

Commission on Faculty Affairs

Minutes of September 11, 1998 Meeting
President's Board Room

Present: Richard Bambach, Janet Johnson, Rick Fell, Hara Misra, Mario Karfakis, Kamal Rojiani, Jackie Davis, Alicia Schultheis, Pat Hyer (for Peggy Meszaros), John Crunkilton

Absent: Paul Knox, Kathryn Clarke-Albright, Donna Dunay, Deborah Mayo, Peter Shires

The meeting was called to order by Richard Bambach at 3:05 PM. Members in attendance introduced themselves and indicated whom they were representing.

John Crunkilton was nominated to serve as secretary and he will work with Pat Hyer in taking minutes of the meeting. Official minutes of each meeting will be distributed electronically by Pat Hyer prior to the next meeting. Richard Bambach encouraged all members to send a replacement if they find they cannot attend a meeting.

Richard Bambach asked Commission members to be thinking of topics that should be taken under consideration this coming year. He suggested faculty evaluation as it relates to service might be one such topic. Do faculty receive credit or are they rewarded for service to the University? While a review of the total faculty evaluation process is too broad and procedures for reviewing and rewarding faculty for teaching and scholarly activities are more understood and formalized, the question remains "Are service activities rewarded as they should be since they are more difficult to measure and quantify?" He encouraged all Commission members to read the Faculty Handbook where it deals with faculty evaluation and talk with others to see if this is a perceived problem across the University.

The Commission then reviewed and discussed Policy 6100, Department Head and Chair Appointments, September 1, 1998 document (carry over item from last Spring) and a new Policy 6105, Periodic Evaluation of Academic Deans, September 1998 document (Third Draft).

Regarding Policy 6100, it states that "department heads or chairs serve for fixed-length terms, specified by the department." The question was raised, "Do departments really set the length of appointments?" Or do deans do this? Discussion also centered on the size of a department head review committee. Should size of the committee be specified? Membership of review committees should include administrative and professional faculty such as extension agents where appropriate, but the majority of a review committee should be academic faculty. It was recommended that the first sentence in the section "Nature of the Review" be omitted.

Regarding Policy 6105, a section needs to be added on what can or will trigger a review of a dean before a scheduled review, e.g. one-third of the faculty request such a review and/or the Provost can initiate a review. Discussion also centered on the word "encourages" that refers to review of associate and assistant deans. Commission members felt that reviews of associate deans and key college administrators who had an impact on the life of faculty should be required. It was recommended that assistant deans be removed from this sentence since CFA members felt that college administrators who served primarily in staff roles need not be reviewed. In addition, it was agreed that the review of such personnel would be more limited in scope than the comprehensive process applied to the deans themselves. Pat Hyer collected other comments regarding Policy 6105 and will share a revised copy of this policy at the next meeting and discuss these proposed changes with the deans later in the month. The schedule, "Administrator Periodic Reviews," a schedule for the review of administrators at Virginia Tech, was distributed to Commission members for

information concerning the timing of reviews for academic deans.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Recorder - John R. Crunkilton

COMMISSION ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

September 25, 1998 Minutes
President's Board Room

Present: Richard Bambach, Larkin Dudley for Paul Knox, Rick Fell, Mario Karfakis, Deborah Mayo, Jackie Davis, Pat Hyer (for Peggy Meszaros), Megan Debranski, Hara Misra, Alicia Schultheis, John Crunkilton

Absent: Kamal Rojiani, Janet Johnson, Kathryn Clarke-Albright, Donna Dunay, Peter Shires

The meeting was called to order by Richard Bambach at 3:00 PM.

Minutes of the September 11, 1998 meeting were approved as distributed.

CFA representation on University Committees:

Employee Benefits - Hara Misra volunteered

EOAA - No one volunteered and Richard Bambach will contact one of the CFA members not present to see if a person volunteers

Status of Dean and Department Head Review documents:

Pat Hyer shared revised drafts of the following: No. 6105, Periodic Evaluation of Academic Deans - fifth draft, 9/24/98 and No. 6100, Department Head or Chair Appointments - draft, 9/24/98, and DRAFT 9/24/98 on Proposed New Section to the Faculty Handbook. Discussion followed on each of the documents and specific points were as follows:

No. 6105:

All revisions in bold print were reviewed and no objections were raised.

