

Commission on Faculty Affairs
Minutes
September 8, 2000

Members present: Leon Geyer, Vanessa Archer, Kamal Rojiani, Deborah Mayo, Tim Pratt, Richard Goff, Patricia Hyer (for Bohland), Don Orth, Richard Cothren, Anne Zajac

Members absent: Rich Sorensen, Bill Stephenson, Rick Fell, John Crunkilton, Jackie Davis

Approval of minutes: The minutes from May 5, 2000 were approved with one correction.

Agenda for the Commission for 2000-01:

Commission members reviewed a list of possible topics to be discussed during the coming year. These were eventually sorted in to high, medium, and low priority for Commission attention. A few items were dropped from the original list as not relevant or appropriate for CFA.

High priority topics included:

1. Roles and responsibilities of department heads: Three topics will be explored in this area. They include finding a better, or alternative, way to trigger an early periodic evaluation for a department head other than the current requirement of a vote of 1/3 of faculty. The current policy is perceived to hold a high risk for faculty members who might try to initiate an early review, as well as consuming much time to discuss with fellow faculty members. Moreover, yearly feedback might assist the dean and head to make adjustments to improve the management and direction of the department. The second area involves the role of and documentation of the department head's efforts in assisting faculty members to meet expectations. The third area is assuring consistency across departments of written feedback/documentation of annual faculty evaluations. Pratt and Orth were asked to try to investigate and frame these issues for further discussion at next meeting.

2. Faculty search procedures: Continued discussion and evaluation of the pilot project in Arts & Sciences related to faculty search procedures and the role of the faculty in the selection process. (Cothren, Goff, and Archer asked to develop a statement about this issue for next meeting)

3. Conflict of commitment: A university task force is to be formed and charged by President. This issue may eventually lead to action this academic year. Issue may be a joint responsibility of CFA and the Commission on Research.

4. Revision of Intellectual Property Policy: Earlier drafts discussed during 1999-00; expect later revision from Gene Brown early fall. Primary responsibility of Commission on Research, but issue will be reviewed by CFA. 5. Conflict of Interest: University Committee on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment to monitor implementation of new policy 13010 and to request revisions as may be needed. CFA wants to be kept informed. Primary responsibility of the Commission on Research.

Medium priority:

1. Research start-up packages: Increasing concern raised about the cost of research start-up packages for new faculty in the sciences and engineering. Can VT be competitive? Particular problem if we want to move to next level of research universities.

2. Other faculty recruitment and retention issues: These include how to assist more effectively in locating employment for spouses of new or

current faculty members, tuition benefits for spouses and dependents, and proportional benefits for part-time faculty member. (Proportional benefits would allow job sharing.)

Lower priority (either because of timing, responsibility of another body, or limited impact)

1. Scholarly publishing: Dr. Meszaros served on a national committee urging reform of scholarly publishing practices and expressing concern on how they affect research libraries. The document of "principles" from the national meeting on this topic was presented to UDPs and ADPs in late August. They may take campus leadership on this issue. This may or may not be discussion item for CFA depending on their conversation. (Hyer will copy document for CFA members.)

2. Bioinformatics: Commission may wish to be informed about the development of the Virginia Bioinformatics Institute and its relationship to existing departments and faculty members. Document prepared over the summer outlining proposed agreements re awarding of tenure to some new appointees, responsibility for development of related degree programs, and proposed committee structures to enhance communication and resolve problems. Recommendations went to the President in late August. This may be an information or investigative item later in year. Invite new director if so.

3. Faculty ability to transfer from one department to another: This may require a policy statement in the handbook.

The chairs of the Commission on Research and CFA have agreed to consider joint meetings on several of the issues of common concern such as intellectual property, conflict of commitment, and conflict of interest.

Future meeting dates:

Because of the dedication of Torgersen Hall on October 6th, the Commission will meet on October 13th, 3:00-5:00, 325 Burruss (only meeting in October).

The revised schedule for the year is as follows:

September 22
October 13
November 3
November 13
December 1
January 19
February 2
February 16
March 2
March 16
April 6
April 20

Patricia Hyer
Recorder

Commission on Faculty Affairs

11/17/2000

Minutes approved from last CFA meeting

Present: Leon Geyer, Tim Pratt, Vanessa Archer, Mac McCreery, Don Orth, Richard Goff, Richard Cothren, Rich Sorensen, Bill Stephenson, Jim Bohland, John Crunkilton, Anne Zajac, Kamal Rojiani

1. Annual Review of Dept Head Performance

Tim handed out a proposed annual survey of department head performance. He asked for feedback. CFA requested further input and dialogue with the department heads. Some mention of mentorship and feedback on areas needing improvements appeared to be highest priority for inclusion. Revision should be made to make the instrument more formative; it should be presented at future meetings with department heads for their input.

2. Orientation of New Faculty

Leon Geyer presented the question, "What kind of orientation is needed for new faculty?" Engineering runs a voluntary orientation program. The Commission discussed when it should be held and for how long. For example, graduate students orientation takes 3 days. A "Frequently-Asked-Questions" section on a website was one suggestion. Leon will seek information on college - level orientation programs and existing "survival guides for new faculty."

