

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

November 15, 2016

PRESENT: Abbas, Agud, Allnut, Anderson, Ashley, Bairaktarova, Baker, Barney, Brown, Bush, Corl, Dalloul, Geyer, Gilmore, Hicok, Hosig (alternate), Kaufman, Lyon, Mackey, Noirot, O’Keefe, Olson, Puckett, Richey, Robinson, Rosenzweig, Schenk, Shadle, Skaggs, Spotila, Sultan, Tegarden, Tracy, Trogdon, Viehland, Wemhoener, Young.

ABSENT: Ahmadian, Amacher, Balci, Billingsly, Brewster, Ducker, Etzkorn, Ferris, Gabbard, Gaskill, Gindlesberger, Good, Gynn, Hopkins, Jordan, Leon, Luttrell, Martin, Matheson, McGrath, Merola, Nappier, O’Rourke, Patterson, Polanah, Reed, Rinehart, Robinson, Safaai-Jazi, Savla, Seth, Smith, Stivachtis, Tavera, Tegarden, Trogdon, Vogelaar, Watson, Zhang.

GUESTS: Jack Finney, Menah Pratt-Clarke, Thanassis Rikakis, Janell Watson.

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

II. PRESENTATION BY JANELL WATSON ON AAUP & ITS VIRGINIA TECH CHAPTER

Dr. Watson shared information about the American Association of University Professors, its origins, mission, and modes of action, such as legal support or challenges to violations of academic freedom, plus a yearly lobbying effort in Richmond on the part of the Virginia chapter. A Spring Forum on University Budget Models, to be held at VT, with an outside expert is announced. New members are invited to join.

III. VP MENAH PRATT-CLARKE ON THE PATHWAYS INTERSECTIONAL DIVERSITY PROPOSAL (now “Critical Analysis of Identity and Inequality in the Human Condition”) FROM CEOD

The initial impulse was the 2015-16 protests and requests for a better climate and “sustainable transformation” at the University, which came to the attention of the Office for Inclusion & Diversity.

1. Goal # 1: Institutionalizing structures

InclusiveVT is an Executive Council now. Ideally, VT would reach a 40% diverse student body in the future, as per the goal set by President Sands. (“Diverse” = underrepresented minorities plus historically underserved populations.)

2. Goal # 2: Diversifying faculty

Only 2% of faculty hires are diversity hires at this point. A new committee has been tasked with strategic planning, recruitment, and funding of diverse faculty hiring.

3. Goal # 3: Improving climate

New cultural centers have been created and duly funded.

4. “Critical Analysis of Identity & Inequality in the Human Condition” as a proposed Pathways Outcome

In light of the above-mentioned goals and concerns, the CEOD issued a resolution to add in a new Core Outcome to the Pathways Curriculum. The purpose is to include mandatory course requirements in diversity-related issues. Since the May 2016 University Council resolution to review and update the inclusion of intersectional diversity into the core curriculum, extensive discussions have occurred, particularly within a six-member faculty working group (comprised of instructional and AP faculty), from which the current proposal came out. The October 27 version of the resolution is available here: <http://www.pathways.prov.vt.edu/8pdf/pathways-revision-doc.pdf>

Why make it a core learning outcome? Because the equivalent currently is not technically required, whether through “Reasoning in the Social Sciences” or “Intercultural and Global Awareness”; there are gaps in key knowledge areas. The permission to “double-count” is there to lighten up the load, as a way not to add 3 credit-hours to Pathways.

The resolution is currently in 15-day review period from CEOD and UCCGE. (All can leave feedback on the website until late November.) It will be reviewed by CUSP in January, then the Faculty Senate again, once the December revision comes through. Both CFA and the Senate have been consulted. A Fall 2018 implementation is projected.

IV. FACULTY SENATE STATEMENT AFFIRMING PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNITY

Many thanks to Brett Shadle for proposing the following:

Faculty Senate Statement Affirming the Virginia Tech Principles of Community

Across the country, expressions of hatred toward Muslims, racial minorities, LGBTQ individuals, and immigrants have recently increased in virulence. On our campus, some students and faculty from these communities have shared their fear of isolation, verbal harassment, and physical violence. It is imperative that all members of the Virginia Tech community feel safe and welcome, regardless of their race, religion, sexual orientation or gender identification, or national origin. As a message of support to any who may feel increasingly marginalized, the Faculty Senate reaffirms the Virginia Tech Principles of Community:

Virginia Tech is a public land-grant university, committed to teaching and learning, research, and outreach to the Commonwealth of Virginia, the nation, and the world community. Learning from the experiences that shape Virginia Tech as an institution, we acknowledge those aspects of our legacy that reflected bias and exclusion. Therefore, we adopt and practice the following principles as fundamental to our on-going efforts to increase access and inclusion and to create a community that nurtures learning and growth for all of its members:

- *We affirm* the inherent dignity and value of every person and strive to maintain a climate for work and learning based on mutual respect and understanding.
- *We affirm* the right of each person to express thoughts and opinions freely. We encourage open expression within a climate of civility, sensitivity, and mutual respect.
- *We affirm* the value of human diversity because it enriches our lives and the University. We acknowledge and respect our differences while affirming our common humanity.
- *We reject* all forms of prejudice and discrimination, including those based on age, color, disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, national origin, political affiliation, race, religion, sexual orientation, and veteran status. We take individual and collective responsibility for helping to eliminate bias and discrimination and for increasing our own understanding of these issues through education, training, and interaction with others.
- *We pledge* our collective commitment to these principles in the spirit of the Virginia Tech motto of *Ut Prosim* (That I May Serve).

This statement was presented and contextualized by President Abbas. Secretary Noirot moved to adopt it and share it widely, both internally and with the greater community. The motion was adopted. As of 11/18, the statement has already been disseminated via the Faculty Senate listserv, its website, and social media. It will be shared with the local media, as well as students and Department heads. All faculty members are invited to share it on their Canvas/course websites and anywhere they see fit.

V. PROVOST RIKAKIS ON DESTINATION AREAS, BUDGET UPDATE, AND UNIVERSITY LABS

Following the adoption of the above-mentioned “Statement Affirming the Virginia Tech Principles of Community,” Provost Rikakis emphasized the idea that “we are building a community that does not

tolerate hate speech.” Our Principles of Community are here to guarantee a safe learning environment. He then presented updates in three areas of concern to the Faculty:

1. Destination/Strategic Growth Areas

We are now entering Stage II, in the next 18 months. Transformative, transdisciplinary work is the goal: the “VT shaped student,” and the University as a “Global destination for talent.” Curricular modularity is a means to achieve that. About 10,000 students could be in Destination Areas (DAs) within 10 years or so. “**Stakeholder Committees**” (SCs) comprising faculty members, Deans, and Institute directors are being formed. They will oversee the interplay between inclusivity, hires, facilities, curriculum, industry partnerships, and research in DAs. The SCs will have a May 2018 deadline to decide on implementation after initial assessment.

2. University Labs:

University Institutes have been playing a strategic role in raising VT’s status as a major research institution. But in lieu of new institutes, the University shall now create **University Labs** following requests from the Stakeholder Committees. Those will centralize external funding opportunities for Destination Areas.

■ Q&A:

- The composition of the Stakeholder Committees (SC) should be inclusive.
- Some programs, if not Colleges, feel ignored despite contributing to the initial visioning initiative. For example, the “Security” DA should incorporate Humanistic elements (e.g., migration, internationalism, race, etc.). Research concerned with people matters, not just servers and data. Provost Rikakis voiced his commitment to integrating all feedback and making DAs part of a “transformative, fully integrative, 360 vision,” doing away with binaries such as STEMs vs Humanities. The human component is indeed critical in all DAs; all SCs will be “360.”
- Issues of access remain for faculty dealing with the institutes. They will be addressed.

3. Budget updates:

A. *State budget cuts*

- Impact: 7.5% State budget cut = about 2.3% overall cut.
- Strategies: to “moderate the growth” and to “grow our portfolio” through the diversification of resources: endowment, enrollment, research. The New Budget Model is a “growth budget.”
- Next steps: No cuts for strategic areas identified by departments. “We’re gonna grow out of this!”

B. *Budget model*

Again, the new budget model, or **PIBB = “Partnership for incentive-based budget,”** is decentralized and designed to fund outcomes, support quality, and promote the diversification of resources. Some of its internal components will comprise:

- a. Unit allocations: enrollment, SCH, external funding... Plus premiums in all areas (about 60-68%)
- b. Scorecards: “quality metrics” related to faculty, student, and administrative success (about 32-40%)

All units are encouraged to grow areas such as enterprise funds, contract courses, sponsored research, and earmarked revenues. PIBB pie chart: The distribution will be different for each College of course, since for instance sponsored research is nearly nonexistent in some. Conclusion: “Hit your metrics”...

4. QUESTIONS from the Senate Cabinet & the floor to the Provost:

1. What are the **targets** used for benchmarking? → The metrics will come from each department, which will state its priorities for success, its targets for good performance in this or that area.
2. What are the 47 performance **metrics** and their **weights**? → The weight will vary per College. 32% will be the average for “quality metrics” and “We’ll check to make sure that’s what your peers are using” (Rikakis). Some tweaking is expected.

3. **Benchmarks:** Benchmarking means making a case based on national data, peer-institution standards. It is not yet clear how often the benchmarks will be reassessed.

Meeting adjourned at 7:19PM.