Faculty Senate Agenda & Minutes
January 24, 2020, 2:30-4:15pm
Location: NCB 160 (or via Zoom for those outside Blacksburg)


Guests: Coogan Thompson (GSA)

Approval of Agenda
Agenda approved by unanimous consent.

Approval of Minutes
Minutes from December 6th approved by unanimous consent.

Announcements
- John Ferris noted that the employer share of retirement benefits has increased from 13.52 to 14.46 percent.
- John Ferris provided an update on undergraduate enrollment and noted that there should be multiple independent models used by the hired contractor. All of the data is tracking similar to last year, so they should be accurate, at least college by college.
  - A senator asked if it was ethical to offer students admission based on how likely they are to accept.
    - John Ferris mentioned that there are multiple models that are used, so it is not entirely based off one or the other.
  - A senator asked if the models agree.
    - Answer: We will know on February 7th.
  - A senator asked if they talked about a total enrollment number.
    - Answer: The colleges talk about their number and then the models help predict the yield rate. They are going to lower their prediction for at least the College of Engineering. If there are not enough students, they will offer admission to waitlisted students.

Topic 1: Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs (CAPFA)
Resolution
● Should an AP Faculty Senate be created and a constitution drawn up? John Ferris suggests that the Senate should have an opinion on this.
  ○ A senator asked how an AP Faculty Senate would interact with this Faculty Senate. Are they all co-equal constituencies with Staff Senate?
    ■ John Ferris notes that communication between the senates would be critical to success; it would help the groups connect. In addition to this, there is a larger discussion about general shared governance.
  ○ A senator mentioned that we already don’t have enough Faculty representation on University Council.
  ○ There is no guidance on how AP faculty do their annual reviews.
    ■ John Ferris noted that having their own senate may assist with those issues.
○ John Ferris noted that research faculty currently report to the VP of research, and it may be appropriate for them to be a part of this senate in the future.
○ A senator asked what needs of AP faculty are not already being addressed.
  ■ John Ferris noted that we don’t really know. Their opinions are not voiced so they may need a senate.
    ● Senator mentioned that if we don’t know the issues, then they may be able to be solved in the current system.
  ■ An AP faculty member noted that over the last 30 years the number of AP faculty has greatly increased. VT chose to maintain the rank of AP faculty, whereas many other schools categorize them as academic staff. Staff members are directly linked to the state, so their policies are created through a different process. Many AP faculty are part of residential services and athletics; very few are in academics. They are represented on different councils, but do not have their own governmental body.
  ■ A senator noted that about 15 years ago AP faculty were more aligned with staff.
    ● An AP faculty member noted that a lot of IT employees moved from staff to AP faculty as they had different concerns.
  ■ John Ferris noted that we agree the AP faculty should have a constituent body, but the open question is if this can be accomplished through Staff Senate or they need their own senate. Are administrators included in this, and should they be?
    ● A senator asked why CAPFA cannot solve the issues that have been mentioned. Is that commission not charged with these?
    ● How many AP faculty members are there?
      ○ Answer: 2,000 (which is 40% of faculty)
      ○ A senator mentioned that there is no mention of the number of Professional versus Administrative faculty.
      ○ A senator mentioned that not all AP faculty are IT and that their regulations are very difficult to navigate and manage.
    ● A senator asked whether the constitution can exclude administrators, if this resolution is approved.
  ● John Ferris noted:
    ○ Administrators who already have representation should not be included in the new senate.
    ○ How will this affect University Council? Representation?
    ○ Would we support the creation of this AP senate? What is the best way to give them representation, if we think that is appropriate?
    ○ In the shared governance conversation, an AP FS does not cause any issues.
    ○ Who exactly will be represented by the new senate?
  ■ Straw Poll: Does FS support this resolution? *with the caveats (representation questions)
● 29 in favor, 3 against
● John Ferris will note that there is a good amount of support but it was not unanimous.

**Topic 2: Election of Senators**

● John Ferris read through the draft resolution.
  ○ Part B Section (2): *Senator asked if those faculty members that don’t have a department could make up their own voting body.*
    ■ The Honors College has some faculty who have affiliations with other academic units, yet a small number of Honors faculty have no other affiliation, and Honors is planning to have additional Honors ONLY faculty. As needed, the Faculty Senate cabinet is determining how such anomalies are represented, until the issue can be resolved.
    ■ John Ferris noted that Part C Section (1) is already part of the bylaws.
    ■ A senator suggested that there should be an uneven number of senators to ensure that there are no tie votes.
    ■ A senator asked if the 100 number is based on what the senate already has.
    ■ Senator asked if the School of Medicine faculty are AP faculty.
      ● John Ferris said the senate may invite 11 of the School of Medicine faculty to participate in FS, even if they cannot vote.
      ■ A senator identified a need for discussion about how to handle the School of Construction specifically.
  ○ John Ferris noted that he will take another look at the resolution and report back to the senate.

**Topic 3: Update on Promotion & Tenure revision**

*Although this was a topic on the agenda, it was tabled until the next meeting (to save time for Topic 4).*

**Topic 4: Closed Session to Discuss a Personnel Matter**

The Senate voted to go into closed session at 3:50pm and returned from closed session at 4:15pm.

**Other business**

No other business was presented.

**Adjourn**

The meeting formally adjourned at 4:15pm.

*Note: Minutes captured by Cameron Donaldson, with additional editing by Eric Kaufman.*