UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING
May 7, 2018
3:00 p.m.
1045 Pamplin Hall

AGENDA

1. **Adoption of Agenda**
   
   Dr. Timothy Sands

2. **Announcement of approval and posting of minutes of April 16, 2018**
   
   These minutes have been voted on electronically and will be posted on the University web.

   Dr. Timothy Sands

3. **Old Business**
   
   Dr. Timothy Sands

   - **Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity**
     
     Resolution CEOD 2017-18A
     
     Resolution to Modify Caucus Criteria for Representation on the Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity

     Resolution CEOD 2017-18B
     
     Resolution to Modify the Membership of the Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity (CEOD)

4. **New Business**
   
   Dr. Timothy Sands

   - **Commission on Faculty Affairs**
     
     Resolution CFA 2017-18A
     
     Resolution to Revise Faculty Handbook Section 3.2.2: Alumni Distinguished Professors

   - **Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies**
     
     Resolution CUSP 2017-18U
     
     Resolution to Approve New Major, Nanomedicine, in Bachelor of Science in Nanoscience

     Resolution CUSP 2017-18V
     
     Resolution to Amend Implementation for the Pathways General Education Curriculum to Extend Pathways Ad Hoc Review Committee

5. **Announcement of acceptance and posting of Commission Minutes**
   
   These minutes have been accepted for filing by electronic vote and will be posted on the University web. Note that the purpose of voting on Commission minutes is to accept them for filing. University Council By-laws require that policy items be brought forward in resolution form for University Council action.

   Dr. Timothy Sands
Commission on Faculty Affairs

April 13, 2018

Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies

April 4, 2018

Commission on Research

March 14, 2018

Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies

April 9, 2018

6. **Presentation**
   Update from the General Assembly
   Mr. Dwight Shelton
   Mr. Chris Yianilos
   Ms. Elizabeth Hooper

7. **Adjournment**
   Dr. Timothy Sands
University Council Minutes  
April 16, 2018  
3:00 PM  
1045 Pamplin Hall


Absent: Richard Blythe, Michael Friedlander, Steve McKnight, Chris Saunders, Bryan Brown, Bob Hicok, Anita Puckett, Chris Lawrence, Mary Marchant (with notice), Yan Jiao, Christopher, Zobel, Judy Alford (with notice), LaTawnya Burleson (with notice), Brian Huddleston, Katrina Loan, Erin Poff, Annette Bailey, Ginai Seabron, Michele Waters, Adwoa Baah-Dwomoh, Savannah Nelson, & Robert Sebek (with notice)

Guests: Nancy Bodenhorn, D’Elia Chandler, Jack Finney, Rachel Gabriele, Rachel Holloway, Erin Lavender-Stott, Erin McCann, Mallory Miller, Marcy Schnitzer, Rick Sparks, Diane Zahm,

Dr. Sands called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. A quorum was present.

1. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the agenda. The motion carried.

2. Announcement of approval and posting of minutes of April 2, 2018

Dr. Sands noted that these minutes have been voted on electronically and can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System on the Web (http://www.governance.vt.edu).

3. Old Business

Commission on Research
Resolution COR 2017-18A
Resolution to Clarify Faculty Handbook Language on Research Faculty Promotion Process

Dr. Ginny Pannabecker presented the resolution for second reading and made a motion to approve. The motion was seconded. Dr. Pannabecker indicated that two minor edits that were recommended at the April 2 University Council meeting have been made to the resolution for second reading. A vote was taken, and the motion passed.

Commission on Research
Resolution COR 2017-18B
Resolution to Clarify Faculty Handbook Language on Overload Compensation for Research Faculty Members Teaching Credit Classes
Dr. Ginny Pannabecker presented the resolution for second reading and made a motion to approve. The motion was seconded, and the motion passed.

**Commission on Research**  
Resolution COR 2017-18C  
Resolution to Clarify Language in Faculty Handbook on Removal Processes for Research Faculty Members

Dr. Ginny Pannabecker presented the resolution for second reading and made a motion to approve. The motion was seconded, and the motion passed.

**Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies**  
Resolution CUSP 2017-18F  
Resolution to Discontinue Bachelor of Science Degree in Environmental Policy and Planning

Dr. Dean Stauffer presented the resolution for second reading and made a motion to approve. The motion was seconded, and the motion passed.

**Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies**  
Resolution CUSP 2017-18G  
Resolution to Approve New Major, Environmental Policy Planning, in Bachelor of Arts in Public and Urban Affairs

**Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies**  
Resolution CUSP 2017-18H  
Resolution to Approve New Major, Smart and Sustainable Cities, in Bachelor of Arts in Public and Urban Affairs

Dr. Dean Stauffer presented these two resolutions for second reading and made a motion to approve both. The motion was seconded, and the motion passed.

**Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies**  
Resolution CUSP 2017-18I  
Resolution to Approve New Major, Chip-Scale Integration, in Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering

**Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies**  
Resolution CUSP 2017-1J  
Resolution to Approve New Major, Controls, Robotics & Autonomy, in Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering

**Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies**  
Resolution CUSP 2017-18K  
Resolution to Approve New Major, Machine Learning, in Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering

**Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies**  
Resolution CUSP 2017-18L  
Resolution to Approve New Major, Networking & Cybersecurity, in Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering

**Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies**  
Resolution CUSP 2017-18M  
Resolution to Approve New Major, Software Systems, in Bachelor of Computer in Computer Engineering

Dr. Dean Stauffer presented these five resolutions for new majors in Computer Engineering for second reading and made a motion to approve. The motion was seconded, and the motion passed.

**Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies**  
Resolution CUSP 2017-18N  
Resolution to Approve New Major, Communications & Networking, in Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering
Dr. Dean Stauffer presented these seven resolutions for new majors in Electrical Engineering for second reading and made a motion to approve. The motion was seconded, and the motion passed.

The resolution for second reading and made a motion to approve. The motion was seconded, and the motion passed.

Dr. Richard Ashley presented the resolution for second reading and made a motion to approve. The motion was seconded, and the motion passed.

Resolution CUS 2017-18A
Resolution to Rename, Update Charge, and Change Membership of the Computing and Communication Resource Committee

Dr. Richard Ashley presented the resolution for second reading and made a motion to approve. The motion was seconded, and the motion passed.

Resolution CEOD 2017-18C
Joint Resolution to Update Membership of the Campus Development Committee

Dr. Richard Ashley presented the resolution for second reading and made a motion to approve. The motion was seconded, and the motion passed.

4. New Business

Resolution CEOD 2017-18A
Resolution to Modify Caucus Criteria for Representation on the Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity
Dr. Deyu Hu presented the resolution for first reading. This change in the caucus membership will allow for better representation from populations that are underrepresented and/or underserved and historically marginalized.

**Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity**  
Resolution CEOD 2017-18B  
Resolution to Modify the Membership of the Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity (CEOD)

Dr. Deyu Hu presented the resolution for first reading. Dr. Hu indicated that this is currently the largest commission with 36 members. This resolution will reduce the number of members to 25, which will help eliminate redundancy and allow the commission to be more efficient. There were many concerns voiced that with these changes there is not enough student representation since the caucuses represented on CEOD are faculty/staff caucuses. A question was raised regarding the rationale for eliminating the student representative from the Council of International Student Organizations (CISO). A suggestion was made to not eliminate the Graduate Student Assembly and Student Government Association representatives. Another suggestion was made to indicate that student representatives would hold the at-large positions. Dr. Hu indicated that all Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity meetings are open to the public and anyone can attend and make comment. Dr. Hu then indicated that the concerns mentioned would be taken back to the commission for discussion and possible revisions.

**Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies**  
Resolution CGSP 2017-18A  
Resolution to Incorporate an Inclusion and Diversity Education Component into Graduate Education

Dr. Kevin Edgar presented the resolution for first reading. It is important for graduate students at Virginia Tech to be exposed to concepts of inclusion and diversity and to have the opportunity to discuss what those concepts mean on this campus at the proper academic level. This resolution requires individual academic units to prepare educational programs in inclusion and diversity which would be part of a student’s graduation requirements. There are examples of acceptable educational programs in the appendix of this resolution. There will be a soft rollout of this in 2019 with a few academic units.

Dr. Cyril Clarke raised a question as to whether this resolution is to include professional students. Dr. Karen DePauw indicated that the Commission on Graduate Studies and Polices (CGSP) does not have a representative from the DVM and MD programs on CGSP so the discussion of this resolution was focused on graduate students, not professional students. The commission will have to review the resolution again if the desire is to include DVM and MD students. Dr. Cyril Clarke indicated that there needs to be clarification as to if this is requirement for DVM and MD students. Dr. Clarke then indicated depending on how the DVM and MD students are addressed, there is an accreditation requirement for all new courses. Dr. Clarke then mentioned that clarification is needed if the soft rollout in 2019 is for new students only or if it includes existing students. A suggestion was made to allow all areas to be in compliance with this requirement within three years. It was then indicated that this requirement does not have to be a new course and may be incorporated in an already existing course.

Dr. Clarke mentioned that in November of 2016 the Board of Visitors passed a resolution that enabled pre-enrollment courses to be required prior to students being permitted to enroll in credit-bearing courses. CGSP may wish to consider whether a pre-enrollment course could achieve the objective.

Dr. Sands inquired about preparation of Graduate Student Teaching Assistants (GTAs) with respect to inclusive pedagogy. It was indicated that all GTAs must take the GTA workshop that includes some basic required information, and they are required to enroll in the Inclusive Pedagogy course and an Ethics course. This requirement is for those graduate students who will be teaching.

A concern was raised that this requirement will place an additional workload on the faculty.
The goal may be accomplished better and more efficiently if the Graduate School were to develop courses or seminars rather than requiring the individual departments or programs to do so.

Dr. Deyu Hu indicated that the Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity endorses this resolution.

**Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies**  
Resolution CEOD 2017-18C  
Resolution to Revise the Graduate Honor System Constitution

Dr. Kevin Edgar presented the resolution for first reading. A committee of faculty, graduate students, and administrators reviewed and revised the Graduate Honor System Constitution to address concerns regarding the appeals process and include more learner-centered language and penalties.

5. **Announcement of Approval and Posting of Commission Minutes**

These minutes have been voted on electronically and will be posted on the University web (http://www.governance.vt.edu). Note that the purpose of voting on Commission minutes is to accept them for filing. University Council By-laws require that policy items be brought forward in resolution form for University Council action.

- Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs  
  March 14, 2018

- Commission on Faculty Affairs  
  March 16, 2018

- Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies  
  March 21, 2018

- Commission on Outreach and International Affairs  
  March 15, 2018

- Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies  
  March 26, 2018

- Commission on University Support  
  September 21, 2017  
  November 16, 2017  
  January 18, 2018  
  February 15, 2018

6. **For Information Only**

Minutes of the University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning  
March 15, 2018

7. **Presentation**

Dr. Menah Pratt Clark, Vice President for Strategic Affairs and Vice Provost for Inclusion and Diversity, gave a presentation (attached) on the strategic planning process.
8. **Announcements**

- President Sands announced that in the General Assembly special session, Governor Northam reintroduced almost the exact same budget as Governor McAuliffe introduced last December. The House reintroduced almost the exact same budget as it had during the regular session. The Senate has not yet introduced a budget during the special session.

- President Sands announced that it is the 11th Anniversary of April 16, 2007, and asked for a moment of silence in remembrance of those lost that day.

9. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, a motion was made to adjourn the meeting 3:58 p.m.
Strategic Planning Process

Overview

- Beyond Boundaries Summary
- Strategic Planning Structure
- Common Foundation
- Strategic Framework Integration
- Proposed Mission, Vision, Core Values and Objectives
- Planning Process and Roadmap
- Next Steps
- Questions
What is Beyond Boundaries?