No. 6100:

All revisions in bold print were reviewed and one change was suggested and made. Section 2.7 on page 3, the next to the last line, the word "changed" was changed to "adjusted." It now reads "Éthe salary will be adjusted to reflectÉ."

New Section of the Faculty Handbook:

At top of last page, the word "academic" was changed to "college." It now reads "É..as that outlined for the college dean."

Fell moved and Mayo seconded to approve these documents. Motion passed. Since there is no change in the basic policy of periodic review for these administrators, but only greater explication of the procedures to be used, these items will now be issued administratively by the Provost to the Deans, Directors, and Department Heads with copies to CFA members. 6100 and 6105 will be available on the web and the material for the Faculty Handbook included in the forthcoming revision.

Passport charge for faculty dependents using recreational sport facilities:

Use of the recreation facilities for family members used to be free, now there is a \$15 charge for them to obtain a Hokie Passport to validate admission. CFA members were unsure of what other benefits were entitled to the holders of the Passport. Bambach will gather more information about this situation.

9-month faculty pay being distributed over 12 months, not 9 months:

Discussion followed on why this is the case and several issues were raised. e.g. Social Security, benefits, etc. Bambach will check with Minnis Ridenour to learn more of the reasons for this practice and implications of any changes considered.

Benefits provided to emeriti faculty:

First, to be considered for emeritus status, the department must recommend the faculty member, it is not automatic. Differences occur across campus on just what is provided by departments to emeriti faculty, there is no set standard or University policy. The point was made that emeriti faculty were not eligible for bookstore discounts of computer purchases, etc. Bambach will contact the Manager of the Bookstore to see if this could be possible.

Suspension/removal of PIs from projects:

There is no policy directly addressing this situation. It has happened. Evidently this issue was brought up to CFA in the past, but no action was taken. A draft proposal addressing this situation was sent to the Commission on Research by Leon Geyer on behalf of the Faculty Review Committee, but the Commission chose not to react. Two points were made. Regardless of where the project is housed, who is directing it, and who funded it, the University is ultimately responsible for the project. And second, if a PI feels that an injustice occurred, he/she has the grievance procedure available. Another question was raised, does this relate to "severe sanctions" discussed last year? The answer to this was no; the sanctions process is purposefully deliberate and if there were a serious problem with mismanagement of funds or project, the response must be immediate. Nor does removal of PI status automatically result in a reduction of pay or rank, which is the basic definition of a severe sanction. Bambach will check for further information on the discussion of the proposal in the Commission on Research and if it warrants, he will bring it back to CFA for further discussion.

Policy about off-campus teaching:

A concern was raised about a department head who signed a contract to deliver a course off campus, out of state, but did not consult the faculty. Subsequently, a faculty member was assigned to teach this course. CFA members were encouraged to read Section 4.1 Assignment of Academic Responsibilities in the Faculty Handbook. The bottom line is that department heads, chairs, or division directors have the authority to assign teaching and advising loads. The grievance procedure was again referred to as a mechanism for a faculty member to pursue if he/she thinks an injustice has occurred. While section 4.1 was written and approved years ago when most teaching occurred on campus, the question was raised if this policy as written needs reconsideration with distance learning, web based courses, and other means of delivering courses in a modern instructional technology age? This topic may be pursued at the next meeting.

Evaluation of service:

Bambach again brought this topic up, but there was no consensus on what to do with this topic.

No other new items were brought up.

Meeting adjourned 4:30 PM.

John R. Crunkilton, Recorder

COMMISSION ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

October 9, 1998
Room 110 Burruss Hall

Present: Richard Bambach, Rick Fell, Kamal Rojiani, Jackie Davis, Megan Debranski, Peggy Meszaros, Janet Johnson, Hara Mirsa, Donna Dunay, John Crunkilton

Absent: Paul Knox, Mario Karfakis, Deborah Mayo, Kathryn Clarke-Albright, Peter Shires, Alicia Schultheis

The meeting was called to order by Richard Bambach at 3:00 PM.