3. Honor System

Section 4.8 of the Faculty Handbook addresses the Honor System, however, the existing honor code had no mention of faculty duties. Concern is that the honor system is not uniformly applied. Students are reluctant to turn in students. If this is true, faculty have a responsibility to raise the level of academic integrity. Some believe that we have difficulty in informing students (and faculty) about the "Constitution of the Virginia Tech Honor System." It's hard to find. (Editorial Comment: it can be found at <<http://www.honorsystem.vt.edu/>>) There is a need to raise the level of awareness about cheating. Discussion ensued about the appropriate responsibility of faculty for the honor system.

Recorder,

Don Orth

Minutes
Commission on Faculty Affairs
December 1, 2000

Members present: Leon Geyer, chair; James Bohland, Pat Hyer, Vanessa Archer, Richard Cothren, John Crunkilton, Richard Goff, Deborah Mayo, Mac McCreery, Tim Pratt, Rich Sorensen, Anne Zajac, Bill Stephenson

Members Absent: Rick Fell, Kamal Rojiani, Jackie Davis, Mimi Lee

Leon Geyer, CFA chair, called the meeting to order.

The Commission on Faculty Affairs hosted a major presentation to a number of groups which had expressed interest in the College of Arts and Sciences Pilot Project on Faculty Search Procedures. These groups included the EO/AA Office and the EO/AA Committee, the Diversity Leadership Group, the Multicultural Fellows, the Advisory Council on Diversity and Multicultural Affairs, and a number of interested others. Approximately 65 people attended.

Dean Robert Bates and Associate Dean Myra Gordon of the College of Arts and Sciences gave a formal presentation titled "Opening Doors, Changing Minds," about the revised faculty search procedures that have been piloted in their college. The challenge that resulted in these revised procedures was to find a way to increase the low representation of women and people of color in the Virginia Tech professoriate.

Bates provided background information on the events that led to the creation of this pilot project, and summarized the "best practices" that were identified in preparation for this project. Bates also provided a summary of institutional data that illustrated the need for efforts to increase diversity at Virginia Tech. Of critical importance to the dean was the awareness that their hiring decisions over the next few years would shape the faculty of Virginia Tech for years to come.

The goals of the pilot project:

- * To further leverage the dean's leadership and vision in the faculty hiring process.
- * To introduce more accountability in the hiring process and for diverse hiring outcomes.
- * To increase the diversity in search committee membership.
- * To address the possibility of bias in the screening and evaluation of applicants.
- * To increase the representation of excellent and diverse applicants in search committee pools.
- * To have search committees function as search committees and not selection committees.
- * To increase the diversity of faculty hiring outcomes.

Gordon outlined the steps in a sample search process and then summarized the pilot project outcomes:

- * All aspects of the pilot procedures were put into place for 16 tenure track searches and 11 search committees.
- * All search committees were diverse with respect to race, gender, and rank.
- * All search committees were charged by the dean prior to beginning their work.
- * All position announcements were written with considerable thought given to required and desired qualifications.
- * Recruiting and advertising plans were developed with great thought given to the need to be proactive and intentional in attracting a diverse pool of excellently qualified candidates.
- * All search committees were asked to consider the possibility of "unintended bias" affecting the screening and evaluation of candidates.

- * All finalist pools were diverse.
- * Because of the increased emphasis placed on diversity in all phases of the search process, the white males who were interviewed and hired understood the importance of and expressed support for diversity in the university community.
- * The pilot is the organizing principle for all of the hiring in the college. The pilot is teaching people to value diversity and that diversity can be achieved in many ways and at many levels.

Data for the tenure-track hires in A&S during 1999-2000 are as follows:

* 16 of the 24 tenure-track hires in CAS during 1999-2000 were made under the new pilot search procedures. Of the 16 pilot project hires, 7 (43.75%) were female and 9 (56.25%) were male; 1 (6.25%) was Black, 2 (12.50%) were Hispanic, and 13 (81.5%) were White. The pilot was very successful in holding the line on hiring African Americans, and in increasing the representation of women and Hispanics in hiring outcomes. The pilot project did not lead to the hiring of any Native Americans or Asians during this cycle.

* The remaining 8 of the 24 hires were made under other search mechanisms. Of the 24 total tenure-track hires made in CAS during 1999-2000 (including both those hired under the pilot procedures and under other search mechanisms), 12 (50%) were female and 12 (50%) were male; 5 (20.83%) were Black, 3 (12.50%) were Hispanic, and 16 (66.67%) were White.

The A&S college leadership plans further evaluation of the pilot search procedures since there is much that they have not yet had a chance to review, including input from candidates hired. The second year of the pilot project is underway and the process is going smoothly, thanks to growing acceptance among heads and faculty and greater experience with procedure themselves.

In response to a question from the audience about whether the procedures called for listing gender or race as a preferred or required characteristic in their evaluation of candidates, Gordon stated that "no" this would be illegal. However, it was appropriate to list as a required or preferred qualification that candidates have experience and willingness to teach and mentor effectively a diverse student body, or contribute to the scholarship on diversity, for example.

In response to another question concerning accountability, Bates emphasized the importance of moving away from a rank-ordering of candidates. This has been one of their most useful efforts. By creating profiles of strengths (and weaknesses) for each of the interviewed candidates, a far more productive conversation occurs about the fit for the department and college. Although many faculty expressed concern at the outset about whether the dean's selection would result in candidates unacceptable to the faculty, this is not how the searches have turned out. There is extensive opportunity for faculty input following the interviews and in building the profiles of finalists and this feedback certainly influenced the conversation between the dean, department head, and search chair in determining to whom to make an offer and in what order other offers would be made if needed.