Beyond Boundaries is the foundation for a vision for Virginia Tech a generation into the future.

Why is Beyond Boundaries Important to Virginia Tech?

Beyond Boundaries is the foundation for a vision that provides a framework for Virginia Tech to:

- Be **nationally/internationally recognized** for excellence in academics, research, and innovation
- **Compete for top talent** across faculty, staff, and students
- **Expand** the breadth and depth of educational and experiential opportunities through inclusion and diversity
- **Address** continued funding cuts and disinvestment at federal and state levels
- Make a clear case for philanthropy and **public-private partnerships**
- Become more **operationally nimble** and **adaptable** to address industry changes and funding challenges
Guiding Components and Discovery Concepts of Beyond Boundaries

**Guiding Components**

- **Campus of the Future**
  Determining future campus facility and infrastructure needs.

- **Global Land-Grant**
  Utilizing research and service to address complex global issues.

- **New Funding Models**
  Identifying new and diverse revenue sources for future growth.

- **Preparing Students**
  Creating innovative approaches to teaching and learning.

- **VT-Shaped Discovery**
  Purpose-driven engagement with a combination of disciplinary depth and interdisciplinary capacities.

- **Communities of Discovery**
  Advance organizational networks and engage the university in ideas that matter.

- **Nexus of Discovery**
  Living laboratory that projects Virginia Tech to the world and brings the world to Virginia Tech.

**Current Initiatives**

- **Destination Areas and Strategic Growth Areas**
  Advances Beyond Boundaries by combining existing academic and research strengths with innovative transdisciplinary teams, tools, and processes.

- **InclusiveVT**
  Virginia Tech’s institutional and individual commitment to Ut Prosim (That I May Serve) in the spirit of community, diversity, and excellence.

- **Campus Master Plan**
  Buildings and facility component of the strategic plan that serves as a road map for the physical future of campus.

- **Partnership for Incentive-Based Budget (PIBB)**
  Tool for supporting the strategic vision of the university through an incentive-based college-level budget process.
Strategic Planning Structure

Office for Strategic Affairs

Steering Committee

Advisory Committee

Metrics and Rankings Subcommittee

Research Subcommittee

Data Analysis Workgroup

SWOT Analysis Workgroup

Leadership Team

Menah Pratt-Clarke
Vice President for Strategic Affairs

Erin McCann
Director for Strategic Planning

Patty Becksted
Assistant Director for Strategic Planning

Agnes Porter
Program Administrator for Strategic Affairs
### Leadership Team

**Steering Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Holt</td>
<td>Professor and Head of Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Khademian</td>
<td>Professor and Director of the School of Public and International Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara Khansa</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs, Pamplin College of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Knapp</td>
<td>Director of the Institute for Creativity, Arts, and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvester Johnson</td>
<td>Assistant Vice Provost for the Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Fricker</td>
<td>Professor and Head of the Department of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallory Miller</td>
<td>Project Manager, Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Mayer</td>
<td>Vice President for Research and Innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Advisory Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Amelink</td>
<td>Assistant Vice Provost for Learning Systems Innovation and Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Case</td>
<td>Professor and Head of the Department of Engineering Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Hungerford</td>
<td>Professor and Head of the Department of Population Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Khademian</td>
<td>Presidential Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwame Harrison</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Earley</td>
<td>Associate Vice Provost for Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Jantzen</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Guerin</td>
<td>Associate Vice Provost for Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvester Johnson</td>
<td>Assistant Vice Provost for the Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Crawford</td>
<td>Professor and Chair of the Department of Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara Khansa</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs, Pamplin College of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Holt</td>
<td>Professor and Head of the Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Holbrook</td>
<td>Professor and Head of the Department of Geosciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Harder</td>
<td>Project Research Specialist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Advisory Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Knapp</td>
<td>Director of the Institute for Creativity, Arts, and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Wilkes</td>
<td>Interim Vice President for Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Stone</td>
<td>Director of Operations for the National Capital Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammie Smith</td>
<td>Business Operations Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Wong</td>
<td>Associate Dean of the Graduate School, National Capital Region and Director of the Northern Virginia Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savita Sharma</td>
<td>Chief of Staff to the Vice President for Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Roberto</td>
<td>Director of the Institute for Society, Culture, and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Lambert</td>
<td>Student, Pamplin College of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercedes Ramirez Fernandez</td>
<td>Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Affairs and Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcy Schnitzer</td>
<td>Assistant Provost for Diversity and Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammie Smith</td>
<td>Business Operations Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Knocke</td>
<td>Professor and Program Coordinator, Department of Civil &amp; Environmental Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laufa Roberto</td>
<td>Director of the Institute for Creativity, Arts, and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Wilkes</td>
<td>Interim Vice President for Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Stone</td>
<td>Director of Operations for the National Capital Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammie Smith</td>
<td>Business Operations Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Wong</td>
<td>Associate Dean of the Graduate School, National Capital Region and Director of the Northern Virginia Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savita Sharma</td>
<td>Chief of Staff to the Vice President for Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Roberto</td>
<td>Director of the Institute for Society, Culture, and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Lambert</td>
<td>Student, Pamplin College of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercedes Ramirez Fernandez</td>
<td>Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Affairs and Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcy Schnitzer</td>
<td>Assistant Provost for Diversity and Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Simmons</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammie Smith</td>
<td>Business Operations Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Knocke</td>
<td>Professor and Program Coordinator, Department of Civil &amp; Environmental Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Holt</td>
<td>Professor and Head of Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Subcommittees

## Metrics and Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Bulka</td>
<td>Associate Director of Strategic Initiatives, National Capital Region Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Earley</td>
<td>Associate Vice Provost for Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Harder</td>
<td>Project Research Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara Khansa</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs, Pamplin College of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Fricker</td>
<td>Professor and Head of the Department of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcy Schnitzer</td>
<td>Assistant Provost for Diversity and Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Provo</td>
<td>Director of the Office of Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvester Johnson</td>
<td>Assistant Vice Provost for the Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luisa Havens Gerardo</td>
<td>Vice Provost, Enrollment Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savita Sharma</td>
<td>Chief of Staff to the Vice President for Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijay Singal</td>
<td>J. Gray Ferguson Professor of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallory Miller</td>
<td>Project Manager, Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Harder</td>
<td>Project Research Specialist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Offices for Strategic Affairs*
## Subcommittees

**Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Fricker</td>
<td>Professor and Head of the Department of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Barrett</td>
<td>Professor and Director, Biocomplexity Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loy Van Crowder</td>
<td>Executive Director of the Office of International Research, Education, and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Mayer</td>
<td>Vice President for Research and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Knapp</td>
<td>Director of the Institute for Creativity, Arts, and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Dingus</td>
<td>Director, Virginia Tech Transportation Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara Khansa</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs, Pamplin College of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Knocke</td>
<td>Professor and Program Coordinator, Department of Civil &amp; Environmental Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Roberto</td>
<td>Director of the Institute for Society, Culture, and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Holt</td>
<td>Professor and Head of Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Amelink</td>
<td>Assistant Vice Provost for Learning Systems Innovation and Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Holbrook</td>
<td>Professor and Head of the Department of Geosciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Hockman</td>
<td>Communications Coordinator, Fralin (Administrative Support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanjay Raman</td>
<td>Associate Vice President, Virginia Tech Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Wong</td>
<td>Associate Dean of the Graduate School, National Capital Region and Director of the Northern Virginia Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Creating a Common Committee Foundation

- Review Beyond Boundaries
- Examine Current Strategic Plan
- Analyze Prior Strategic Plans
- Explore Academic and Administrative Units
Creating a Common Committee Foundation:
Retreat 1, January 10, 2018

- Pathways/VT Shaped/Experiential Learning/Destination Areas/Strategic Growth Areas (Rachel Holloway)
- Graduate Education, Interdisciplinary Graduate Education Programs (Karen DePauw)
- Student Affairs (Patty Perillo)
- Research Enterprise/Institutes/ Learning/Destination Areas/Strategic Growth Areas (Theresa Mayer)
- Master Plan (Jason Soileau)
- External Affairs & Outreach National Capital Region (Steve McKnight, Nick Stone)
- International and Outreach (Guru Ghosh)
- Roanoke and Health Science & Technology Center (Mike Friedlander)
- Financial Affairs (Tim Hodge, Ken Smith)
- InclusiveVT (Menah Pratt-Clarke)

Creating a Common Committee Foundation:
Retreat 2, January 26, 2018

- Corp of Cadets (Randy Fullhart)
- Human Resources (Lisa Wilkes)
- Information Technology (Scott Midkiff)
- Learning Systems and Destination Areas (Don Taylor)
- Library Services (Tyler Walters)
- University Relations (Tracy Vosburgh)
- Faculty Affairs (Jack Finney)
- Advancement (Charles Phlegar)
- Government Relations (Chris Yianilos)
Creating a Common Committee Foundation:
Retreat 3, February 9, 2018

- Dean of Science (Sally Morton)
- Dean of Engineering (Julie Ross)
- Associate Dean of Business (Kevin Carlson)
- Athletics (Whit Babcock)
- Enrollment (Luisa Havens)
- Virginia Cooperative Extension (Cathy Sutphin)
- Dean of College of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences (Rosemary Blieszner)
- Dean of Natural Resources (Paul Winistorfer)
- Dean of Architecture (Richard Blythe)
- Dean of Veterinary College (Gregory Daniel)
- Dean of Agriculture and Life Sciences (Alan Grant)
- VT Carilion School of Medicine (Dan Harrington)

Committee Presentations and Discussions

- Metrics In Academia (Ron Fricke)
- HUME (Charles Clancy)
- Rankings and Metrics Indicators (James Harder, Mallory Miller)
- Destination Areas (Marcia Davitt)
- Research (Theresa Mayer)
- Institute for Society Culture and Environment (Karen Roberts)
- Institutional Research (Roxanne Bliek, Abhay Joshi)
- Institute for Creativity Arts and Technology (Ben Knapp)
- Academic Affairs Metrics (Ken Smith)
- Financial Resource Metrics (Savita Sharma)
- Biocomplexity Institute (Chris Barrett)
- Virginia Tech Transportation Institute (Tim Dingus)
- Auxiliary Budget Process (Tim Hodge)
- FRALIN (Dennis Dean)
- Assessment and SACS Accreditation (Jaime Williams, Bethany Bodo)
- Institute for Critical Technology and Applied Science (Stefan Duma)
Draft Vision

An inspirational and aspirational statement of what we want to become

We will be the global leader for transformative change in the spirit of *Ut Prosim* (That I May Serve).
As a public land grant university, we enhance personal development; foster economic growth and sustainability; promote diverse and inclusive communities; advance the human condition; and improve the quality of life through knowledge, discovery, innovation, and creativity.

**Draft Mission**
*How the vision will be achieved*

**Draft Strategic Objectives**
*The key principles that support the vision and mission*

**Global Land-Grant**
Engage in integrated approaches to discovery, learning, and engagement – regionally, nationally, and globally.

**Economic Development**
Support the viability of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the nation through economic development, industry partnerships, and talent development.

**Research and Discovery**
Advance knowledge acquisition, discovery, innovation, and the creative process within and across disciplines.

**Student Success**
Prepare students, through innovative teaching and learning, to be empathetic, creative, informed, and engaged citizens.
Draft Strategic Objectives

The key principles that support the vision and mission

Inclusion, Diversity, and Excellence
Promote the institutional and individual commitment to community, diversity, equity, and excellence in accordance with the Principles of Community.

Financial Sustainability
Identify and manage new, diverse, and sustainable revenue sources and implement versatile and robust financial management models and systems.

Campus of the Future
Create and sustain an infrastructure that supports world-class talent and provides dynamic learning and discovery environments through a technology-enhanced, data-enabled, and interconnected campus.

Continuous Planning
Integrate continuous planning, evaluation, and assessment to ensure the organizational capacity for agile, flexible, and data-informed decisions.