Minutes of the September 25 meeting were approved as distributed.

Discussion continued on developing agenda items for the Commission. Recognizing faculty service contributions was suggested as one item and discussion on this item follows later in these minutes.

Bambach brought Commission members up to date on items from the September 25 meeting.

Policies 6100, 6105, and the Faculty Handbook section 2.9.5 with a cover letter from Peggy Meszaros was distributed by Pat Hyer to the Deans.

Passport charge situation - nothing to report yet

9 month vs 12 month pay situation - a request for information has been made to Minnis Ridenour, but no reply has been received.

Benefits for emeriti faculty - nothing to report yet

Suspension/removal of PIs from Projects - Bambach has talked with Leon Geyer, but discussion is continuing on this topic.

Off-campus teaching

Dave Alexander has been invited to the Commission's next meeting, October 23. He has both taught off campus over the years as well as heading a department where faculty also must teach off campus to serve their students. In discussions with him, Bambach reported that Dave indicated that it takes about 27 hours per week to teach one class off campus.

Copies of Section 4.1 Assignment of Academic Responsibilities from the Faculty Handbook were distributed. When Richard Bambach searched university materials, he did not find off-campus teaching mentioned. Concerns raised with off-campus teaching revolve around the travel time involved. It was also mentioned that distance learning and web-based courses require more time of the faculty than regular courses. What impact or implications does the "extended campus" concept have on future faculty loads? Some faculty travel away from Blacksburg to offer courses, then we have faculty stationed off-campus that travel to Blacksburg to offer courses.

The question was raised "how do our peer institutions handle off-campus teaching?" Peggy indicated that Pat Hyer might be able to provide some information related to what peer institutions are doing either from information in her office or from their web pages. The Commission was cautioned about suggesting policy due to one case or problem. This topic will be discussed further when Dave Alexander attends the next meeting

Evaluation of Faculty Service Contributions

Discussion continued on this topic. Major points made were: faculty are heavily loaded with classes and other responsibilities; hard to get volunteers (nobody has agreed yet to be the CFA rep on EOAA); recognition of faculty for service contributions can be higher than it is now; P and T discussions at the University level does include a faculty member's contribution to university service; busy faculty are the ones who tend to get things done, so they are asked to do more and more; when one faculty was asked to serve on Faculty Senate, the response was "that it was a waste of time;" some department heads discourage young faculty member from service type of activities, they want the new faculty member to spend time developing good teaching skills, research projects, and scholarly publications; emphasis and rewards for university service varies throughout the university and departments; faculty with advanced ranks should take the lead in volunteering for university service, especially as they reach the tenure stage; we do have an Academy of Service to recognize university service; perhaps we have too many committees and thus, faculty get burned out; faculty need to feel they are making a contribution through committee work; university, college, and department administrators need to emphasize the value of university service; and what is the current feeling of faculty? Is this a problem/concern or is it not viewed as a problem/concern by faculty? Perhaps a survey needs to address this area to arrive at answer. Can the Senate pursue this?

Health of Higher Education

Peggy Meszaros shared some of her concerns regarding the future of higher education institutions. Who are the political groups having impact today on higher education? Education is becoming an environment for venture capitalists. This may not be all positive. Research dollars are coming more and more from industry, not the government, thus the research being conducted may not be what needs to be researched.

Meeting adjourned at 4:25 PM

John R. Crunkilton, Recorder

Commission on Faculty Affairs

Minutes

October 23, 1998

Present: Dick Bambach, Janet Johnson, Kamal Rojiani, Mario Karfakis, Donna Dunay, Hara Misra, Rick Fell, Pat Hyer (for Peggy Meszaros), Jackie Davis, Paul Knox

Absent: Kathryn Clarke-Albright, Deborah Mayo, Peter Shires, Alicia Schultheis, John Crunkilton

Guest: Dave Alexander

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes from October 9, 1998 were approved as submitted.

