was an expressed preference for a scale that would pay faculty the same regardless of discipline; hence, the interest was in payments scaled by rank, rather than by a percentage of the individual's salary. Hyer said she would take the discussion points along with the recommendation and fold them into another draft policy guideline for CFA to consider.

II. Legislative action

Hyer reported on two actions passed in the legislature that would be of interest to faculty. First, a study is being conducted for the legislature to examine the additional employee benefit of long term care. The study is due to be completed October 1. Should the state program not consider the option of adding family members to such a policy, the Virginia Tech committee which has been working on such a policy for several years would look at a complementary program which might be made available to employees. Second, the Sick and Disability Program for State Employees passed in the legislature and will be required for new classified employees. Faculty members who choose VRS may opt for the new program or retain the university sick leave program, which provides better coverage for longer-term illnesses.

Discussion concluded at 4:40.

Submitted by:
Donna Dunay

Commission on Faculty Affairs

Minutes: April 10, 1998

Approved: April 24, 1998

Present: Sigrid Gustafson (Chair), Pat Hyer, Hara Misra, Trina Doran, Mario Karfakis, Robert Bates, Janet Johnson, Mary D. Moore, Sue Tolin

Absent: Peter Shires, Donna Dunay, Jonathan Fisher, Tom Hergert, Kathryn Clarke-Albright, Deborah Mayo, Darlene Grega

I. Update on "Guidelines for the Review of Department Heads and Deans" issue

Gustafson informed CFA members of the Senate assessment working group's progress concerning the documentation of their concerns regarding the review of academic administrative faculty. She notified the CFA that a set of guidelines, or issues to consider, will be drawn up and presented to the Faculty Senate meeting on Tuesday.

II. Faculty compensation for credit overload

The discussion began with a review of the issues discussed at the previous CFA meeting. One issue of importance at that meeting had been the formulation of general guidelines for the payment of faculty who instruct courses for credit in an overload situation. The faculty desired a payment scale that would reflect the faculty member's rank as opposed to determining payment on the basis of department or discipline. A percentage of the mean salary within each rank was suggested.

At the current meeting, Hyer provided evidence that basing overload compensation on the current mean salary within each rank, from Instructor to Full Professor, would be prohibitively expensive, in terms of pricing Virginia Tech out of the distance learning market. Further calculations performed during the meeting indicated that the same problem would be encountered if overload payment were based on the mean entering salary for each rank, or on summer school pay. Moreover, payments based on percentages of means were considered by some to be too cumbersome because they would have to be re-computed each year.

Other options were considered, including using adjunct rates, as do a number of other institutions. However, it was generally thought that adjunct rates were too low.

After much discussion, the CFA members decided to recommend the use of flat sums to compensate faculty for teaching credit courses beyond their normal load. Recommended starting points for the pilot project were: \$2,500/course for an Instructor; \$3000/course for an Assistant Professor; \$4000/course for an Associate Professor; and \$5,000/course for a Full Professor. These payments represented a compromise between keeping the university competitive and paying enough to make overload teaching desirable to faculty. The flat rates could vary, however, if there were extenuating circumstances. Such exceptions would have to be approved by the Department Head/Chair, the Dean, the faculty member and the sponsor. Moreover, any faculty member would be able to refuse to teach an overload course.

These guidelines for compensation in overload situations will be reviewed after one year or after an adequate number of instructors have been compensated by this method to make appropriate evaluations possible.

It was decided that this issue would not be presented at the next Faculty Senate meeting because: (1) only pilot work is being planned at the present time; and (2) the results of the CFA's deliberations will serve as recommendations to the bodies charged with formulating the final (or pilot)

overload policy and do not, in and of themselves, constitute a proposed addition to the Faculty Handbook.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 P.M.

Submitted by,
Trina Doran

Commission on Faculty Affairs
Minutes: April 24, 1998 meeting
Approved: April 27, 1998

Present: Sigrid Gustafson (Chair), Pat Hyer, Trina Doran, Janet Johnson, Mary Moore, Deborah Mayo, Peter Shires

Absent: Donna Dunay, Jonathan Fisher, Tom Hergert, Kathryn Clarke-Albright, Hara Misra, Mario Karfakis, Robert Bates, Darlene Grega, Sue Tolin

I. The minutes of the April 10, 1998 meeting were unanimously approved.

II. Evaluations of academic faculty holding administrative positions

Gustafson reported that a proposed section 3.9.2 in the Faculty Handbook, regarding the review of academic faculty holding administrative positions, passed at the last meeting of the Faculty Senate. She asked that the CFA attempt to satisfy the administration concerning the phrasing and placement of the document while maintaining the essential elements of the original proposal passed by the Senate.