Draft Core Values

The foundation for the vision, mission, and strategic objectives

Collaboration and Integration.
We value an integrated approach to discovery, learning, and outreach that is collaborative, transdisciplinary, and impactful.

Diverse and Inclusive Communities.
We value the imperative of diversity, inclusion, and equity to achieve excellence.

Access and Affordability.
We are committed to creating affordable educational opportunities for the Commonwealth of Virginia consistent with its land-grant mission.

Mutual Respect and Open Expression.
We support and promote open expression, self-awareness, mutual respect, and the engagement of different perspectives to enhance discovery, learning, and outreach.

Ethics and Integrity.
We expect the university and its members to maintain the highest standards of integrity and ethical behavior, both personally and professionally.

Reflection and Improvement.
We value continuous evaluation and improvement to advance individual and institutional objectives.
**Strategic Plan Components**

Virginia Tech Strategic Planning Framework

- **Operational**
  - Organization
  - PIBB, Administrative and Auxiliary Budget Processes

- **Financial**
  - Infrastructure

- **Structural**
  - Faculty, Staff and Students

**Campus Engagement Activities**

*April and May 2018*

- Student Government Association Committee
- Department Heads Council Executive Committee
- Faculty Senate
- Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty
- Commission on Research
- Commission on Student Affairs
- Commission on Faculty Affairs
- University Council
- President’s Leadership Council
- Northern Capital Region Senior Management Team
- Commission on Staff Policies and Affairs
- Commission on Outreach and International Affairs
- Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity
- Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies
- Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies
- Staff Senate
- Commission on University Support
- Graduate Student Assembly
- Council of Deans
The Big Picture: Developing the Process and Framework

- Information gathering and collaboration.
  - January – April 2018 Retreats, committee meetings, collaboration with university units.

- Develop mission, vision, core values and objectives.
  - March 2018 – Draft mission, vision, core values and objectives, develop communication strategy, workgroups and university presentations to subcommittees.

- Campus engagement and communication.
  - April 2018 – Engage and inform campus of the strategic planning process.

- Data analysis to formulate goals and metrics.
  - May thru August 2018 – Formulate goals and metrics, research and review rankings, re-engage and inform campus.

- Finalize the strategic framework.
  - September 2018 - April 2019 – Finalize goals, metrics and the strategic framework.

- Partnership for implementation.
  - May 2019 – Present the strategic framework to the campus, partner with campus units for implementation.

- Continuous Evaluation.

Who are we? Beliefs Mission Vision

Where are we now? Performance Data Financial Data Stakeholder Input SWOT Analysis

Where do we want to go? Strategic Goals Areas Strategic Workloads

How do we continue to improve? Performance Objectives Measures & Targets

Questions

- Feedback:
  - [http://www.beyondboundaries.vt.edu/strategicplanning.html](http://www.beyondboundaries.vt.edu/strategicplanning.html)

- Qualtrics Survey
WHEREAS, University Council resolution CEOD 2015-16B updated membership to include representation of diverse employee constituencies by faculty/staff caucuses at Virginia Tech, and

WHEREAS, the Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity seeks representation from populations that are underrepresented and/or underserved and historically marginalized, and

WHEREAS, faculty/staff caucuses have no common criteria for membership and representation on CEOD;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the membership of the Commission on Equal Opportunity be revised in Section III-B of the Bylaws of the University Council, as noted below, effective August 13, 2018, and the proposal forwarded to the President for approval.
University Council By-Laws

B. Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity

Membership:

... 

**TEN Eight Faculty and Staff Caucus community representatives (three-year terms)**

Community representatives shall be chosen by one of two methods. Where there is a single widely representative organization for faculty and staff, this organization would have responsibility for electing a representative. Where there is no appropriate organization (or multiple organizations), then a related office, program, or center serving related interests will be responsible for the nominations and election (or selection) of a community representative. The Vice President for Strategic Affairs and Provost for Inclusion and Diversity will be responsible for overseeing the identification of community representatives on an annual basis, including assuring that named organizations, programs or offices use an open process for securing nominations and interested participants if an election is not feasible or reasonable. Representatives elected by a university organization with open membership for faculty and staff (one representative each). A Faculty/Staff Caucus shall demonstrate its representational nature for membership on CEOD through verification of the following criteria:

- At least one member serving in President, Vice President, Chair, or Vice Chair roles must be faculty or staff. Graduate students who are employees may serve on the leadership team.

- A written mission related to the advancement of equity, diversity, and inclusion.

- An advocacy focus for its own population as well as intersectional identities.

- Representative of an identity group that has been historically underrepresented, marginalized, and disenfranchised.

- Committed to upholding the Principles of Community.

- Maintains organizational documents and policies that include:
  - By-Laws and/or Constitution
  - Elected officers
  - Regular meetings and minutes
  - Definition of voting membership/quorum
• Annual reports of accomplishments and goals for the upcoming year

Changes to caucuses specified below per Resolution CEOD 2015-16B shall be approved by University Council.

- Black Caucus
- LGBT Caucus
- Hispanic / Latino Faculty and Staff Caucus
- Appalachian Caucus
- American Indian and Indigenous People’s Caucus
- Women’s Alliance and Caucus Alliance
- Disability Caucus
- International Caucus
- Veteran’s Caucus
- Asian and Asian American Caucus

WHEREAS, the Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity has grown in size over the years to be the largest Commission in the governance system, and

WHEREAS, University Council resolution CEOD 2015-16B updated membership to include representation of diverse employee constituencies by faculty/staff caucuses at Virginia Tech, and

WHEREAS, the Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity membership from Ex-officio, Faculty Senate, and Staff Senate, and Commission on Student Affairs representatives is higher than other university commissions, and

WHEREAS, University Council resolution CEOD 2014-2015B specifies CEOD’s charge to “study, formulate, and recommend to University Council policies and procedures as they relate to the university’s responsibilities regarding equal opportunity, affirmative action, accessibility, compliance, diversity, and inclusion. Areas for consideration include recruitment, retention, and advancement of faculty, staff, and students, in a manner consistent with the university’s principles of community and commitment to equal opportunity and access”, and

WHEREAS, the Commission should be more efficient through reduced size and yet maintain a diverse and appropriate representation of faculty, staff, and students;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the membership of the Commission on Equal Opportunity be revised in Section III-B of the Bylaws of the University Council, as noted below, effective August 19, 2019, and the proposal forwarded to the President for approval.
University Council By-Laws

B. Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity

Membership*:

Ex-officio

- **Vice President for Strategic Affairs & Vice Provost for Inclusion and Diversity** & **Vice President for Strategic Affairs**
- **Assistant Vice President for Equity and Accessibility**
- **Vice President for Human Resources** & **Associate Vice President for Administration**
- **Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs**
- **Senior Director Cultural and Community Centers** & **Vice President for Student Affairs**
- **Director, Cranwell International Center**
- **Dean of Students**
- **Director of ADA Services and Access Services**

Organizations and Caucuses

- One academic dean selected by the Council of College Deans (two-year term)
- Three representatives elected by the Faculty Senate, who, of which at least one must be a senator (three-year term)
- Three representatives elected by the Staff Senate, who, of which at least one must be a senator (three-year term)
- One representative of the administrative/professional faculty elected by the Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs CAPFA (three-year term)
- One staff representative from the Commission on Staff Policies and Affairs (one-year term)
- One faculty representative from the Commission on Faculty Affairs (one-year term)
- One student representative from the Commission on Student Affairs (one-year term)
- Ten Eight Faculty and Staff Caucus community representatives (three-year terms)

... Three Three faculty, staff, or student at-large members:
- One faculty/staff representative (three-year term)
- One graduate student representative (one-year term)
- One undergraduate representative (one-year term) (three-year term for faculty/staff representatives; one-year term if a student is selected)...

The at-large members will be chosen by an application process, open to faculty, staff, and students, and conducted by the commission annually for the available, undesignated slot. The application process is managed by the Office of Inclusion and Diversity. The commission will forward at least two nominations (so long as there are at least two) for each vacant position to the president for appointment to the commission. The commission may rank the candidates in order of preference. The at-large positions are designed to allow representation from groups not identified above as well as individuals who would make significant contributions to the work of the commission, regardless of background.
- Two one representative of the Student Government Association: the Director of Equity and Inclusion for SGA and one representative elected by the Student Government Association (one-year term)
- One representative of the Graduate Student Assembly elected by the Graduate Student Assembly (one-year term)
- One student representative elected by the Council of International Student Organizations (one-year term)

*The chair will be elected from among the non-ex officio faculty or staff members of the commission

(Last updated on November 2, 2009, July 21, 2014, October 16, 2015, March 3, 2016, July 19, 2016, & October 11, 2016, ...
WHEREAS, the Virginia Tech community strongly endorses a well-rounded educational experience for graduate students, and

WHEREAS, all graduate students and those associated with their education are expected to uphold the Virginia Tech Principles of Community and the Graduate School’s Expectations for Graduate Study, and

WHEREAS, individual departments, colleges, and programs offer opportunities for graduate students to engage in educational programs that promote and strengthen their effectiveness working across disciplines, cognizant of the benefits of a diverse and inclusive environment while studying at Virginia Tech and thereafter,

WHEREAS, inclusion and diversity education at the graduate level would complement existing components developed by college or program diversity committees, InclusiveVT, AdvanceVT, required diversity-related pre-enrollment module and the undergraduate Pathways curriculum, and

WHEREAS, input and endorsement has been received from the Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that all graduate students (with the exception of professional students in DVM and MD unless also pursuing a graduate degree simultaneously) participate in inclusion and diversity educational programs as part of their graduate studies, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the particular inclusion and diversity educational program for a graduate student be selected and approved by the student’s program, department, or college, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the details of the particular inclusion and diversity educational programs within each program, department, or college be submitted for approval to the Graduate School by the Graduate Program Director of a program or department, or its equivalent in a college, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Program of Study for all graduate students show a record of the student’s participation in the particular inclusion and diversity educational programs delineated by the student’s program, department, or college, as part of the student’s graduation requirements.
**RECOMMENDATION:** Implementation to start with a rollout in Fall 2019 with some departments for incoming graduate students, followed by a continuous process of review and expanded implementation toward full adoption by Spring 2022. Details for inclusion and diversity education are found in the Appendix to Resolution 2017-18A.

**APPENDIX TO CGS&P RESOLUTION 2017-18A**

The guidelines offered in this Appendix seek to clarify the intent of the Resolution and to make specific recommendations regarding its implementation. It is the aim of the Resolution to serve the needs of all graduate students, while acknowledging the distinctiveness of those needs across the range of departments, programs, and colleges (hereafter referred to as “academic units”). To comply with the terms of the Resolution, academic units are encouraged to make use of existing strategies and efforts to instill in their students a lasting awareness of the benefits of a diverse and inclusive environment and to instruct their students in this regard. Should measures existing in the academic units be insufficient, new measures will be put in place to satisfy the requirements set forth in the Resolution. The Office of Recruitment and Diversity Initiatives (ORDI) in the Graduate School and the Office for Inclusion and Diversity will be available to offer assistance with the identification of suitable instructional resources and formulation of these plans as needed and/or requested. Additional possible resources include the college diversity committee members and InclusiveVT representatives.

Satisfactory plans may, among other possibilities, take the form of specialized workshops, stand-alone courses, or follow-up substantive discussion/ reflections on required diversity related pre-enrollment module, or other modules incorporated into existing courses or incoming student orientation sessions. Possibilities include GRAD 5214 Diversity and Inclusion in a Global Society, existing courses offered by departments, workshops to be developed in conjunction with NLI, integration into existing departmental seminars, guest speakers and more. The plans will be individualized, designed and tailored to the academic units and could include a variety of options. The Graduate School will work specifically with each academic unit to develop the plans. Professional development opportunities for faculty seeking best practices and strategies for managing these discussions will be provided through NLI.