Assignment of Faculty Responsibilities:

Dick Bambach reopened the discussion of assignment of faculty responsibilities asking whether we needed to revisit the language in section 4.1 of the Faculty Handbook which gives authority to the department head in making assignments to faculty for teaching and advising. Changes in the nature of faculty work, particularly increased involvement in distance learning (on or off-campus) and outreach, are the impetus for the discussion. In addition, Bambach suggested that we may need to look at the larger issue of defining faculty workload and that, if we were able to define "load" more specifically, this might be helpful in the political discussions taking place outside the institution and act as a protection for faculty.

Several members disagreed about the value of tackling the definition of faculty workload. Among the points of discussion were: trying to decide what each piece of a faculty member's effort was worth may play into the hands of critics at the state level who are questioning what faculty do and the priorities they pursue; quantification of a faculty member's assignments would be extremely difficult given variation from semester to semester and from department to department and may lead to unknown and unwanted consequences; and CFA dealt with this issue last year in the context of determining whether overload pay should be authorized for faculty teaching distance learning on contract and determined that we did not want to determine "load" in any uniform way, but leave this definition and justification for overload to departments and colleges.

Turning from the broader issue of defining faculty workload to the narrower issue of assignment of off-campus teaching, David Alexander was invited to share his perspectives as someone who has taught off-campus for many years and as a department head involved in making off-campus assignments to faculty in his department. Alexander shared some of the history of compensation for off-campus teaching. At one time, faculty members were paid a dislocation allowance, 1% of their salary for each trip made. This was discontinued in 1976 in a trade with the state for more permanent positions, a number of which were then permanently based in Northern Virginia. For a period of time, off-campus teaching was also weighted at 1.5; this formula was discontinued by Provost Wilson many years ago. Since that time, department heads meet with faculty to determine reasonableness of off-campus assignments. In his department, they try not to assign faculty to more than one off-campus course per year, but each case is fact specific. For example, they would look at whether the faculty member has a grant, is heavily involved in dissertation supervision, how far they are required to go (Roanoke versus Tidewater, for example), which courses needed to be taught to the cohort and in which order, and other factors. They do not assign probationary faculty to teach off-campus unless it is absolutely necessary since they are trying to protect their time for

research and publication. Off-campus teaching is an expectation in their department and perhaps throughout the college. Since most of their coursework is provided as part of a complete program, it takes the commitment of many faculty to deliver a program to a particular site; they make this as a collective commitment.

Commission members felt the assignment of faculty work and the determination of off-campus programming is a departmental matter and that attempts to regulate it at the university level might jeopardize the flexibility needed to make it work. Fell pointed out that many faculty members with extension appointments have been handling off-campus travel and teaching commitments for many years.

New issues have been introduced by the university's involvement in distance learning and many of these remain unresolved as yet, by Virginia Tech or by any other institution. Although some of these issues may be related to faculty workload, many are not (such as how to charge tuition for out-of-state enrollees, etc.). Alexander expressed a great need for institutional guidance on outreach and distance learning, particularly enrollment projections by region and guidance on strategic directions so that they might plan more rationally for deploying faculty effort.

Bambach expressed continued concern about the extensive effort required of faculty involved in distance learning and whether such expectations were reasonable. Johnson and Knox reported that departments have tried to find ways to provide release time, summer pay, or other methods to allow faculty members to be involved in course redesign for distance learning. Fell responded that such expectations were not necessarily driven by administrative directive, but rather that faculty needed to be out ahead developing new directions for teaching and learning if they are to remain competitive. In his view, faculty cannot focus on the terms of their original contracts or conditions when they were hired 25 years ago, because institutions must change and so must faculty work. It is not really a matter of administrators requiring them to change, but of faculty responding to the changing world of higher education and their disciplines.