Gordon reflected on the difficulty of changing faculty attitudes as part of this process. For many, there is an unexamined assumption that jobs automatically belong to whites, or that white candidates are automatically more qualified, and therefore the selection of a female or person of color for the position suggests that a more qualified white candidate was somehow denied what should have been theirs. While painful, these have been very important conversations and those who participated came to a little better understanding of the concept of white privilege. This led to a greater commitment to develop more diverse candidate pools, broadening notions of what constitutes excellence, and carefully considering the qualifications they were seeking in candidates.

Recorder,

Patricia B. Hyer

Minutes
Commission on Faculty Affairs
January 19, 2001

Members Present: Jackie Davis, Richard Goff, Anne Zajac, Kamal Rojiani, Leon Geyer, Bill Stephenson, John Crunkilton, Don Orth, Pat Hyer (for Jim Bohland)

Members Absent: Rich Sorensen, Vanessa Archer

Guests: Ted Settle, John Phillips, Ed Nelson

1. Geyer announced that Rick Fell had resigned from the Commission since he is in South Africa for the spring semester. The Faculty Senate president has been asked to appoint a replacement. The undergraduate representative is also off campus this term and a replacement has been requested.

2. John Phillips provided background on the proposed Technical Assistance Program (TAP). In his capacity as the university's economic development officer, John visits with businesses and organizations, or has been contacted by them, for help with short-term, quick-turnaround, smaller-scale tasks. Some of these are readily satisfied by faculty members providing service within the traditional understanding of outside consulting, with little or no university involvement other than the initial contact. But in many cases, the business or the faculty member welcomes university involvement in these small projects. TAP was created as a mechanism to respond to these requests. The Provost approved a pilot in the College of Engineering, which was then extended to the College of Business, and they are now seeking formal approval through governance.

TAP projects differ from research in that they do not involve creation of intellectual property or development of new knowledge. Usually they are applications of knowledge to specific business-related processes or problems. The university's legal counsel assisted in drawing up a relatively simple agreement that could be used between the faculty member and the business. Continuing Education would administer the arrangements, collecting revenue from the business and making payments as needed to faculty members, reimbursements for laboratories, etc. Projects are expected to be small scale, under \$25,000. The TAP mechanism essentially becomes university-sponsored consulting, providing additional income to the faculty member, legal protection and administrative services from the university, and an entrée to a business or organization with a need. It may be particularly appropriate for junior faculty who do not yet have extensive connections and who look to ways to include university-sponsored outreach in their dossiers.

Stephenson asked about the change in the proposed distribution of overhead, which now requires 30% to go to the state. Settle responded that analysis by Dwight Shelton suggested that these projects do not appear to fit any of the narrowly defined exclusions, thus we must return the 30% overhead. Stephenson commented that the reduced share of overhead to the department makes it less attractive for participation. Settle responded that the major benefit to participation related to possibilities for subsequent, more extensive grants and contracts, sites for student internships, or other departmental relationships with the sponsor, rather than overhead.

In response to a question about why a faculty member would want to do this, Settle responded that it is unlikely, and perhaps not even appropriate, for senior faculty whose reputations draw direct requests to them. However, these opportunities are not available to all faculty members. The university has committed significant resources to its outreach efforts and is trying to bring more of this kind of activity into official

view. Faculty members can include TAP activities on their faculty activity report. It allows university approval for use of laboratories or other resources for consulting (in line with usual reimbursement requirements). In addition, TAP will bring new business opportunities to faculty.

Outreach already reports some summary statistics such as number of faculty involved and amount of activity. Settle anticipates trying to document some of the longer-term benefits such as student co-op placements, research grants and contracts, corporate gifts, etc. Several specific changes were suggested to the accompanying documents: include undergraduate as well as graduate students, clarify the meaning of item 10 in the agreement related to work leading to expert testimony or official hearings, and spell out continuing education. A motion to approve the resolution adding material concerning the technical assistance program to the Faculty Handbook was made, seconded, and approved unanimously.

3. Geyer announced that the Governor's budget proposal included a reduction in the state's contribution to optional retirement plans for faculty members from 10.4% to 9.2%.

4. The chair then asked for suggestions of other topics and issues that needed to be dealt with in the coming months. Zajac brought up the issue of library funding, which has fallen far behind rising costs. Discussions on campus and in several national associations suggest that the answer may not be in allocating an ever greater share of institutional resources to libraries, but to consider a change to the culture of faculty publishing. Commission members agreed with the dilemma of library funding inadequacy, but were unable to think of a way in which constructive action could be taken by CFA.

5. Hyer raised the broad set of issues that would need to be considered as part of our strategic planning process for reaching top-30 status. General issues, such as the mix of tenure-track, non-tenure track, and research personnel; management of pending retirements and start-up costs of hiring new and senior faculty; and other issues, including many related to staff, will need to be thought through.

6. Other issues carried forward from previous discussions include: annual survey of department head performance, orientation of new faculty members, faculty duties and responsibility towards the honor system, the role and responsibility of faculty in hiring faculty, and conflict of interest/commitment.

The meeting was adjourned. The next meeting is scheduled for March 2.