In all cases, the appropriate academic unit will submit for approval to the Graduate School the manner and method by which the requirement will be satisfied. Once the academic unit’s plan is approved, the completion of the requirement for any given student will be verified through that student’s Plan of Study. With regard to the extent of topics to be covered, again recognizing the range of appropriate emphases across different academic units, four topics have been identified as appropriate for all students and must be included. Other topics should be addressed, as identified by the individual academic units and appropriate to specific disciplinary needs. Lists of required topics and potential additional focus areas appear below:

**Required Topics:**

1. The Virginia Tech Principles of Community as they apply to the valuing of human diversity and inclusion.
2. The impact that personal actions and words have on self, others, and the communities—university, national, and global—in which we live; issues of privilege, bias, power, prejudice, and discrimination; concepts of multiple personal, social, and cultural identities.
3. Available avenues of redress and our shared responsibilities as active by-standers.
4. The process of individual introspection required both to understand one’s own forms of implicit or unconscious bias and to create inclusive environments.

**Additional Topics/Focus Areas (as appropriate to the particular academic unit):**

1. Inclusion and Diversity in a global context; institutional and governmental policies affecting immigration, accessibility, affordability, and related matters.

2. Historical perspectives on diversity and the impact of traditions of privilege on the development of the discipline represented by the particular academic unit; inclusive pedagogy.

3. Effective strategies for inter- or intrapersonal conflict resolution; pathways to individual reconciliation of unconscious or implicit bias.
WHEREAS, the Virginia Tech community values academic integrity; and

WHEREAS, all graduate students are expected to uphold the Graduate Honor Code and exercise honesty and ethical behavior in all their academic pursuits at Virginia Tech, including study, course work, research, extension, or teaching; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Honor System Constitution was alerted to problems in the appeals process and a desire to update language and penalties,

WHEREAS, a committee of faculty, graduate students, and administrators reviewed and revised the Constitution using guidance from other systems in the university and past cases to address concerns regarding the appeals process, and include more learner-centered language and penalties.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the 2009 Constitution of the Graduate Honor System be retired and that the 2018 Constitution of the Graduate Honor System be adopted as the guiding document regarding academic integrity and the process of reviewing violations for graduate students.
ARTICLE I: PURPOSE AND DESCRIPTION

Section 1 - Graduate Honor Code

The Graduate Honor Code establishes a standard of academic integrity. As such, this code demands a firm adherence to a set of values. In particular, the code is founded on the concept of honesty with respect to the intellectual efforts of oneself and others. Compliance with the Graduate Honor Code requires that all graduate students exercise honesty and ethical behavior in all their academic pursuits at Virginia Tech, whether these undertakings pertain to study, course work, research, extension, or teaching.

It is recognized that graduate students have very diverse cultural backgrounds. In light of this, the term ethical behavior is defined as conforming to accepted professional standards of conduct, such as codes of ethics used by professional societies in the United States to regulate the manner in which their professions are practiced. The knowledge and practice of ethical behavior shall be the full responsibility of the student. Graduate students may, however, consult with their major professors, department heads, International Graduate Student Services, or the Graduate School for further information on what is expected of them.

More specifically, all graduate students, while being affiliated with Virginia Tech, shall abide by the standards established by Virginia Tech, as described in this Constitution. Graduate students, in accepting admission, indicate their willingness to subscribe to and be governed by the Graduate Honor Code and acknowledge the right of the University to establish policies and procedures and to take disciplinary action (including suspension or expulsion) when such action is warranted. Ignorance shall be no excuse for actions which violate the integrity of the academic community.

The fundamental beliefs underlying and reflected in the Graduate Honor Code are that (1) to trust in a person is a positive force in making a person worthy of trust, (2) to study, perform research, and teach in an environment that is free from the inconveniences and injustices caused by any form of intellectual dishonesty is a right of every graduate student, and (3) to live by an Honor System, which places a positive emphasis on honesty as a means of protecting this right, is consistent with, and a contribution to, the University's quest for truth.

Section 2 - Implementation

The Graduate Honor System was established to implement the Graduate Honor Code, and its functions shall be:

1. To promote honesty and ethical behavior in all academic pursuits, including, but not limited to, study, research, teaching, and extension.
2. To disseminate information concerning the Graduate Honor System to all new graduate students, faculty, and other interested parties.
3. To consider and review all suspected violations of the Graduate Honor Code in an impartial, thorough, and unbiased manner.
4. To review all cases involving academic infractions of the Graduate Honor Code brought before the System.
5. To assure that the rights of all involved parties are protected and assure due process in all proceedings.

Section 3 - Violations

All forms of academic work including, but not limited to, course work, labwork, thesis or dissertation work, research, teaching, and extension performed by any graduate student enrolled on a part-time or full-time basis under any of the admission categories listed in the Virginia Tech Graduate Catalog shall be subject to the stipulations of the Graduate Honor Code. Violations of the Graduate Honor Code are categorized as follows: Cheating, Plagiarism, Falsification, and Academic Sabotage. Violations are defined as follows:

1. **Cheating**: Cheating is defined as the giving or receiving of any unauthorized aid, assistance, or unfair advantage in any form of academic work. Cheating applies to the products of all forms of academic work. These products include, but are not limited to, in-class tests, take-home tests, lab assignments, problem sets, term papers, research projects, theses, dissertations, preliminary and qualifying examinations given for the fulfillment of graduate degrees, or any other work assigned by an instructor or professor, graduate committee, or department that pertains to graduate work or degrees.

   Any student giving or receiving unauthorized information concerning a test, quiz, or examination shall be responsible for an Honor Code violation. Submitting work that counts towards the student's grade or degree which is not the sole product of that student's individual effort shall be considered cheating, unless, for example, the professor explicitly allows group work, use of out-of-class materials, or other forms of collective or cooperative efforts. In general, all academic work shall be done in accordance with the requirements specified by the instructor or professor. In the absence of specific allowances or instructions by the professor, students shall assume that all work must be done individually.

   Some uses of permanently returned, graded material ("koofers") are cheating violations of the Code. By permanently returning graded materials, a faculty member or instructor demonstrates the intent that these materials should be accessible to all students. Such materials may be used for study purposes, such as preparing for tests or other assignments, and other uses explicitly allowed by the professor or course instructor. Once test questions have been handed out, koofers may not be used. Other specific examples of the unauthorized use of koofers include, but are not limited to, using koofers during closed-book exams, handing in any type of copy (e.g., a photocopy or a transcribed copy) of someone else's work (partial or complete) from a previous term, and copying a current answer key or one that was handed out in a previous term. Students may not copy and
hand in as their own work answers taken from any kind of koofer. When in doubt of what may or may not be used, students should consult with the course instructor. In the absence of specific instructions concerning koofers from the instructor, students shall assume that all submitted work must be the product of their own efforts without koofers or other unauthorized aid/ materials.

2. **Plagiarism**: Plagiarism is a specific form of cheating, and is defined as the copying of the language, structure, idea, and/or thoughts of another and claiming or attempting to imply that it is one's own original work. It also includes the omitting of quotation marks when references are copied directly, improper paraphrasing (see Plagiarism), or inadequate referencing of sources. Sources used in preparing assignments for classes, theses, dissertations, manuscripts for publication, and other academic work should be documented in the text and in a reference list, or as directed by the instructor or professor. Sources requiring referencing include, but are not limited to, information received from other persons that would not normally be considered common knowledge (Plagiarism), computer programs designed or written by another person, experimental data collected by someone else, graded permanently-returned materials such as term papers or other out-of-class assignments (koofers), as well as published sources. A more detailed discussion of plagiarism may be found in Plagiarism.

3. **Falsification**: Students who falsify, orally, in writing, or via electronic media, any circumstance relevant to their academic work shall be responsible for a violation of this Code. Included are such actions as forgery of official signatures, tampering with official records or documents, fraudulently adding or deleting information on academic documents, fraudulently changing an examination or testing period or due date of an assignment, and the unauthorized accessing of someone else's computer account or files. Violations also include willfully giving an improper grade or neglecting to properly grade submitted material, improperly influencing the results of course evaluations, and knowingly including false data or results in any paper or report submitted for a grade, as a degree requirement, or for publication.

4. **Academic Sabotage**: Academic sabotage is purposeful vandalism directed against any academic endeavor or equipment. It includes, but is not limited to, the destruction or theft of written material, laboratory or field experiments, equipment used in teaching or research, or computer files or programs. Unauthorized tampering with computer programs or systems shall constitute a violation. Academic sabotage includes deliberately crashing or attempting to crash a computer system or the use of files intended to cause or actually causing computer systems to behave atypically, thereby impeding another person's or group's efforts. In particular, knowingly infecting any system with a virus, worm, time bomb, trap door, Trojan horse, or any other kind of invasive program shall be considered a serious violation. Note that violations under this category may also lead to University judicial action or to criminal suits charged by the University.

**Misconduct and unethical behavior in research and teaching** deserves special mention in the Code since it is an area of special interest to graduate students. It is not a separate violation category since it may involve cheating, plagiarism, falsification, and/or academic sabotage as discussed above. **Misconduct in research** does not include those factors intrinsic to the process of research, such as honest error, conflicting data, or differences in interpretation concerning data or experimental design. Likewise, **misconduct in teaching** does not include honest disagreement
over the method of presentation of instructional material to a class or in the evaluation of the performance of a student. Research misconduct allegations may also be investigated by the Virginia Tech Office of Research Integrity.

* For further information on misconduct in research and its definition, see the references listed under item 4 of 1991 Revision -- Reference Material Used.

Section 4 - Composition

The Graduate Honor System shall consist of an Advisor, a Chair, one or more Associate Chair(s), GHS Facilitators, and Panelists for the Preliminary Review Panel and Review Panel. The Dean (or designee) of the Graduate School shall be responsible for the continued operation of the System. Appointment of Graduate Honor System personnel shall be made in accordance with Article XI, Section 7.

ARTICLE II: GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Section 1 - Appointment of the Graduate Honor System Advisor

A member of the staff of the Dean of the Graduate School shall be appointed by the President to serve as the Graduate Honor System Advisor. The Advisor shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Chair and shall be present (or represented) at all hearings of both the Preliminary Review Panel and the Review Panel.

Section 2 - Duties and Functions of the Advisor

The following duties and functions shall be performed by the Advisor:

1. The advisor shall have the responsibility to train the Chair, Associate Chair(s), Facilitators, and new board and panel members.
2. The advisor shall provide counsel to the Chair and Associate Chair(s) in the preparation of cases.
3. The advisor shall provide staff for handling training sessions, scheduling meetings, and other matters related to the administration of the Graduate Honor System.
4. The advisor shall counsel faculty or students referring cases as well as those students charged with offenses.
5. The advisor (or designee) shall attend all hearings.
6. The advisor, in consultation with the Chair, shall be responsible for appointing the Associate Chair(s).
7. The advisor, upon the receiving the recommendation of the Chair, shall be responsible for approving the membership of the Preliminary Review Panel and Review Panel.

Section 3 - Appointment of the Chair

1. Nominations for the position of Chair shall be accepted from the Graduate Student Assembly, College Deans, and other members of the academic community, and applications by qualified persons shall be welcomed. Candidates for the position of Chair
must be graduate students in good standing and must have been in residence for at least one (1) semester immediately preceding nomination. Preferably, the nominee will have served as an Associate Chair or as a graduate student panelist for at least one (1) semester prior to appointment.

2. The term of office shall be one (1) year, but if available and willing, the current Chair may be re-appointed by the President of the University to serve subsequent terms, up to four (4) years, upon the recommendation of the Graduate Honor System Advisor.