In response to the question whether addressing faculty workload issues more precisely might provide some political protection for faculty members, Alexander responded that accountability for faculty and institutions was a national issue and a political issue not likely to be influenced by defining faculty workload at Virginia Tech. In his opinion, it is absolutely critical that Virginia Tech grow its outreach programs so that we have visible tentacles in urban areas where there are more legislators. This is important for both political and programmatic reasons. This is one way to address accountability issues-- through outreach, faculty work can be visible and valued by regions outside Blacksburg and hopefully then by the politicians who represent these regions.

CFA members decided to conclude the discussion of assignment of faculty workload by NOT taking any action to revise section 4.1, preferring to leave the statement as worded in very general terms and using the grievance process to handle individual cases where workload assignments were perceived to be unfair.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Hyer

Commission on Faculty Affairs
Minutes
January 22, 1999

Present: Richard Bambach, Paul Knox, Rick Fell, Mario Karfakis, Kamal Rojiani, Deborah Mayo, Pat Hyer, Janet Johnson, Hara Misra, Alicia Schultheis, Jack Cranford, John Crunkilton

Absent Jackie Davis, Peggy Meszaros, Kathryn Clarke-Albright, Donna Dunay

Richard Bambach called the meeting to order and reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

Family Faculty Sick Leave Modification

Pat Hyer distributed Resolution 1998-99 B from the Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs proposing a modification in the faculty sick leave. The current policy provides for the use of six days per calendar year and the resolution proposes that be extended to ten days per calendar year and removes the restriction on the number of days that can be used per incident. The use of such leave would have to be recorded through the regular leave reporting system.

Discussion followed and the greatest concern centered on the record keeping that would be required of academic-year faculty who may not be accustomed to these monthly reports.

Motion was made, seconded, and unanimously passed to support this resolution.

Virginia Tech Family Scholarship Program - VTFSP

An ad-hoc committee is exploring the possibility of starting a scholarship for spouses and dependents of Virginia Tech employees who choose to enter the university. A DRAFT copy of the details of the formation of this scholarship was distributed. Comments about the VTFSP were basically positive and were centered on how the fund would be started and implemented. Special remarks, comments, or questions raised were: there are over 5000 employees at Virginia Tech and it is estimated that about 8 percent might be eligible for this scholarship in any one year; a goal is to develop a program that both faculty and staff would want to contribute to; state funds cannot legally be used to fund such a scholarship; the committee has discussed their ideas with the University Development Office, Office of Financial Aid, and other groups; program would be for dependents or spouses of employees who were currently employed at the time the student enters the University and the scholarship would be used to off set tuition; the University Development Office is concerned that faculty might contribute to this cause and not to any University campaign that might be planned or underway; a study of peer institutions indicated that about 50 percent have such a program, funding from 25-100 percent of the tuition cost of the student; and the goals for starting such a program would be the benefit to recruiting and retaining faculty and staff, developing a shared community value toward furthering one's education, and providing a visible incentive to staff to show that we value their role in the effective operation of our University.

A suggestion made was that the word "bachelor" be deleted under the Eligibility section and the word "undergraduate" be added. This would then include those who might enroll in the Associate Degree program in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

Motion was made, seconded, and unanimously passed to support the development of such a scholarship fund.

Assignment of Academic Responsibilities

This was a topic carried over from previous meetings. A handout distributed to the group included Section 4.1 from the Faculty Handbook which contained the current wording on this topic. Discussion centered around the situation where the current wording may not adequately cover situations involving faculty assignments in a contemporary educational environment. Basically the group agreed that the current statement is not as complete as it might be and does not encourage department heads to consult with faculty before teaching or non-routine assignments are made. With this in mind, the following change is being offered to help clarify the expectations. The proposed change in Section 4.1 is in all caps.

Assignment of teaching load and academic advising are the responsibility of the department head or chair and may vary from one term to the next depending on the department requirements. ASSIGNMENTS SHOULD INVOLVE CONSULTATION WITH THE FACULTY MEMBER AND IN CASES INVOLVING NON-ROUTINE ASSIGNMENTS, SUCH AS THOSE REQUIRING EXTENSIVE TRAVEL, CONSULTATION IS REQUIRED. ULTIMATELY THE DEPARTMENT HEAD OR CHAIR HAS THE AUTHORITY TO MAKE THE FINAL ASSIGNMENT.