Recorder,
Patricia Hyer

Minutes
Commission on Faculty Affairs
Meeting of Friday 02.16.01

Present: Rich Sorensen, Tim Pratt, Don Orth, Richard Cothren, Kamal Rojiani, Vanessa Archer, Richard Goff, Anne Zajac, Leon Geyer, Pat Hyer

Absent: Bill Stephenson, Deborah Mayo, Jackie Davis, John Crunkilton

Guests: Brian Montgomery & Ross Amico from SGA and Adam McLain from Honor System

Meeting was called to order by Leon Geyer at 3:05 PM

1. Rich Sorensen moved to approve the agenda with Tim Pratt speaking first. Anne Zajac seconded with unanimous approval.

2. Annual Review of Dept Head Performance

Tim Pratt reported progress of the proposal for an annual review of department heads. He has received negative comments from deans and department heads. Leon Geyer said that we need to turn the process into positive assistance for the department heads. The process should help them to do a better job. Richard Sorensen sees some positive aspects of a faculty survey regarding department heads, but many negatives. Frequent questionnaires could result in a popularity contest. It was mentioned that student evaluation of faculty is a similar situation. Discussion is ongoing. Kamal Rojiani said that 5 years is too long a cycle for a formal evaluation; Untenured faculty, for example, have no effective voice in such a time frame. Leon Geyer said that more thought needs to be given to a process that might balance these concerns. Rich Sorensen suggests taking this to the Faculty Senate for discussion. Leon Geyer and Tim Pratt will discuss how to take this issue back to the Senate.

3. Senate Constitution Revision

In response to a question about whether the Faculty Senate Constitution changes would have to be approved by a commission before submission to University Council, Hyer checked the University Council Constitution and found that action by a commission was not required. Thus CFA would not be asked to address this item at the meeting.

4. Honor System

Brian Montgomery, Adam McLain, & Ross Amico told the Commission that reported violations to the honor system have increased in recent years - a 200% increase in case load this year and roughly a 600% increase over the past eight years. Most violations involve homework and assignments rather than major tests and exams. They are trying to find a way to make students aware of their obligations and to prevent cheating. They presented a resolution to have the honor pledge included on every assignment. The resolution passed through the SGA house and it is seen as a positive move; it is going forward to the SGA senate for approval.

Richard Cothren suggested that we may not need to monitor homework rather just tests and exams. The guests responded that the resolution would reinforce that each assignment is bound by honor pledge and that all work must be done without unauthorized aid. Official policy concerning the honor system is contained in the honor system constitution and the Faculty Handbook. Discussion ensued about the need for the resolution and what "group work" means. CFA was not asked to approve the resolution.

Geyer then passed out suggested changes to the Faculty Handbook regarding faculty responsibility relating to the honor system. He suggested

that some of the proposed language might be incorporated in the Faculty Handbook, while other parts might be on the honor system website. Educating faculty and students about their responsibility is key to a smooth functioning and effective honor system. He wants to raise the dialogue about academic integrity to a place of greater importance in the academic community. Pat Hyer mentioned that the suggested changes contained a lot of detail and might be more appropriate for a brochure that could be distributed every fall, for example. Other members questioned whether faculty read the Handbook and thus whether that was really the place to put such information if it needed visibility.

5. Visiting Faculty number of years of service counting toward tenure

Currently all full-time service while a visiting faculty member at VT counts toward the probationary period if the faculty member is later appointed to a tenure-track position. Pat Hyer brought forward a resolution that would make this a negotiable decision. However, the determination to count this service or not must be made at the time of appointment to the tenure-track position. Current policy states that the counting of prior service credit from ANOTHER institution is at the discretion of the faculty member. Commission members supported the proposed resolution making service at the visiting rank optional, but requested that the decision to count this service be at the initiation of the faculty member. This would make it parallel to the provision related to prior service credit. Hyer will revise the resolution and bring it to CFA for approval at the next meeting.

6. Strategic Planning Process

Pat Hyer pointed out that we are in the midst of revising the university's strategic plan, particularly with regard to the goal of top-30 status. Key policy issues and questions related to faculty and staff were presented. One of the issues discussed was if it was more effective to surround higher paid faculty with less expensive non-tenure track faculty and classified staff, making each more productive. This might be more cost effective than simply increasing the number of more highly paid tenured faculty. Hyer asked for additional items or changes to the list. Rich Sorensen commented that Virginia has much more fiscal control on what we do compared to some other states and that, in addition, many of the institutions among the top-30 are private and not subject to state controls of any kind. Our classified staff policies must also be the same as all other state agencies, which may work against us as well. Leon Geyer suggested staff support for teachers and moving undergraduate issues to the top of the list. Improving the skills of graduate students who teach was also discussed. Don Orth feels that achieving top-30 status is not a realistic possibility without a serious commitment to more faculty positions and other resources. The list of policy issues contains other areas of concern including support for dual career families and the ability to offer proportional benefits for part-timers. Identifying issues is an ongoing process and suggestions should be funneled to Hyer or to Rosemary Blieszner.

Leon Geyer declared the meeting adjourned at 4:30 PM.