It is the administration's opinion that the proposed rewording is largely procedural. Rather than including explicit procedures in the Handbook, any new wording should set forth general guidelines and then reference appropriate university documents on the Web. Hyer pointed out that periodic review of heads/chairs and deans is already standing policy and that the procedures used for such reviews are an administrative responsibility belonging to the Provost and deans in consultation with the relevant Faculty Associations. Thus, besides discussing what might eventually appear in the Handbook, our purpose at this meeting was to make recommendations and additions that we felt necessary to address certain faculty concerns. In addition, the importance of staff input's having a place in the process of these evaluations was emphasized.

Gustafson summarized the concerns of the Faculty Senate. There is a perception among some faculty that although department heads and deans undergo periodic reviews, the faculty who serve on the review committees may be "hand-picked" by whoever controls the composition of the committee. Therefore, the judgments of these faculty may not represent the judgments of the rest of the faculty in that academic unit. In addition, it is felt that Policy 6100, which briefly addresses department head evaluations, is neither widely known nor easily accessible. To provide faculty with information that is more readily available, general guidelines regarding such evaluations should be placed in the Faculty Handbook.

After reviewing the revised section 3.9.2 passed by the Faculty Senate, it was noted that there was no mention of periodic reviews of assistant or associate deans. Gustafson reported that the Faculty Senate was more concerned with the evaluations of deans and department heads/chairs, as these are generally the people who evaluate the faculty. She felt that the evaluation of other administrators may be an issue the Senate would like to pursue in the future but that, for the present, they would like to concentrate on deans and department heads/chairs, as their evaluation has been an ongoing issue with the group.

Some CFA members also felt that the timing of departmental reviews and reviews of department heads and chairs is an issue to consider, given that such reviews are often time-consuming and cumbersome. It was first suggested that such reviews should be done simultaneously. Further discussion, however, concluded with the decision to make no recommendation regarding the coordination of both reviews because the departmental reviews already follow a determined schedule that, within any given department, may or may not be compatible with conducting the review of a head or chair.

The issue of evaluating other college administrators, besides deans and department heads/chairs, was then re-visited. Hyer and Johnson pointed out that, at least in some colleges, assistant or associate deans, as well as the actual dean, do, in fact, evaluate faculty. Furthermore, even assistant or associate deans who do not evaluate faculty directly may exert a substantial impact on a faculty member's professional life, in terms of negotiating outside contracts, allocating funds, etc. Therefore, it was suggested (1) that individuals who hold these positions should be included in whatever policies and procedures are documented for evaluating deans and (2) that we may need two separate evaluation policies and procedures--one for deans and their staffs and one for department heads and chairs.

III. Revisions of the original "Proposed wording" document passed by the Senate

A. It was decided that the five guidelines originally proposed for the Faculty Handbook should be amended and condensed into four general guidelines. With a brief introductory statement emphasizing that the purpose of the evaluations is to develop fair and effective leadership, these general guidelines will be included in the Faculty Handbook and will apply to evaluations of collegiate administrators (deans, assistant and associate deans, and heads/chairs):

- 1) The composition of the committee to review collegiate academic administrators will include tenured faculty and peer administrators. (Further guidance concerning membership from other groups may need to be addressed here or in the more detailed procedural documents.)
- 2) The review committee will seek input from staff, students, and all faculty in the academic unit of which the subject is a member.
- 3) The review committee will report its findings to the subject's supervisor, who, in consultation with the review committee, will determine how to convey these findings to the academic unit. The supervisor will convey the results to the subject.
- 4) The periodic reviews should take no longer than four months, from inception to final report.

B. Hyer proposed the following strategy to respond to the Senate's concerns. Revisions could be done over the summer and shared with deans and others who should have an opportunity to comment on final language, given their responsibility for conducting the evaluations and the fact that many colleges already have detailed procedures for these reviews. The changes should be in place by early fall since most do not constitute a change in the basic policy already included in the Handbook.

1) Place the guidelines above, once finalized, in Chapter 2 of the Faculty Handbook, probably in, or after, section 2.9 which concerns annual evaluation and post-tenure review. (Although the original proposal had been suggested as an addition to Chapter 3, that chapter is really focused on administrative and professional faculty, most of whom serve in roles outside of the academic colleges. Chapter 2 would appear to be a more visible and appropriate location for material related to periodic reviews of departmental and collegiate administrators.)

2) Revise Policy 6100 to include additional points made in the document passed by the Senate at its April 14, 1998 meeting. Issues to be addressed in the revised Policy 6100 include the frequency of reviews for department heads/chairs, the recommendation that new heads/chairs receive an abbreviated review at the end of their second year, the manner in which reviews for chairs whose terms are less than five years will be handled, and the involvement of a college's Faculty Association in determining the exact procedure each college will use for evaluating the heads or chairs of all departments in that college, including the composition of the review committee.

3) A parallel document will be written and issued by the Provost to codify

the process that is already being followed for evaluating deans.

4) Section 3.9 of the Faculty Handbook will be updated to reflect how the administrative and professional faculty are being evaluated now that the Benchmarks program from the Center for Creative Leadership is in effect.

IV. The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 PM after acknowledging Sigrid Gustafson's commendable work as chair of this committee.

Submitted by:
Trina Doran