The Commission will act on this proposed wording at the next meeting.

College and University Service Recognition

Bambach distributed the results of an opinion survey completed by members of the Faculty Senate as it relates to their thoughts on service at the college and university level. Discussion centered on the findings and implications of actions that the CFA might want to take. The Commission members were asked to study these findings and this agenda item will be continued at the next meeting.

Next meeting - February 12, 1999

John R. Crunkilton
Recorder

Commission on Faculty Affairs
Minutes
February 12, 1999

Present: Richard Bambach, Paul Knox, Rick Fell, Kamal Rojiani, Jackie Davis, Pat Hyer, Peggy Meszaros, Janet Johnson, Kathryn Clarke-Albright, Jack Cranford, Alicia Schultheis, John Crunkilton

Absent: Mario Karfakis, Deborah Mayo, Hara Misra, Donna Dunay

Richard Bambach called the meeting to order and reviewed the agenda for the meeting. Minutes of the January 22 meeting were approved as distributed.

Looking ahead to future meeting dates, Richard will not be available on March 26 and will need to identify a chair for that meeting and on April 9, the meeting will be canceled since it conflicts with Founder's Day.

Assignment of Academic Responsibilities

After a brief discussion, it was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the following statement be added to Section 4.1 in the Faculty Handbook. The new wording is in all CAPS.

Assignment of teaching load and academic advising are the responsibility of the department head or chair and may vary from one term to the next depending on the department requirements. ASSIGNMENTS SHOULD INVOLVE CONSULTATION WITH THE FACULTY MEMBER AND IN CASES INVOLVING NON-ROUTINE ASSIGNMENTS, SUCH AS THOSE REQUIRING EXTENSIVE TRAVEL, CONSULTATION IS REQUIRED. ULTIMATELY THE DEPARTMENT HEAD OR CHAIR HAS THE AUTHORITY TO MAKE THE FINAL ASSIGNMENT.

Pat Hyer and Richard Bambach will draft up a resolution to go with this change and submit it to the next level for approval.

Emeritus Faculty

Stan Burke, Chair of the CALS Faculty Affairs Committee has raised the question on the services or privileges extended to emeritus faculty. It appeared after some discussion that CFA members were unsure of what privileges were available to emeritus faculty or what types of privileges retired faculty would like to have at the University. In searching the Faculty Handbook, the only mention of emeritus faculty is in Section 2.4. The point was also made and the group agreed that retired faculty need recognition and they can still make a significant contribution to the University and many would like to if given the opportunity. It was also pointed out those retired faculty could be PI of a project, where the general impression is that they cannot. Hyer pointed out that the Retirement Transition program, which provides a framework for continued involvement with the department, is still available and described in policy number 4410. This program provides full coverage of health care costs through age 65 for tenured faculty who retire at age 60 or later.

After further discussion, it was decided that the following members would pursue this topic further in the areas identified and be ready to report at the next CFA meeting.

Discounts at the University Bookstore - Jack Cranford

CNS - Rick Fell

Peer institutions treatment or privileges extended to emeritus faculty - Peggy Meszaros

Desires/ideas from currently retired faculty regarding their expectations, contact the New Dimensions - Janet Johnson

A summary of privileges available to faculty upon retirement should be made

available. The provision of space and other resources to emeritus faculty are at the discretion of the faculty member's department.

College and University Service Recognition

CFA members were encouraged to review the materials distributed by Richard Bambach at the January 22 meeting. Consider what should or could be done to recognize faculty for their efforts in this area, how service might be evaluated, differences in how department's view service, i.e. philosophy, value, recognition.

This topic will be on the next meeting agenda.

Next meeting - February 26: 3:00pm

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 PM.