Recorder,
Richard Goff

Commission on Faculty Affairs
March 2, 2001

Members present: Leon Geyer, Anne Zajac, Patricia Hyer (for Jim Bohland), Rick Ashley, Don Orth, Tim Pratt, Bill Stephenson, Kamal Rojiani

1. Continuation of Discussion of Honor System

Leon Geyer distributed in advance revised language for the Faculty Handbook concerning the Honor System. Based on comments from commission members at the last meeting, the revisions in the latest version were less extensive and detailed. (The details will be incorporated into the Honor System website and other materials.) Most of the changes update language and procedures in Sections 4.6.6 and 4.8, reflecting changes that were approved for the Honor System Constitution. Commission members offered several suggestions for improving existing Handbook language, especially the bullet concerning the role of faculty members in proctoring exams, which commissioners felt should be encouraged even though proctoring is not required.

Since the revisions did not represent a change in policy, but simply editing to bring the Handbook in line with the approved Constitution and to make other editorial improvements, the Commission determined that it was not necessary to take the changes to University Council. However, Leon will review the proposed changes with the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies which does oversee the Honor System through one of its committees. When this process is complete, Pat Hyer will incorporate the changes in the on-line version of the Faculty Handbook and include them in subsequent distributions of the paper version. A motion was made, seconded, and passed to approve the editorial changes as proposed and amended during the meeting by the commission and to proceed in the manner described above.

2. Visiting Faculty Appointments

Pat Hyer reintroduced Resolution 2000-01A which allows a visiting faculty member who is appointed to a tenure-track position to determine at his or her discretion whether the full-time service at the visiting rank at Virginia Tech would count toward the probationary period (reference to section 2.3.1.2 of the Faculty Handbook). Current policy requires all full-time service at the visiting rank to be counted. A motion was made, seconded, and passed to approve the revised resolution and to send this on to University Council for consideration.

3. Geographic Transfer Policy Revision

Hyer introduced resolution 2000-01B concerning the geographic transfer policy. Currently section 2.19 of the Faculty Handbook describes the process for relocating a faculty member to a primary work location more than 35 miles from their current workstation. The resolution changes the threshold distance to 50 miles in order to include Roanoke within the radius in which transfers could be done more quickly, especially since they do not necessarily require relocation of the employee's home or family, and to match the IRS regulations which have been changed from 35 to 50 miles. (IRS regulations were the original source of the 35-mile trigger distance.)

A concern whether six months was adequate time to prepare for a relocation was brought up, at least one member believing that it may not be adequate notice. The policy does directly affect the university's ability to respond to needs of the state and to fulfill its mission. Six months lead time was the compromise made at the time the policy was passed to recognize the need for programmatic relocations while trying to provide a reasonable time for the employee to relocate home and family if necessary. (An involuntary relocation that appeared to be retaliation and not justified on programmatic grounds would be a grievable issue.) The concern about

length of notification however was not related to the resolution under discussion, which sought only a change in the distance between the current and future primary work locations.

A motion was made, seconded, and passed to approve the change to the trigger distance in the geographic transfer policy from 35 to 50 miles. There was one negative vote.

4. New Faculty Orientation

Leon Geyer provided background on the on-going conversations with the Provost's Office concerning the content and format of new faculty orientation in the fall, and perhaps throughout the year. While there is a great deal of information and guidance that is necessary and appropriate for new faculty members, finding the time for them to participate is extremely difficult. Unlike the corporate setting, mandatory and extensive orientation to the role seems impossible to achieve, despite its apparent benefit. There are about 15 issues that need to be addressed, according to Geyer. A variety of options and formats have been explored with David Ford, who is responsible for new faculty orientation. A full-day format, perhaps on the Tuesday before classes begin, is under consideration. Building some camaraderie would also appear to be a desirable goal and this might be partially achieved by holding a family picnic that evening. Commission members discussed several variations on this proposal, including two partial days of orientation, where the second day focussed on needs of the teaching faculty. Currently new faculty orientation includes A/P faculty, ROTC officers, and a wide variety of other personnel. Recognition of the varying needs for information would be important if we are to retain interest and be efficient with limited time. Also, some departments and colleges offer additional orientation throughout the year, providing small, more digestible increments of information and understanding of the faculty role.

5. Key Factors Concerning Faculty and Staff Issues for Strategic Planning

Geyer reopened the discussion from the previous meeting concerning some of the key factors and policy issues identified concerning faculty and staff if the institution is to move toward a goal of increasing its stature among research universities. The commission considered the necessity and wisdom for new models of faculty (and staff) hiring, which may be appropriate for some departments. For example, the Biology Department anticipates a higher-than-average proportion of retirements in the next five or more years. While this is an exceptional opportunity to shape program direction for the future, the department does not have the space or start-up funds to provide the level of support that will be expected for research-active faculty members who they might want to recruit. Would a better, more realistic, approach be to replace only a portion of the faculty positions with research-active faculty, providing more lab space per person than would be possible otherwise, and then to hire several instructors and/or lab technicians with the remaining positions and funds so that the department is able to maximize the productivity of its new, more expensive researchers? While this model is not appropriate in a number of cases, it needs to be considered, given the constraints many departments face in terms of inadequate infrastructure and the need to focus those resources as strategically as possible.

Bill Stephenson registered his concern that there are not enough resources institution wide to support research advances in every field; the institution must make some strategic choices.

Several commission members expressed misgivings about aspiration to top-30 status in that there are aspects among those institutions that we may NOT want to emulate. For example, the tremendous emphasis on research has in some cases led to neglect for undergraduate programs. Given scarce

resources, the time for faculty to focus on research must come from somewhere. Increasing class size even further or doing significantly more teaching with graduate teaching assistants could damage Tech's traditional strength and reputation in serving undergraduates-which is of intense interest to state policy makers and taxpayers. It is possible that the STATE's priority for Tech's future development might be to grow the undergraduate program to absorb some of the anticipated growth in high school graduates, even as we are trying to move in a different direction. It was reiterated that we will not be able to increase our research ranking significantly without additional support from the state.