3. The Chair Nominating Committee shall be convened by the Dean upon the resignation of the current Chair, upon completion of term of office, or upon termination of office. This committee shall consist of the Graduate Honor System Advisor, up to three (3) graduate student members of the Graduate Honor System, and one (1) faculty member having previously served on a Review Panel and appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School. All members shall have equal voting privileges. The function of this committee shall be to nominate a candidate for appointment by the President. The nomination process shall be to: (1) invite nominations and accept applications, (2) review applications and conduct interviews with applicants, and (3) recommend to the President of the University, from among these applicants, a nominee for the position of Chair. The recommendation of this committee shall be by majority vote.

4. The recommendation of the nominating committee is voted on by the Graduate Student Assembly (GSA) and the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies (CGS&P).

5. The Dean of the Graduate School will forward the nomination to the President conveying the vote of the GSA and CGS&P.

6. The President shall appoint the Chair.

7. In the absence of a timely appointment, the President, through the recommendation of the Dean, can appoint the nominee as an interim Chair until the conclusion of the appointment process.

**Section 4 - Duties and Functions of the Chair**

The Chair shall perform the following duties and functions:

1. The Chair shall receive reports of suspected violations and determine, in consultation with the GHS Advisor, if the referred student is eligible for a Facilitated Discussion.

2. The Chair shall assign to the Preliminary Review Panel all cases not eligible for Facilitated Discussion.

3. The Chair shall preside at all Review Panel hearings. The Chair may request a member of the Review Panel to preside in his or her place.

4. The Chair shall assure justice, fairness, and due process.

5. The Chair shall secure nominations and select graduate student and faculty members for the Facilitated Discussion Process, the Preliminary Review Panel, and Review Panel, subject to approval by the Graduate Honor System Advisor.

6. The Chair shall assume responsibility for the instruction and training of graduate student and faculty members in the operation, function, and responsibility of the Graduate Honor System.

7. The Chair shall orient entering graduate students and new faculty to the values and obligations of the Graduate Honor Code.
8. The Chair shall conduct information activities and coordinate activities of the Graduate Honor System.
9. The Chair shall administer the operation of the Graduate Honor System throughout the entire calendar year.
10. The Chair shall keep the graduate community apprised of relevant activities of the Graduate Honor System.
11. The Chair shall consult with the Graduate Honor System Advisor in the appointment of the Associate Chair(s) and Facilitators.
12. The Chair shall select the panelists to hear the cases.

Section 5 - Staff of the Chair

The Chair, with the approval of the Graduate Honor System Advisor, shall appoint sufficient staff to assist with the duties of the office.

Section 6 - Appointment of Associate Chair(s)

1. The Graduate Honor System Advisor, in consultation with the Chair, shall appoint one or more Associate Chair(s). Nominations for this position shall be accepted from the Graduate Student Assembly, College Deans, and other members of the academic community; and applications from qualified personnel shall be welcomed. Students being considered for Associate Chair positions must be graduate students in good standing and must have been in residence for at least one (1) semester immediately preceding appointment. Preferably, the nominee will have served as a graduate student panelist of the Graduate Honor System for at least one (1) semester prior to the appointment. Associate Chair(s) shall serve a one (1) year term but may be re-appointed to serve subsequent terms, up to four (4) years, if available and willing.
2. The appointment of the new Associate Chair(s) shall be made upon the resignation of the current Associate Chair(s), upon completion of term of office, or upon termination of office.

Section 7 - Duties of Associate Chair(s)

Associate Chair(s) shall perform the following duties:

1. Associate Chair(s) shall gather evidence and conduct interviews with the referrer and the referred student(s).
2. Associate Chair(s) shall prepare a brief report summarizing the evidence.
3. Associate Chair(s) shall present the report summarizing the evidence to the referrer, referred student, and Chair before presenting it for review by the Preliminary Review Panel.
4. Associate Chair(s) shall convene and chair Preliminary Review Panel meetings.
5. Associate Chair(s) shall prepare a brief report for the Chair that summarizes the decision of the Preliminary Review Panel and shall brief the Chair on all the details of the case at hand.
6. Associate Chair(s) may attend and may present the evidence to the Review Panel.
7. Associate Chair(s) shall aid the Chair in convening and conducting training sessions for Preliminary Review Panel members.

Section 8—Appointment of Panelists

1. Panelists will include graduate students and faculty members from each College. Panelists will be recruited from all qualified graduate students and faculty (see Article XI Section 7).
2. Graduate student panelists shall be approved by the Graduate Honor System Advisor after training by the Chair and/or Associate Chair and following clearance of graduate student records (see Article XI Section 8). Graduate students may serve for up to four (4) years. After the four years, graduate students will take a one-year break from all duties related to the Graduate Honor System.
3. Faculty member panelists shall be approved by the Graduate Honor System Advisor after training by the Chair and/or Associate Chair. Faculty panelists may serve for up to four (4) years. After the four years, faculty will take a one-year break from all duties related to the Graduate Honor System.

Section 9—Duties of Panelists

1. Panelists shall sit on either the Preliminary Review Panel or the Review Panel.
2. Panelists shall evaluate the evidence and make recommendations regarding the case within a Preliminary Review Panel or Review Panel.
3. Panelists shall maintain the rights and confidentiality of the referred student(s) and referrer.
4. Panelists may assist in conducting educational sessions on campus and/or training sessions for new panelists.

Section 10 – Appointment of Graduate Honor System Facilitators

1. The Graduate Honor System Advisor, in consultation with the Chair, shall appoint one or more Graduate Honor System Facilitators. Applications for this position shall only be taken from current panelists. Graduate Honor System Facilitators must have significant experience with the Graduate Honor System as determined by the Graduate Honor System Advisor and Chair before appointment as Discussion Facilitators. Facilitators shall serve a one (1) year term but may be re-appointed to serve subsequent terms, up to four (4) years, if available and willing.
2. The appointment of new Facilitators shall be made as necessary to meet the needs of the Honor System.

Section 11 – Duties of Graduate Honor System Facilitators

1. Graduate Honor System Facilitators shall facilitate a discussion meeting between the referrer and the referred student(s).
2. Graduate Honor System Facilitators shall ensure that all applicable GHS guidelines are observed and followed.
3. Graduate Honor System Facilitators shall ensure that the rights of the referred and referrer are upheld.
4. Graduate Honor System Facilitators shall, upon examination of the facts of the case, have the authority to refer cases to the Chair so that they may be assigned an Associate Chair for evidence gathering and interviews.
5. Graduate Honor System Facilitators shall prepare a full report for the Chair, which summarizes the outcome of the facilitated discussion and shall brief the Chair on all the details of the case at hand.
6. Graduate Honor System Facilitators shall aid the Chair in conducting the training session(s) for new Graduate Honor System Facilitators.

**ARTICLE III: FACILITATED DISCUSSION**

**Section 1 - Composition**

1. The Facilitated Discussion shall be attended by the referrer(s) of the case, the referred student(s), and one Graduate Honor System Facilitator (as outlined in Article II, Sections 10 and 11).

**Section 2 – Functions of the Facilitated Discussion**

The Facilitated Discussion shall fulfill the following functions:

1. It shall assure that the rights of the referred and the referrer are protected and assure due process.
2. It shall facilitate a discussion between the referrer and referred student(s).
3. It shall attempt to build a consensus resolution to a suspected Honor Code violation without convening a Preliminary Review Panel or a Review Panel.
4. It shall create a record of an Honor Code violation if all parties conclude that a violation did occur. This record shall be kept in the Graduate Honor System case files.

**Section 3 – Eligibility for the Facilitated Discussion**

A suspected Honor Code violation will be eligible for a Facilitated Discussion if **ALL** of the following criteria are met:

1. The referrer of the case is a Faculty member;
2. The suspected violation involves an allegation of either 1) cheating or 2) plagiarism as outlined in Article I, Section 3 of the GHS Constitution;
3. The referred student(s) is(are) not on Graduate Honor System Probation at the time the report of the suspected violation is received by the Graduate Honor System;
4. And the violation is one for which a reasonable person who is familiar with the form and functions of the Graduate Honor System would not assign a penalty of more than the sanctions outlined in Article VII, Section 1, Item 1, Parts a-f of this Constitution.

**Section 4 – Operation of the Facilitated Discussion**
1. The Chair, after determining if a case eligible for a Facilitated Discussion, will notify the referrer and the referred of this determination.

2. The referrer and referred will then have no more than ten (10) University business days to notify the Chair of their desire to participate in a Facilitated Discussion; otherwise the case will be sent for evidence gathering and panel review. Exceptions to the ten-day period will only be made under extenuating circumstances, as determined by the Chair or Graduate Honor System Advisor.

3. If either the referrer or the referred student(s) does not agree to participate in the Facilitated Discussion, the case will be sent for investigation and panel review.

4. During the Facilitated Discussion, the referrer of the alleged violation and the referred student will attempt to reach a resolution to the case, with the assistance of the Graduate Honor System Facilitator. The question that the referred student and the referrer must answer is “did the student commit a violation of the honor code?” A determination of a violation shall require both the referrer and the referred student to agree that the student is responsible for violating the honor code. A determination of no violation shall require both the referrer and the referred student to agree that the student did not violate the honor code. In the absence of such an agreement, the case shall be sent for evidence gathering and panel review.

5. If the referrer and student agree that the student has committed a violation of the honor code, the referrer and student may then decide upon an appropriate penalty. Sanctions for the Facilitated Discussion will be limited to those sanctions outlined in Article VII, Section 1, Item 1, Parts a-f of this Constitution. The referrer and referred must both come to an agreement on the appropriate penalty. In the absence of such an agreement, the case shall be sent for evidence gathering and panel review.

6. The GHS Facilitator shall prepare a record of the outcome of the Facilitated Discussion. This record, the original report of the alleged violation, and any relevant evidence shall be held in the Chair’s confidential file. The Chair shall inform the Dean of the Graduate School (or designee), in writing, of the outcome of all Facilitated Discussions.

7. For cases in which the referrer or the referred withdraws from the Facilitated Discussion, no record shall be kept that the Facilitated Discussion occurred and the fact that they did participate in such a proceeding shall not be deemed relevant in any future Honor System proceedings.

Section 5 – Withdrawal from the Decision of the Facilitated Discussion

1. The referred or referrer may withdraw from a decision reached during a Facilitated Discussion for any reason.

2. If the referred or referrer wishes to withdraw from the Facilitated Discussion decision, the Chair must be notified of the desire to withdraw from the decision within two (2) calendar days of the conclusion of the Facilitated Discussion.

3. If the referred or referrer withdraws from the Facilitated Discussion decision, the case shall be immediately sent for evidence gathering and panel review.

4. In these instances no record shall be kept that the Facilitated Discussion occurred and the fact that they did participate in such a proceeding shall not be deemed relevant in any future Honor System proceedings.
ARTICLE IV: PRELIMINARY REVIEW PANEL

Section 1 – Preliminary Review Panel Waiver

1. The referred student(s) and referrer shall have the opportunity to review the report prepared by the Associate Chair, before it is presented to a Preliminary Review Panel.
2. If, after review of the materials presented in the report, the referred student(s) accepts that there is substantive evidence to support the charge and warrant a full hearing of the case by the Review Panel, the student may request a Preliminary Review Panel Waiver. This request must be submitted to the Chair within five (5) University business days of the student(s) receiving the Associate Chair’s report.
3. A request for a Preliminary Review Panel Waiver must be received before a Preliminary Review Panel is scheduled.
4. A request for a Preliminary Review Panel Waiver does not, in any way, imply guilt or responsibility on the part of the student(s).
5. In cases involving multiple referred students, if all referred students do not request a Preliminary Review Panel Waiver, the case will proceed to a Preliminary Review Panel.
6. Cases for which a Preliminary Review Panel waiver is granted shall proceed directly to a Review Panel for a hearing.