John R. Crunkilton
Recorder

Commission on Faculty Affairs
Minutes
February 26, 1999

Present: Paul Knox, Rick Fell, Kamal Rojiani, Deborah Mayo, Jackie Davis, Pat Hyer (for Meszaros), Janet Johnson, Hara Misra, John Crunkilton

Absent: Richard Bambach, Mario Karfakis, Peggy Meszaros, Kathryn Clarke-Albright, Donna Dunay, Jack Cranford, Alicia Schultheis

Pat Hyer called the meeting to order and reviewed the agenda sent out by Richard Bambach.

1. Draft of Whereas statements for review to support the resolution for Faculty Handbook

Draft of Whereas statements was not available for discussion, thus will be discussed later.

2. Privileges for Emeritus Faculty

Janet Johnson is going to check with Ray Murley concerning any input the New Dimensions might have on this topic. Rick Fell reported that through CNS computer links are available, but the faculty must pay for it if their department does not pay. Also, some software special pricing might be available. All retired faculties have these privileges, just not emeritus faculty. Somebody also mentioned that they thought reduced parking permit was also available. CFA members were encouraged to follow up on their assignments.

3. Discussion of Evaluation of Service

Will be added to the agenda at the next meeting.

4. Discussion was held on possible next meeting date. No conclusion was reached. Richard Bambach will not be available on March 26 as well as some other members. The April 9 meeting conflicts with Founder's Day.

Meeting adjourned 4:00pm.

Recorder

John R. Crunkilton

COMMISSION ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

Minutes of March 31, 1999 meeting

Present: Richard Bambach, Rick Fell, Kamal Rojiani, Deborah Mayo, Jackie Davis, Pat Hyer for Peggy Meszaros, Janet Johnson, Hara Misra, Jack Cranford, John Crunkilton

Absent: Paul Knox, Marjo Karfakis, Kathryn Clarke-Albright, Donna Dunay, Alicia Schultheis

Meeting was called to order by Richard Bambach

WHEREAS STATEMENTS FOR RESOLUTION FOR SECTION 4.1 IN FACULTY HANDBOOK

Motion was made, seconded, and passed to accept the "whereas statements" as sent out to the Commission Members by e-mail on the resolution to revise Section 4.1 in the Faculty Handbook dealing with assignment of duties of faculty members.

EMERITUS FACULTY MEMBER PRIVILEGES

Pat Hyer distributed the following materials: Emeriti Faculty Eligibility and Privileges at Virginia Tech, and Benefits and Services for the Retired Faculty of the University of Oregon. Discussion followed on those two documents. It was pointed out that nearly all faculty members who retire from Virginia Tech are awarded emeritus status; on rare occasions a retiring faculty member will not be nominated for emeritus status by the department. The nomination rests with the department head or, in some departments, with a departmental committee.

Jack Cranford has been in touch with the University Bookstore and they are studying the issue of continued faculty discounts for retirees, but nothing has been heard from them at this time.

Janet Johnson has been in touch with Jim Owens, President of the New Dimensions. He reported positively to the parking privileges received, being invited to University events, and helping to staff the Visitor's Center. Activities of the group get some subsidy from the University, which they appreciate. Areas of concern centered on lack of recognition to some individuals who retire after dedicated service to the University and profession, and that some publications are not sent to them, e.g. Spectrum. Some members are still advising students.

Rick Fell reported that CNS extends computer access to retired faculty and makes available 4-help to them. Any charge for monthly access must be paid by the retired faculty member, unless their department pays for it.

Additional discussion was held on how emeritus faculty could or should be recognized. Also, the question was raised, "What is or should be the distinction between retired and emeritus faculty?" Commission members felt that any eligible faculty member who was not recommended for emeritus status by the department should have the right to appeal; perhaps this appeal right should be stated in a policy document. Concerning liability, if a retired faculty member is acting in an official capacity and within the scope of responsibilities as a volunteer representative of the university, then they are covered by the University's liability policy. Retired faculty members can continue to serve as student advisors, especially with graduate students.