Recorder,

Patricia Hyer

To: Members of University Council

The following Commission on Faculty Affairs minutes of April 6, 2001 will be voted on at the May 7, 2001 University Council meeting.

Commission on Faculty Affairs

Minutes

4/6/01

Members Present: Rich Sorensen, Richard Cothren, Tim Pratt, Anne Zajac, Jackie Davis, Bill Stephenson, Richard Goff, Kamal Rojiani, Deborah Mayo, Don Orth, Pat Hyer, Leon Geyer

Guests: Tim Pickering, Peter Rony, Len Peters, Gene Brown

1. Intellectual Property Policy:

Geyer opened the discussion on the intellectual property policy revision by reminding Commission members that the policy was before University Council and this was the appropriate opportunity to ask questions and make suggestions for improvement if desired. A question was raised about the impact of the policy on distance learning courses. In particular, faculty members currently participated with the understanding that recorded material would only be used for students who missed class or who wanted to review, then it would be destroyed. Brown responded that this is current policy for the Institute for Distance and Distributed Learning. Tom Wilkinson is working on a statement of this policy and practice to go on the IDDL website. In addition, the group recommended that section 2.3.b, number 8, be modified to state "Any courses taught at Virginia Tech which are videotaped or recorded using any other media are Virginia Tech property, and may not be further distributed without PERMISSION OF THE FACULTY MEMBER AND THE UNIVERSITY."

A question was raised about who controlled Virginia Tech Intellectual Properties and their relationship to oversight of the policy. Len Peters responded that there is a standing university committee that administers the intellectual property policy. VTIP only gets involved once ownership has been transferred to the university. VTIP is a non-profit corporation governed by a Board of 14 members including representatives recommended by the Commission on Research, the Faculty Senate, a department head, a research center representative, the Vice Provost for Research, and the Vice President for Business Affairs. There are several external members, primarily from the venture capital community; however, VT members are the majority by design. The Intellectual Property Committee is the one that makes determinations of ownership, not VTIP. Disputes, when they arise, are typically related to the distribution of royalties; not usually over ownership. Appeals are handled by a committee set up by the Vice Provost for Research.

Stephenson distributed a summary of concerns that had been raised in the College of Engineering. In general, there is a concern that the revised policy could be too broadly interpreted, bringing into question a great variety of faculty activities. A specific concern was around the relationship between the IP policy and sabbaticals where faculty members may be developing IP at another institution or at a host company. The policy appears to suggest that the university will always assert ownership of such IP, which may mean that some institutions or companies may not agree to host faculty for sabbaticals under these conditions.

Peters suggested that when the faculty member disclosed patentable IP developed during a sabbatical, the committee would certainly take into account the collaborative nature of the development process. By law, each creator is entitled to shared ownership of the entire right in the case of joint creation. (Copyrightable works produced during sabbatical are assumed to be the property of the faculty member unless extraordinary resources were involved in their creation.) It was recommended that the policy suggest that such negotiations would be possible so that the policy did not appear so absolute on this point.

There were several places where the text was open to interpretation that was too broad in the minds of several. Brown and Pickering promised to look at some of the words that appeared to cause concern and to see if they could be made more explicit to minimize these concerns.

The commission discussed several instances where university resources may go beyond those generally available to all faculty and the consequent effect on ownership of copyrightable works. For example, grants used to support the development of a scholarly work or to upgrade equipment or software beyond what was typically provided constitute use of university resources and thus ownership of the copyright would belong to the university.

A question was raised about whether patentable or copyrightable works that were the product of outside consulting would in any way be claimed as university property. The response was **no.** Consulting is NOT considered part of university employment, thus the university makes no claim of ownership for work produced through consulting done without university resources. (This would not be true of the new Technical Assistance Program in which consulting is done THROUGH the university.) It was recommended that this be addressed in a very straightforward way in the policy.

A question was raised whether it was possible to negotiate the percentage of revenue coming to the various parties as part of the royalty sharing agreement. The policy speaks of 50% for the creator. Brown responded that he was not aware of any exceptions to the 50/50 split or case-by-case negotiations. He pointed out that the stated split protects the faculty member's share and that negotiating could actually diminish rather than increase the faculty member's portion of the royalty income.

The discussion was closed by stating that Brown and Pickering would return with some revised language at the next CFA meeting that might address some of the concerns.

2. End-of-term grade submission deadlines:

Peter Rony and Tim Pratt presented a set of concerns about the brief time allowed for submission of final grades (48 hours following the final exam), particularly for those scheduled for the latter part of the exam period. The short turnaround deadline virtually dictates that complex assignments, portfolios, computer programs, and other possibilities for summative evaluation of course learning are impossible to grade. Others shared his concern that desirable assessment methods had to be sacrificed to meet the deadline. The commission agreed to pursue this issue jointly with the appropriate committee of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies and relevant administrators to see whether greater flexibility was possible.

3. Athletic Excuse Policy:

Geyer distributed the athletic excuse policy to CFA members in advance. He

reported that there had been a great deal of discussion on this item and related issues at the Faculty Senate. The Commission was not asked to act on this at this time.