Section 2 - Composition

1. The Preliminary Review Panel shall consist of trained graduate student and faculty panelists. Graduate student members of the Preliminary Review Panel shall have full voting privileges, whereas the faculty members shall serve in an advisory capacity to the student members and shall not have voting privileges.
2. The Associate Chair(s) (or designees) shall chair Preliminary Review Panel meetings and shall not have voting privileges.
3. The Graduate Honor System Advisor shall be a non-voting member and shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Associate Chair and the Preliminary Review Panel.

Section 3 - Functions of the Preliminary Review Panel

The Preliminary Review Panel shall perform the following functions:

1. It shall evaluate the evidence provided for the case.
2. It shall decide whether a hearing before the Review Panel should be held.

Section 4 - Operation

1. For each case without a Preliminary Review Waiver, a hearing shall be conducted by a Preliminary Review Panel, consisting of a minimum of five (5) graduate students and at least two (2) faculty members, to be selected by the Chair. The Associate Chair managing the case shall serve as chair of the Preliminary Review Panel. In addition, the Graduate Honor System Advisor shall be a non-voting member and shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Associate Chair and the Preliminary Review Panel.
2. Evidence gathering shall adhere to the basic tenets of due process and to the rights and responsibilities for referrer and referred as outlined in Article VIII and Article IX.

3. A decision to send the case to the Review Panel should be based upon substantive evidence to support the charge. The lack of such evidence should lead the Preliminary Review Panel to vote against sending the case to the Review Panel and consequently lead to the termination of the proceedings. Otherwise, the Preliminary Review Panel should send the case forward for the further scrutiny of the Review Panel. The fact that the case is forwarded to the Review Panel shall in no way imply guilt or responsibility for the violation; the Preliminary Review Panel is simply stating that the case should be reviewed with the aid of personal testimonies.

4. The student members shall have full voting privileges while the faculty members serve in an advisory capacity. Recommendations of the Preliminary Review Panel must be by majority vote of the graduate student members present. In the event of a tie vote, the case will go forward.

**ARTICLE V: REVIEW PANEL**

*Section 1 - Composition*

1. The Review Panel shall consist of trained graduate student and faculty panelists. Both graduate student and faculty members of the Review Panel shall have full voting rights. The Chair (or designee) shall be a non-voting member and shall serve as the panel moderator.

2. The Graduate Honor System Advisor shall be a non-voting member and shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Chair and the Review Panel.

*Section 2 - Functions of the Review Panel*

The Review Panel shall perform the following functions:

1. It shall hear evidence gathered by the Associate Chair.
2. It shall hear testimony of the referrer, referred student, and witnesses.
3. It shall hear the remarks of the University community representative of the referred.
4. It shall assure that the rights of the referrer and referred student are protected and assure due process.
5. It shall determine whether a violation occurred.
6. It shall recommend the penalty when the referred is determined to have violated the honor code.

*Section 3 - Operation*

1. For each case, a hearing shall be conducted by a Review Panel. The Review Panel shall consist of the Chair, a minimum of four (4) graduate students, a minimum of three (3) faculty members, and the Graduate Honor System Advisor. The number of voting faculty shall not exceed the number of voting graduate students present. The graduate students and faculty members shall be selected by the Chair with the approval of the Graduate Honor System Advisor. Each graduate student and faculty member shall have full voting privileges, while the Chair (or designee) shall be a non-voting member and shall serve as
the moderator of the hearing. In addition, the Graduate Honor System Advisor shall be a non-voting member and shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Chair and the Review Panel. The Associate Chair who gathered the evidence may attend the Review Panel as a non-voting member.

2. All Review Panel hearings shall adhere to the basic tenets of due process and rights and responsibilities as outlined in Article VIII and Article IX.

3. All persons involved with the hearing have the right to be treated with respect. Persons displaying disrespect for another person at the hearing or contempt for the proceedings shall be dismissed, and the hearing shall be concluded in their absence.

4. All evidence regarding cases should be submitted to the Associate Chair(s) during the evidence gathering and interviewing process (prior to the Preliminary Review Panel meeting). If additional information is submitted after the case is sent forward by the Preliminary Review Panel, the Review Panel will decide the relevancy of that information.

5. The referred must be adjudged to have violated the honor code before any consideration is given to the penalty, unless the referred acknowledges responsibility, in which case the deliberations shall focus solely on the penalty.

6. In evaluating evidence and testimony regarding whether a violation of the honor code has occurred, each member of the Review Panel shall consider whether or not there exists substantive evidence of a violation. The decision whether a violation occurred shall be based solely on the facts regarding the charge, i.e., based on evidence collected and testimony presented at the Review Panel hearing.

7. At the conclusion of the deliberations on whether a violation occurred for each charge against the student, the Chair shall poll the members of the Panel on the question: "Has the student violated the honor code?" An affirmative vote represents "a violation," while a negative vote represents "no violation." A determination of a violation shall require a majority vote. In the absence of such a vote, the Panel shall found that no violation has occurred. An abstention shall not be counted as a vote. In the unlikely event that a majority of the Review Panel members do not vote, the current panel shall be dismissed and a new panel shall be convened to re-hear the case.

8. In determining the appropriate sanction, such factors as the referred student's past history of violations, attitude, intent, severity of the violation, and the degree of cooperation may be considered.

9. Recommendations of penalty shall be by majority vote. An abstention shall not be counted as a vote.

10. A recording of the proceedings, the confidential recommendations of the Review Panel, together with all submitted evidence and votes recorded, shall be held in the Chair’s confidential file. The Chair shall inform the Dean of the Graduate School (or designee), in writing, of the findings and recommendations of the Review Panel.

**ARTICLE VI: UNIVERSITY ACTION**

**Section 1 - Review and Decision**

1. The recommendations (decision of violation, and penalty if required) of the Review Panel shall be submitted in writing by the Chair to the Dean of the Graduate School (or designee) for review and decision.
2. No penalty shall be announced until an official decision has been rendered by the Dean of the Graduate School (or designee).
3. The official decision of the Dean of the Graduate School (or designee) shall be transmitted in writing to the referred, the referrer, and the course instructor (or major professor for a research-related violation). The referred shall also be notified of the right to appeal the decision.
4. When the Review Panel's recommendation is not accepted by the Dean (or designee), the Panel shall be notified of the final decision of the Dean (or designee).

Section 2 - Appeals

1. The referred may appeal the official decision to the Dean of the Graduate School on grounds of (1) failure of the Graduate Honor System to follow proper procedures, (2) introduction of new evidence, and/or (3) severity of the penalty. The imposition of the penalty shall be deferred until the termination of the appeals process.
2. The Dean of the Graduate School must receive the appeal within five (5) University business days after the referred receives written notification of the decision and penalty.
3. In the event of an appeal, the case will be forwarded to an appellate officer, who is well versed in the Graduate Honor System, graduate academic policies, and Virginia Tech standards of ethics and have received training from the Graduate Honor System. Such officers include, but are not limited to, the Director of Undergraduate Academic Integrity, Associate Dean for Professional Programs in the College of Veterinary Medicine, or Associate Vice President for Research Compliance.
4. The appeal is not a retrial and must be focused solely upon one or more of the following: (1) failure of the Graduate Honor System to follow proper procedures, (2) introduction of new evidence, (3) severity of penalty. The appeal shall be limited to the consideration of the specific information pertaining to one or more of the above. The burden shall be placed on the appealing student to demonstrate why the original finding or sanction should be changed.
5. The decision of the appellate officer is limited to the grounds of the appeal. Judgments are made according to the following guidelines:
   a. Failure of the Graduate Honor System to Follow Proper Procedures

Determine whether or not the Graduate Honor System followed proper procedures. If proper procedures were followed, then the official decision is enforced. If proper procedures were not followed, then the referred student is acquitted and the case is closed.

b. Introduction of New Evidence

Determine whether or not the new evidence is relevant to the official decision. In the event that the information is determined to be relevant, the appellate officer shall inform the Dean of the Graduate School or the Graduate Honor System Advisor that a new Review Panel is requested. The new Review Panel shall have no members from a previous panel. If information is determined to be irrelevant or there is no new evidence, then the original decision is upheld.

c. **Severity of Penalty**

Determine if the penalty is too severe for the violation(s), for which the student was found responsible. The finding of a violation is not appealable and the case will not be reheard. The appellate officer has the option to consult GHS facilitators or experienced panelists who were not involved with the original case, as identified by the Chair or Advisor to the GHS, if perspective on the severity of the penalty is required. In the event that the penalty is found to be too severe, a lower penalty may be determined by the appellate officer from those specified under Article VII of this Constitution.

6. The final determination of an appeal shall be the sole responsibility of the appellate officer. The student shall be notified in writing of the disposition of the appeal.

**ARTICLE VII: ACTIONS OF THE GRADUATE HONOR SYSTEM**

**Section 1 - Penalties**

Where a violation is determined, the Review Panel or Facilitated Discussion shall also be responsible for determining an appropriate sanction. There are four major penalty levels (1-4) with increasing severity. These penalties are (1) Graduate Honor System Probation, (2) Suspension in Abeyance, (3) Suspension, and (4) Permanent Dismissal. For each charge of a Graduate Honor Code violation for which a student acknowledges responsibility or is found responsible, one of these four penalties must be given.

For cases resolved through Facilitated Discussion, only penalty 1 (Graduate Honor System Probation), subparts a-f may be applied.

For those cases where suspension or dismissal is not warranted, the subparts of penalty 1 (Graduate Honor System Probation) provide a further gradation in the penalty action. Whereas penalties 2, 3, and 4 must be given as a whole (i.e., no parts may be given without the others), penalty 1 may be given in part or in full. However, *if penalty 1 is selected, parts a and b are required.* Only parts c-i of penalty 1 shall be optional. The very minimum penalty given shall be penalty 1, parts a and b.

1. **Graduate Honor System Probation** (parts a and b mandatory, parts c-h optional)
   a. The referred shall not be suspended from the University, but shall be placed on Graduate Honor System Probation until graduation or termination of enrollment. The sentence of Probation is a warning and is intended to serve as a deterrent against future misconduct. In the event of any other University or Graduate Honor Code violation, the appropriate parties shall be notified of the previous history of the referred. In the event of resignation and re-enrollment within a period of one (1) year, the referred shall be reinstated on Graduate Honor System Probation (penalty 1, part a only) subsequent to re-enrollment.
   b. The referred shall also automatically receive a zero on the assignment on which the violation occurred. In cases other than those involving course work (or other
similar work where a zero is applicable), action shall be taken to negate any 
advantages obtained by the violation.
c. A record of the action shall be kept in the referred student's folder (not the official 
transcript) in the Graduate School until graduation from the University or 
termination of enrollment.
d. The referred shall be required to attend a meeting or meetings with the Chair and 
the Dean of the Graduate School for the purpose of achieving a better 
understanding on the student’s part of the requirements and purpose of the 
Graduate Honor System. Failure to participate in this meeting(s) shall constitute 
grounds for the automatic invocation of part "g" below.
e. The referred shall be required to write an essay on academic integrity, prevention 
of academic misconduct, and/or what they have learned regarding academic 
integrity. Additional essay topics may be requested by the Review Panel. The 
Chair or Associate Chair from the case will review and guide the writing of the 
essay. Failure to complete this assignment shall constitute grounds for the 
automatic invocation of part “g” below.
f. The referred shall be required to complete GRAD 5014: Academic Integrity and 
Plagiarism course. Failure to successfully complete this course shall constitute 
grounds for the automatic invocation of part "g" below.
g. The notation "placed on Graduate Honor System Probation" shall appear on the 
student's permanent record (transcript) under the semester in which the violation 
occurred.
h. If substantial unfair academic advantage was gained, that is to say, if the 
violation, undetected, would have led to an advantage over the other students (or 
if the referred thought it would), then a grade of "F" for the course in which the 
offense occurred shall also be a penalty action under this part. This grade shall 
appear on the student's grade report and permanent record (transcript) as an "F."
i. If substantial unfair academic advantage was gained, that is to say, if the 
violation, undetected, would have led to a substantial grade advantage over the 
other students (or if the referred thought it would), then a grade of "F for violation 
of the Graduate Honor Code" for the course in which the offense occurred shall 
also be a penalty action under this part. This grade shall appear on the student's 
grade report and permanent record (transcript) as an "F*", and it shall be a 
permanent notation.