The Faculty Handbook only refers to how one is appointed to emeritus status, but nothing else. Commission members believe that a more comprehensive statement of policy and privileges would be most helpful, not just to retirees, but to department heads who are unsure about normal

practices concerning allocation of space and resources to retiring faculty members. CFA members liked the Oregon statement and Pat Hyer will use that document as a guide to draft a copy for CFA members to review. A draft copy should be shared with Jim Owens to get his input to any policy statement developed for Virginia Tech.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30am.

Next meeting is April 23 at 3pm.

The last meeting has been scheduled for May 6, 8-9:30am.

Recorder - John Crunkilton

COMMISSION ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

Minutes of April 23, 1999

Present: Richard Bambach, Rick Fell, Jackie Davis, Pat Hyer for Peggy Meszaros, Jack Cranford, Alicia Schultheis, John Crunkilton

Guest: Jim Owens

Absent: Paul Knox, Marjo Karfakis, Kamal Rojiani, Deborah Mayo, Janet Johnson, Hara Misra, Kathryn Clarke-Albright, Donna Dunay

Minutes of the March 31 meeting distributed electronically were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Richard Bambach reported that the University Council approved the resolution to revise Section 4.1 in the Faculty Handbook.

Pat Hyer indicated that CFA has a representative on the committee to select one Alumni Distinguished Professor. Eight names were submitted. Also, several positions as UDP are available and a past CFA member will serve on this committee. The exact number of UDPs to be appointed is unknown at this time.

Richard Bambach has been elected President of the Faculty Senate and Mitzi Vernon, Architecture, has been selected as Vice President. Thus, Mitzi Vernon will serve as Chair of CFA next year.

SERVICE EVALUATION

The problem of recognition of faculty members who perform service to the University community was again discussed. In recent weeks the seriousness of this problem again surfaced as the Faculty Senate and other organizations tried to fill vacant leadership positions. The following observations from Committee members helped point this out: "When you do service, you are not rewarded and when you don't do it, you are not penalized;" and from the graduate rep on CFA, "service on University, College, and Department committees is not rewarded; all that is recognized and/or encouraged are publications and research."

The group concluded that this topic should again be taken up next year and CFA might do three things as background to the deliberations: 1) meet with representatives of the Commission on Outreach which is developing better mechanisms for evaluating outreach activities; 2) meet with Carol Burch Brown or others who led the Faculty Roles and Rewards Project several years ago; and 3) contact other institutions to find out how they evaluate and reward faculty for university service. It was also mentioned that department heads should take the lead to be sure that University service contributions are rewarded.

EMERITUS FACULTY MEMBER STATUS

Richard Bambach welcomed Jim Owens, President of the New Dimensions, to the meeting. Pat Hyer had drafted and distributed Policy 4405: Emeritus Faculty Status for the group's review and also shared a copy with Jim. Jim expressed his appreciation for being asked to the meeting and the opportunity to participate in this discussion. Members of his group are very supportive for the idea of continued participation in University events and activities and he encouraged the University to make better use of emeritus faculty. He indicated a positive reaction to the proposed policy.

A discussion followed in which editorial comments were suggested. Pat Hyer noted these and will make changes as appropriate. Motion made and passed to approve the policy as edited and CFA members indicated that they did not need to see the revised document. Policy 4405 will be shared with the deans and then issued administratively by the Provost. It will be referenced in the Faculty Handbook, but not included in its totality.

NEW PARKING REGULATIONS AND CHARGES DURING FOOTBALL GAMES

A discussion of a resolution which has been drafted concerning the new charges for parking during football games was shared with CFA and discussed. Issues of concern were centered around parking space needed by faculty and students who do not attend games, but are involved in academic classes, research, and other official University activities that occur at the same time as football games. Also, that faculty and students have already paid for a permit to park on campus, and they should not be required to pay again.

The point was also made that the Athletic Association must pay for all athletic activities and events and thus, must search for ways to help fund the programs. They receive no state dollars. Richard Bambach indicated that he was scheduled to meet with Minnis Ridenour on this issue.

After further discussion, CFA members generally agreed with the resolution, but did not take action.

The May meeting of CFA will not be held.

Recorder - John R. Crunkilton