4.0 Digitized photos of students: Geyer reported that another institution has produced digitized photos of students for the faculty member's class roll, making it easier to learn names.

Recorder,

Patricia Hyer

Judy Davis, CPS
Executive Secretary Senior
President's Office, Virginia Tech
210 Burruss Hall (0131)
Blacksburg, VA 24061
(540) 231-6232 FAX: (540) 231-4265

To: Members of University Council

The following Commission on Faculty Affairs minutes of April 20, 2001 will be voted on at the May 7, 2001 University Council meeting.

Minutes
Commission on Faculty Affairs
April 20, 2001

Members Attending:

Leon Geyer, Anne Zajac, Tim Pratt, Don Orth, Jackie Davis, Pat Hyer, Rick Ashley, Kamal Rojiani, Richard Goff

Guests:

Tim Pickering, Gene Brown, Kay Heidbreder, Paul Metz, Tim Luke, Eileen Hitchingham, Gail McMillan

1. Intellectual Property Policy Revisions:

Gene Brown reported on the extensive activity and consultation that has occurred since the intellectual property policy revision was first introduced to University Council and then deferred: four university-wide meetings have been held and a website with questions and responses, and an e-mail address for comments, has been in place and well utilized for a month. They have made a number of clarifications or revisions to the policy as a result of questions that have been raised. Some changes are editorial; some sections were moved to a different location so that the text would flow more smoothly; some text was deleted when it appeared redundant or problematic. The only really substantive change is the extension of ownership rights to classified employees for copyrightable works under similar conditions as faculty.

A suggestion was made that section 2.2 reference the definition of an academic year appointment from the Faculty Handbook (section 2.6.1).

In response to a question about ownership of a patentable product developed on "one's own time," Pickering responded that the faculty member would be required to disclose creation of the patentable product to the IP committee. On the disclosure form, they would respond to a series of questions that would help the committee determine whether or not university ownership of the patent was appropriate.

Commission members reviewed comments about the IP policy prepared by Peter Rony. (The comments related to a prior draft.) Pickering responded that those issues that could be addressed have been addressed in the latest revision, including concerns about sabbaticals, consulting, and summer, along with several other topics. Brown reiterated that he feels that they have addressed a great many of the concerns raised at the meetings and by those sending in comments to the website. They believe that the document is a better document as a result of these clarifications and changes. For those who believe that the university will not treat them fairly, there is an appeal process involving a committee of peers stated in the policy. All of this has been in place for a number of years and no change is recommended. The university is not changing its practice of relying on faculty member's ethical commitment to disclose intellectual property and to comply with university policy.

In response to a question about ownership of software developed at home on one's own time, Heidbreder responded that the new policy would actually allow faculty members to claim ownership for this as a copyrightable work as long as it was developed without extraordinary university resources (or other conditions as stated in the policy draft). This is a benefit of the new policy since it was not addressed in the old one.

Commission members later returned to this discussion and how the IP policy revisions might best be presented. They urged that several points be emphasized: the new policy actually extends some new benefits to faculty and classified staff, permitting ownership of some copyrightable works that might not have been allowed under current policy; the fact that the policy is required by state law and must be viewed within the context of state regulation on these matters; and that a set of examples might be helpful in addressing questions that are of concern to faculty members. Faculty senators on the commission are considering a way to postpone a vote on the policy since some Senate members and general faculty do not feel that they have had an adequate opportunity to review or understand the revised policy.

2. Other agenda items: Leon briefly addressed the status and plans for several on-going topics. The concern about grade submission deadlines will be carried forward for discussion next year at CFA and with the appropriate committee of CUSP; the Senate is forming a work group to look at concerns about the athletic excuse policy; Leon will pursue the suggestion about digitized student photos with administrators and continue to work with Dave Ford on new faculty orientation.

3. Ed Sewell will be the chair of CFA next year.

4. Faculty publications:

A team from the Library presented a growing set of concerns about rising costs for serials and the control exercised by publishers in relation faculty scholarship. Paul Metz reported that all libraries are canceling serials because of escalating costs, although Virginia Tech has had to go further with this than many campuses. The leadership of the library is trying to bring this set of issues to as many faculty groups as possible so that they, in turn, can try to influence the practices of their scholarly societies and institutional committees.

Technology allows faculty members to take greater control of their creative effort, but we will have to change many professional practices and misconceptions if we are to take advantage of these possibilities. For example, promotion and tenure committees need to be more receptive to publication in on-line journals IF those journals are peer-reviewed in a manner similar to print media. The "Tempe Principles" state that WE are the academy and the acceptance of on-line publications is really in the hands of faculty. As more prestigious scholars involve themselves in establishing new journals in on-line format and dedicate themselves to a high quality scholarly vehicle, then there will be greater acceptance in the academic community. Faculty members need to ask very critical questions about the publication process and costs associated with journals supported by their professional societies.

Gail McMillan reported that editors who have moved their publications to on-line formats have not experienced the drop in subscriptions that they feared. Indeed, many faculty members welcome the availability of on-line publications because they are searchable and readily available without leaving their office. The library provides faculty members with support for the creation of on-line journals.