2. **Suspension in Abeyance** (all parts mandatory)
a. The referred shall be allowed to remain in the University to complete the semester 
in which the offense occurred or in which the hearing is held.
b. The penalty shall automatically include a grade of "F for violation of the Graduate 
Honor Code" for the course (or equivalent) in which the offense occurred. This 
grade shall appear on the student's grade report and permanent record (transcript) 
as an "F*", and it shall be a permanent notation.
c. After the completion of the semester as specified in item (a) above, the referred 
shall be suspended for a period not to exceed two (2) successive semesters or one 
(1) full academic year as specified by the official notification of the University 
action (as specified under Article VI, Section 1, item 3 of this Constitution).
d. The notation "suspended for violation of the Graduate Honor Code" shall appear on the student's permanent record (transcript) under the semester in which the violation occurred.
e. Upon the referred student's re-enrollment at Virginia Tech at the end of the period of suspension, the student shall be placed on Graduate Honor System Probation (penalty 1, part a only) until graduation or termination of enrollment.

3. **Suspension** (all parts mandatory)
   a. Suspension is immediate and the student shall not be allowed to complete the current semester. In addition, the referred shall be suspended for a period not to exceed two (2) successive academic semesters or one (1) full academic year following the current semester (as specified under Article VI, Section 1, item 3 of this Constitution).
   b. All credits shall be lost for work done during the semester in which the student is currently enrolled. The penalty shall automatically include a grade of "F for violation of the Graduate Honor Code" for the course (or equivalent) in which the offense occurred. This grade shall appear on the student's grade report and permanent record (transcript) as an "F*", and it shall be a permanent notation.
   c. The notation "suspended for violation of the Graduate Honor Code" shall appear on the student's permanent record (transcript) under the semester in which the violation occurred.
   d. Upon the referred student's re-enrollment at Virginia Tech at the end of the period of suspension, the student shall be placed on Graduate Honor System Probation (penalty 1, part a only) until graduation or termination of enrollment.

4. **Permanent Dismissal** (all parts mandatory)
   a. The referred shall be permanently dismissed from the University without being allowed to complete the current semester.
   b. All credits shall be lost for work done during the semester in which the student is currently enrolled. In addition, if the offense did not occur during the semester in which the hearing is held, then a grade of "F for violation of the Graduate Honor Code" shall also be assigned for the course in which the offense was committed. This grade shall appear on the student's grade report and permanent record (transcript) as an "F*", and it shall be a permanent notation.
   c. The referred may never re-enroll in the University.
   d. The notation "permanently dismissed for violation of the Graduate Honor Code" shall appear on the student's permanent record (transcript) under the semester in which the violation occurred.

**Section 2 - Acquittal**

In the event of acquittal by the Graduate Honor System, all records of any description in conjunction with the trial shall be completely destroyed, except the "charges" and the "Findings of the System," which shall be filed in the Chair’s confidential file.

**Section 3 - Announcement**
1. In cases where students are found in (or claim responsibility for) violation of the honor code, the penalty and specifications may be published without names, when the case is resolved, in such media as the GHS annual report and reports to the Graduate Student Assembly or Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies.

2. Exonerations may also be published (without names) if the referred so desires. A written release must be obtained from the referred prior to publication.

**ARTICLE VIII: RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS OF THE REFERRED STUDENT**

**Section 1 - Rights of the Referred Student**

A student referred for violating the Graduate Honor Code shall have certain procedural guarantees to ensure fair judicial hearing of evidence. These rights under the Graduate Honor Code shall be as follows:

1. Students shall be considered innocent until judged guilty.
2. Students shall have the right to refrain from speaking for or against themselves.
3. Students shall have the right to speak in their own behalf.
4. Students may choose a member of the university community, such as a fellow student, faculty member, or staff member who is willing to assist them in preparing their defense. This person may attend a Facilitated Discussion, but may only participate in an advisory capacity to the student. During a Review Panel, the student's representative shall only be allowed to address the Review Panel; they may not question witnesses. Lawyers retained by referred students shall not be permitted in Review Panel hearings or at Facilitated Discussions.
5. Students may terminate a Facilitated Discussion at any time, without reason.
6. Students shall have the right to review the report prepared by the Associate Chair, prior to the scheduling of a Preliminary Review Panel.
7. Students shall have the right to suggest corrections and/or additions to the report prepared by the Associate Chair, prior to the scheduling of a Preliminary Review Panel. All suggestions will be considered at the discretion of the Chair and the Associate Chair for the case.
8. Students may at any time privately seek counsel with their university community representative. Statements made at this time shall be confidential.
9. Students may have any Graduate Honor System function that they are entitled to attend stopped at any time for a point of clarification.
10. Students may leave any Graduate Honor System function at any time; however, it is in their best interest to remain until they are made aware of all the details.
11. Students shall have the right to receive written notice of the charges, the "Order of Events for Review Panel Hearings," and any other pertinent information sufficiently in advance of the Review Panel hearing and in reasonable enough detail to allow them to prepare a case in their behalf. Likewise, students shall have the right to examine all evidence collected during evidence gathering prior to the Review Panel hearing. The students and their representatives shall have a copy of the evidence during the Review Panel hearing.
12. Students shall have the right to be aware of all testimony.
13. Students shall have the right to face the referrer, when such opportunity exists, at the Review Panel hearing and to present a defense against the charges, including presenting
witnesses on their behalf. Consequently, students shall be consulted in the scheduling of the Review Panel hearing. However, students shall only be allowed to reschedule the Review Panel hearing once. Except under extenuating circumstances, Review Panel hearings shall not be rescheduled unless the Chair or the Graduate Honor System Advisor is notified of the requested change prior to three (3) days preceding the scheduled hearing date.

14. Failure of students to be present at Review Panel hearings, assuming reasonable effort has been made to ensure their presence, shall indicate that they are waiving their rights to face the referrer and to appear before the Review Panel.

15. Students may ask that a panel member be excused from the Review Panel hearing if they can give reasonable cause why that panel member may be biased or have some other conflict of interest. The Chair and the Graduate Honor System Advisor shall make a final ruling on any such request.

16. Students shall have the right to an appeal as specified under Article VI, Section 2.

Section 2 - Obligations of the Referred Student(s)

Students referred of Graduate Honor Code violations shall have the responsibility of cooperating with Graduate Honor System personnel. Furthermore, when a case involves other students, these students' rights to privacy should be observed. Students should be aware that the confidentiality of Honor System proceedings may be covered under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) as outlined on the University Registrar’s website.

Article IX: Rights and Obligations of the Referrer

Section 1 - Rights of the Referrer

A person referring charges of a Graduate Honor Code violation against a graduate student shall be accorded the following rights:

1. Discussion of the charges between the referrer and referred prior to the Review Panel hearing shall be allowed, although the referrer shall have the right to decline to discuss the case with the referred. The referrer shall have the right, with the permission of the referred, to have one witness present when talking with the referred about the alleged violation.

2. The referrer shall have the right to choose one person (any member of the university community, such as a graduate student, a faculty or staff member, or department head) to assist them in preparation of the case. This person is not allowed to be present at the Review Panel hearing or during a Facilitated Discussion.

3. The referrer shall have the right to terminate a Facilitated Discussion at any time, without reason.

4. The referrer shall have the right to review the report prepared by the Associate Chair, prior to the scheduling of a Preliminary Review Panel.

5. The referrer shall have the right to suggest corrections and/or additions to the report prepared by the Associate Chair, prior to the scheduling of a Preliminary Review Panel. The referrer shall have the right to receive a copy of the evidence collected during the evidence gathering, the "Order of Events for Review Panel Hearings," and any other
pertinent information, if the Preliminary Review Panel sends the case to the Review Panel.

6. The referrer shall have the right to receive written notification of the final disposition of the case.

7. The referrer shall have the right to be secure in person and property.

8. Professors referring charges of violations may opt to grade or refrain from grading any assignment referred to the Graduate Honor System. It is recommended that instructors, if they are able to do so, grade the assignment with the assumption that the student is innocent of the charge. However, an incomplete grade may be assigned to the referred student pending the decision of the Graduate Honor System. The incomplete grade will be removed when the case is resolved.

Section 2 - Obligations of the Referrer

A person referring a suspected of a Graduate Honor Code violation shall accept the following obligations:

1. The referrer shall cooperate with the Chair, the Graduate Honor System advisor, the Associate Chair, and any other personnel of the Graduate Honor System.
2. The referrer shall be expected to appear at the Review Panel hearing.
3. The referrer shall have the responsibility of maintaining confidentiality in all matters pertaining to the case. However, referrers may discuss the case with their counsel (see Article IX, Section 1, item 2). The referrer should be aware that the confidentiality of Honor System proceedings may be covered under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) as outlined on the University Registrar’s website.

ARTICLE X: OBLIGATIONS OF PARTIES INDIRECTLY INVOLVED IN HONOR SYSTEM CASES

1. Parties indirectly involved in Honor System cases include but are not limited to persons who witness alleged violations, witness discussions between referrers and referred students, and serve as members of the University community that help referrers and referred students prepare their case.
2. Parties indirectly involved in Honor System cases shall have the responsibility of maintaining confidentiality in all matters. Parties indirectly involved in Honor System Cases should be aware that the confidentiality of Honor System proceedings may be covered under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) as outlined on the University Registrar’s website.

ARTICLE XI: GENERAL

Section 1 - Reporting of Violations

It is the obligation of all members of the academic community to report alleged violations of the Graduate Honor Code. Reporting the observance of a Graduate Honor Code violation shall not be optional; it shall be mandatory. Reports should be submitted in writing to the Chair or the
Graduate Honor System Advisor on forms provided for that purpose, which are available at the Graduate Honor System website. The report form also may be obtained at the Graduate School.

Alleged violations of the Graduate Honor Code must be reported within ten (10) University business days after the date of discovery. Only under very special circumstances shall exceptions to this policy be granted, and then only at the discretion of the Chair and the Graduate Honor System Advisor. A possible reason for exception could include, but is not limited to, unavoidable delays in obtaining the evidence.

Section 2 - Violations at Extended Campuses

1. Students engaged in graduate studies at any of Virginia Tech’s extended campuses shall be subject to all provisions of this Constitution.
2. Designated panelists may assist in gathering evidence if it is not possible for an Associate Chair to do so. The evidence obtained shall be presented to the Preliminary Review Panel and shall be evaluated in a manner prescribed in Article IV of this Constitution.
3. Unless otherwise designated by the Chair, with the approval of the Dean of the Graduate School, all hearings shall be conducted at the Virginia Tech main campus in Blacksburg.

Section 3 - Summer

Because of the decreased availability of graduate student and faculty panelists during the summer, delays in processing and hearing cases may result. Thus, reasonable delays of this sort shall not be considered as violating the student's rights or as grounds for an appeal.

Section 4 - Graduate Students Enrolled in Undergraduate Classes

Graduate students shall be subject to stipulations within this Constitution regardless of whether they are enrolled in undergraduate or graduate classes. In cases in which the graduate student is referred in conjunction with an undergraduate student, the Graduate Honor System will work with the Office of Undergraduate Academic Integrity.

Section 5 - Undergraduate Students Enrolled in Graduate Classes

The undergraduate honor system, commonly referred to as The Virginia Tech Honor System, shall have jurisdiction over cases involving undergraduate students in graduate classes unless the student is also enrolled in the Graduate School and taking graduate classes for graduate credit under the classification of "Dual Student" or "Combined Student," and “Bachelor/Master’s Degree Student,” in which case the Graduate Honor System shall have jurisdiction. In cases in which an undergraduate student is referred with a graduate student, the Graduate Honor System will work with the Office of Undergraduate Academic Integrity.

