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1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

3. VISIT FROM THE VTCSOM PERSONNEL WORKING GROUP
Presentation and discussion on plans for integrating the School of Medicine faculty

Dr. Jack FINNEY
- MOTIVATION: VTCSOM was the original vision for this public/private partnership, but due to accreditation problems, the school of medicine was originally developed as a private SOM.
- STRUCTURE: Leadership in place. The school is already incredibly successful; it will become our 9th College and the Roanoke Innovation corridor, a sort of CRC, will be added. All degree-programs will be VT based.
- INTEGRATION: Dozens of people are working out the logistics (finances, personnel, facilities, accreditations, etc.) so that VTCSOM can open July 1, 2018.
- FACULTY APPOINTMENTS: Multiple employers: Not all faculty members will be under the full purview of VT (e.g., some would not be Senators). There will be a good number non-tenure faculty, too. The anticipated number of TT faculty is 50 (most are already part of VT, in Biomedical Research especially).

Dr. Cynda JOHNSON, Founding President and Dean, VTCSOM (since 2008)
- Faculty appointments (Ct^ed): There are 750 faculty now; 20 or 30 are “tenure-to-title” track, as in most other med schools.
- A Vet School partnership is already in place.
- Students: There have been 7 classes since 2008; 2014 is when the first class graduated, then integration process was launched. NIH funding and admissions rate are impressive; there are 42/year; it is necessary to build clinical capacity and facilities before increasing enrollment.
- Funding: SOM lives within its budget; right-sizing is key.
- There is no accreditation for PhD programs at this point (except with VT CRI).
- Research: Practice-based research is taught and encouraged, including for undergraduates (e.g., BA in Public Health).
- Diversity issue is being successfully addressed, since it is part of accreditation requirements.
- A shuttle between campuses is in the works.

Dean Johnson reiterated that Faculty Senate input is required as part of SACS accreditation.
2. BUDGET MODEL FEEDBACK DISCUSSION:
Much input was provided by senators on the floor on behalf of their respective departments. Recurring questions, concerns, and suggestions include:
- Second majors are not second-class citizens; why count only primaries? The same amount of resources is necessary to produce a major. Differentiating between students who pay the same tuition rate in terms of varying premiums appears troublesome.
- The impact of teaching is not immediately measurable.
- The model appears to disproportionately value competitiveness over collaboration.
- How will national bench-marking be done?
- A long-term view and qualitative measures are needed.
- Extension, Outreach and Service appear to be missing.
- Evaluating metrics themselves is key (Cf. Wells Fargo scandal).
- There is a risk of increasing the divide between the Humanities, and other disciplines with no sponsored research, and heavily-funded units.

Many underscored a communication issue regarding the model itself and its development & implementation plan:
1) The model: The need for the Provost and Budget office to release the much talked-about “47 performance metrics” was near-unanimously emphasized. Advantages would be to appraise and test things out and get feedback before full implementation occurs; to have a multi-level review; and to cut the perception of top-down management.
2) The plan: “Moving target” issue: We are giving feedback on a model which we only know in parts and which has already been altered significantly!

These are but a few of the remarks that were voiced. The Faculty Senate will write a report based on the feedback received and forward it to the Provost’s office.

4. TASKFORCE DISCUSSION – President Monty Abbas:
Four taskforces were (partly) formed and charged with identifying problems and proposing solutions in order to enhance faculty engagement:
- Education: to revise the existing SPOT survey and propose other ways to value and evaluate teaching
- Research: to help implement the COR/CFA survey (conducted last year)
- Scholarship: to increase publication and impact
- P&T: to clarify P&T requirements and the related governance process; to shorten or move up the P&T timeline; to discuss the relevancy of metrics to be used; to define proper benchmarks with the help of each discipline, each department; to foster innovation not just follow standard or passé requirements.

5. COMMISSION UPDATES:
CGS&P has resolutions that were not forwarded to the Senate: The Chair/Secretary will be informed of the new procedure.
UC: One replacement is needed.
CUSP: A 2-year committee was created to oversee the implementation of the Pathways CLE.

Meeting adjourned at 6:56 pm