McMillan also reported that the initial (and lingering) concern that publishers will not publish a work that has already been published on-line is also seriously overstated. Publishers recognize that a chapter in an on-line dissertation is not usually the same as that submitted for publication. They have surveyed our students who have put their dissertations on line and no one reported problems getting their work published in a print venue. Even the initial extreme reaction from the American Chemical Society has also changed over time and they have begun to recognize that their position was unjustified. Nevertheless many faculty members still recommend that their students restrict access to the ETD.

Tim Luke offered that the university could make an important contribution by developing a statement defining a middle ground on acceptance of electronic dissemination of scholarly work. Luke feels that we are not going to achieve top-30 status using the old print rules for scholarship. We do not have the funds or number of prestigious scholars to compete effectively. Luke urged that we need to make new rules and be among the first to do so. Truly great institutions are defining the cutting edge and we could be taking the lead by developing reasonable guidelines that recognize the new world of electronic publication.

Zajac wondered how to get the attention of faculty and engage them on this issue. The state of scholarly publishing is not a compelling personal issue for most. Luke responded that it will be important to develop some awareness of the issues and how they permeate nearly everything we do - work in our professional associations, the promotion and tenure process, and our academic discourse.

Recorder,

Patricia Hyer

Judy Davis, CPS
Executive Secretary Senior
President's Office, Virginia Tech
210 Burruss Hall (0131)
Blacksburg, VA 24061
(540) 231-6232 FAX: (540) 231-4265

MINUTES
COMMISSION ON CLASSIFIED STAFF AFFAIRS

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 2001
1:30 PM - 325 BURRUSS HALL

Present: Billie Cline, Angie Harvey for Judith Shrum, John Hess, James Martin, Suzanne Piovano, Wyatt Sasser, Linda Woodard, Jon Wooge

Absent: Pat Ballard, Bob Bates, Michele Holmes, Tom Kaloupek, Mike Koechlein, Sue Meredith, Christine Porterfield, Mary Whitlock

Guest: Doug Martin, Personnel Services

Chair James Martin called meeting to order at 1:35 PM. The agenda approved as presented. The minutes of the March 28, 2001, meeting were approved as written.

1. Personnel Update

* Update on Changes in Insurance Benefits: Doug Martin reported on three changes to employee life insurance enacted by the General Assembly in the 2001 session: provides the cost of transportation up to \$5,000 for repatriation of remains if an employees dies more than 75 miles from home; provides 10 percent of the basic death or dismemberment amount up to \$50,000 of additional benefits if an employee dies in an accident while properly wearing a safety restraint; and provides benefit equal to the lesser of \$50,000 or 25 percent of the accidental death or dismemberment benefit amount and educational benefits for dependent children if an employee dies or suffers a dismemberment as the result of workplace violence.

He also noted that the open enrollment period for health benefits ends on May 1. The state has discontinued the floating open enrollment period and returned to the April enrollment period. He further noted that an amnesty period is still in effect which allows employees to remove any ineligible dependents from their health care coverage. This also includes employees credited with both spouses being state employees when one is no longer eligible. If corrections are made during this time, there will be no penalties. Martin stressed the importance of having paperwork for new employees submitted in a timely manner so that employees can attend orientation to sign up for health care benefits. State policy no longer allows retroactive enrollment for employees who miss the deadline for enrollment in a given month.

* Return To Work Policy: The state has mandated that each agency adopt an aggressive return to work program. The goal is to keep down worker compensation costs. Personnel Services has hired a Return to Work Coordinator, Teresa Lyons. The focus will be on returning employees to the workforce, even on light or temporary duties if necessary, in their own work area first. If this is not possible, then placement in the employee's department will next be considered and then in the campus community. Personnel Services will work with Environmental Health and Safety Services, and accommodations will be made within ADA guidelines. The university has approximately 450 worker compensation claims each year and generally has 20 to 30 claims in process at any one time. Costs to the university are approximately \$3 million a year.

* Cash Match Program: Martin noted that Personnel Services receives many inquires as to why the state's cash match payment does not show up on the employee earning statement. The contribution is state money and does not come out of the employee's salary. Employees should get quarterly statements from their selected 403(b) company that shows money contributed

from both sources.

2. Reports of Committees

* Staff Senate

Jon Wooge reported that Cathy Jacobs, Director of the Office of Family and Work/Life Resources, gave an overview of the programs and services provided by the office.

* Benefits

The Benefits Committee is scheduled to meet on April 26.

3. New Business

Linda Woodard updated the commission on Virginia Public Service Week, May 7-12, 2001, proclaimed by the Governor. Employees from around the state will be recognized for special accomplishments in various categories. Unfortunately, information and guidelines for the awards were not received in time to allow committees to be put together to review and submit nominations by the deadline. However, submissions were made using existing awards programs that fit the state's criteria. An article in the May 4 edition of Spectrum will provide details on the university's submissions. It is hoped that in the future the state will provide information in a more timely manner. The university will also be incorporating this new program into the university's award recognition policy.

4. Announcements and Other Business

* A conflict has arisen with the next regularly scheduled commission meeting. A new program for lab employees is scheduled for this date. Since several commission members have been invited to attend, the chair will reschedule the meeting for another date.

* April 27 is Founders' Day.

* The McComas Leadership Seminar is scheduled for May 3.

* Staff Appreciation Day is May 16.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned 2:45 PM.

Judy Davis, CPS/CAP
Executive Secretary Senior
President's Office, Virginia Tech
210 Burruss Hall (0131)
Blacksburg, VA 24061
(540) 231-6232 FAX: (540) 231-4265