Section 6 - Violations Involving Graduate Students Already Graduated

If the degree towards which the student was working at the time of the alleged violation has already been awarded, the case shall be referred to the Dean of the Graduate School who shall
convene a committee to review and investigate the charge and make recommendations. The committee composition shall be determined by the Dean of the Graduate School. The Chair of the Graduate Honor System shall be an ex officio member of this committee and shall have the same voting privileges as the other members of this committee.

Section 7 - Recruitment of Graduate Honor System Members

Recognizing that it is strongest when it fosters and reflects the support of all graduate students and faculty at the University, the Graduate Honor System shall seek to be as broadly representative of the graduate student and faculty bodies at Virginia Tech as possible. To this end, all qualified graduate students and faculty shall be encouraged to participate in the Graduate Honor System. No otherwise qualified graduate student or faculty may be excluded from membership on the basis of race, sex, handicap, age, veteran status, national origin, religion, political affiliation, or sexual orientation.

Section 8 - Clearance of Graduate Student Records

Graduate students volunteering or appointed to serve on the Graduate Honor System must receive clearance of their personal disciplinary records and their academic records through the Dean of the Graduate School. Such clearances shall be conducted consistent with the University's regulations on the confidentiality of records and shall assure a minimum academic quality credit average of 3.00 and no previous or current disciplinary action for each appointee.

Section 9 - Confidentiality

All investigations, hearings, reviews, and other associated activities of the Graduate Honor System shall conform to the University's "Confidentiality of Student Records" and FERPA policies.

Section 10 - Substitution of Graduate Honor System Personnel

The Chair or the Graduate Honor System Advisor shall be authorized, when circumstances dictate, to appoint substitutes for any Graduate Honor System personnel in any case before the Graduate Honor System. However, faculty may not be substituted for graduate students and vice versa.

Section 11 - University Policies

Where appropriate, the Graduate Honor System shall abide by all applicable policies, statements, and principles as contained in the University Policies for Student Life.

Section 12 – Definition of a “University business day”

A “University business day,” as referred to in this constitution, shall be defined as any day on which the main Virginia Tech campus is open and the Graduate School offices are open.
ARTICLE XII: AMENDMENTS

Proposed amendments to the Constitution of the Graduate Honor System may be initiated through one of the following channels: (1) by a majority vote of the Graduate Student Assembly, (2) by a majority vote of the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, or (3) by direct submission to the Chair or the Dean of the Graduate School. Also, at the discretion of the Chair and the Graduate Honor System advisor, amendments may be initiated through the Graduate Honor System. Upon receiving such proposals, the Dean of the Graduate School shall convene the Constitution Revision Committee. With the approval of two-thirds of this committee, proposed amendments shall be forwarded for approval by the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies and thereafter through the proper channels of the University governance structure (which at the time of the 2008-09 revision is described in Policies and Procedures No. 8011). Any substantive changes in proposed amendments as they proceed through subsequent levels of approval shall be resubmitted to the Constitution Revision Committee for its approval.

The Constitution Revision Committee shall consist of the Chair, the Graduate Honor System Advisor, a minimum of six (6) panelists (minimum of four (4) graduate students and two (2) faculty), and up to two (2) other representatives from the graduate student body to be nominated by the Graduate Student Assembly.

2018 Revision

The Vice President and Dean of the Graduate School convened a Constitution Review Committee in the Spring of 2018. This revision was conducted by a panel of graduate students and faculty members in accordance with the constitution.

The goals of the revision were to address concerns about the path of appeals, update language within the constitution to better fit the Honor System’s values, and include penalties that fit the Honor System’s values and mission which were not available at the time of the last revision.

2008-09 Revision

At the request of the Dean of the Graduate School, a Constitution Review Committee was convened in 2008 to perform a periodic review to bring the GHS Constitution up to date with current University policies and the climate of the time. This revision was conducted by a panel of graduate students and faculty in accordance with the constitution.

The goals of the current revision were two-fold: First, revisions were intended to address substantive issues that have arisen since the 1991 revision. Second, revisions were intended to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Honor System. The Review Committee considered a number of changes and ultimately rejected those that did not meet either of the above mentioned goals. The committee has worked very hard to ensure that the revisions to this constitution stand for at least another 15 years.

1991 Revision
Following the conclusion of the 1987 University Self-Study, a Constitution Revision Committee was convened to evaluate the Graduate Honor System. Since the Constitution had not received serious scrutiny in a decade or more, and since the Graduate Honor System has now matured to a level where the old Constitution is hardly serviceable, the ultimate goal of this committee from the outset was a revision of the Constitution. Much work has gone into ensuring that this revision will stand the test of time and will be instructive in guiding the operation of the Graduate Honor System in the years ahead.

**Reference Material Used**

Revision of this document was based on a variety of materials; these include:

3. Several ideas and sentences from the following sources have been used with and without modification in the writing of the section "Purpose and Description of Graduate Honor Code" (Article I, Section 1):
   a. Reference 1.
4. Information used in defining "Misconduct in Research" (Article I, Section 3):
   a. Recommendations on "Research Misconduct and Graduate Students at VPI&SU" submitted to the Constitution Revision Committee by the Degree Requirements, Standards, Criteria and Academic Policies Committee (DRSCAPC) of the Commission on Graduate Studies, January 18, 1990.
5. "Computer Science Department Policy on Koofers, Old Programs, Cheating, and Microcomputer Use," CS Bits & Bytes (CS Dept. VPI&SU), Wednesday, February 15, 1989, pp. 7-8. (Ideas and and wording from this policy were used in Article I, Section 3.)
Summary of GHS Constitution Proposed Revisions

A constitution review committee was convened in Spring 2018 by Karen DePauw, Vice President and Dean for Graduate Education, to consider proposed amendments to the language of the constitution and review and revise the Appeal Process (Article VI, Section 2). The committee was chaired by Erin Lavender-Stott, chief justice of the GHS.

After a thorough review and discussion, the committee proposes the following changes:

- **Update terminology to better reflect the educational mission and functions of the honor system (all articles and sections):**
  - Change the title of chief justice to chair
  - Change the title of investigator to associate chair
  - Change investigative board to preliminary review panel
  - Change judicial panel to review panel
  - Simplify language describing the referral and review process (Article IV, sections 2, 3 and 4; Article V, sections 1, 2 and 3)

- **Describe panelist recruitment and appointment process with greater clarity (Article II, sections 8 and 9)**

- **Update the appeal process (Article VI, section 2):**
  - Define a new role of appellate officers (Director of Undergraduate Academic Integrity Office, Associate Dean for Professional Programs in the College of Veterinary Medicine, or Associate Vice President for Research Compliance)
  - Describe a new appeal review and decision process (see attached flow chart)

- **Update penalty options (Article VII, Section 1):**
  - Remove penalty option of performing community service hours
  - Introduce new penalty option of writing an reflection essay
  - Introduce new penalty option of ethics course requirement (GRAD 5014: Academic Integrity and Plagiarism)
  - Update penalty option “F#” (penalty 1. g) to “F” to reflect actual practice of how the GHS-assigned F grade appears on the transcript

- **Update announcements about GHS cases to reflect changes in available media for information distribution (Article VII, Section 3)**

- **Update or remove references to outdated internal and external resources (Article V, Section 3; Article IX, Section 2; Article X, Article XI) such as websites.**
Student submits appeal to dean of Graduate School

Is appeal received within five university business days of notice of verdict?

Appealed case is forwarded to one of three Appellate Officers for review (based on violation type and home department/college of student)

Appeal case packet includes:
- original case file
- recording of judicial panel hearing
- rationale of judicial panel for verdict and penalty
- appeal with detailed information

Appeal denied; original decision enforced

Appeal denied; original decision enforced

Was appeal based on any of the following?
- procedural irregularities,
- introduction of new evidence;
- severity of penalty

Yes

Is appeal based on any of the following?
- procedural irregularities,
- introduction of new evidence;
- severity of penalty

No

Appeal denied; original decision enforced

Appellate Officer reviews all materials

Procedures not properly followed: review procedural details
New evidence: review new evidence
Severity of penalty: review violation and penalty options

Appellate Officer confers, as needed, with experienced GHS panelists not connected to the case (as identified by CJ or GHS advisor)

Was original penalty too severe?

Yes

Appellate Officer determines lower penalty

Was original penalty too severe?

No

No

Is evidence new and relevant?

Yes

Appellate Officer confers, as needed, with experienced GHS panelists not connected to the case (as identified by CJ or GHS advisor)

Was original penalty too severe?

No

No

Is evidence new and relevant?

Yes

Appellate Officer determines lower penalty

Appellate Officer determines lower penalty

No

Appellate Officer determines lower penalty

Appellate Officer determines lower penalty

Student, referrer, Graduate School, and original Judicial members are notified in writing.

GHS Appeal Procedures – proposed

Appellate Officers:
- Head of UGHS (Assistant Provost for Academic Strategy and Planning)
- Associate Dean for Professional Programs at College of Veterinary Medicine
- Research Integrity Officer

Were GHS procedures followed?

No

Student acquitted, case closed

Case is returned to GHS for new judicial panel hearing with no members from previous panel(s)
WHEREAS, the preeminently recognized rank of Alumni Distinguished Professor has grown since its inception many years ago; and

WHEREAS, the standards for and expectations of current and recently appointed Alumni Distinguished professors have evolved with the vision of Virginia Tech as a global land-grant university; and

WHEREAS, the description and criteria for selection in the existing Faculty Handbook Section 3.2.2 are no longer accurate in describing how the rank has evolved; and

WHEREAS, the current description and criteria for selection have somewhat limited the consideration of nominees; and

WHEREAS, the Alumni Distinguished Professor embodies the university’s mission by contributing extraordinary scholarly work across all three mission areas of the global land-grant university: teaching, research and/or creative activities, and engagement;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Faculty Handbook Section 3.2.2: Alumni Distinguished Professor be updated as attached:
3.2.2 Alumni Distinguished Professor

**General conditions and definitions:** The Alumni Distinguished Professorship (ADP) is a preeminent faculty appointment, reserved by the Board of Visitors for recognition of faculty members who demonstrate extraordinary accomplishments and academic citizenship through substantive scholarly contributions across all three of Virginia Tech’s core mission areas of teaching, research or creative activity, and engagement. The provost determines the number of Alumni Distinguished Professors in consultation with the president and the Alumni Association. There is no quota by college or department.

**Eligibility and criteria for selection:** While no minimum number of years of service is required for eligibility, the selection committee places strong emphasis on the magnitude, character, and quality of each nominee’s scholarly accomplishments as they contribute to the global land-grant mission of the university. Nominees must have well-established outstanding records of substantive scholarly accomplishment in teaching, research or creative activities, and engagement at Virginia Tech.

**Responsibilities and perquisites:** Each Alumni Distinguished Professor shall continue making scholarly contributions in teaching, research or creative activities, and engagement at the same high level evident at the time of appointment. This includes continued contributions to the department and college and may include contributions to other departments, colleges, and units, subject to the professor’s interests and the ability of the department head or chair and college dean to accommodate such latitude. Alumni Distinguished Professors may also elect, in a given term, to divert energies from the usual activities or responsibilities to other valued scholarly pursuits appropriate to this university-level appointment.

Alumni Distinguished Professors embody the university’s land-grant mission in their scholarly work and are also crucial faculty ambassadors within and beyond the university community. As such, they may be called upon from time to time, individually and as a group, to share their scholarship with university alumni or other interested groups, as well as to render special service or to offer particular advice to the university at large.

Each Alumni Distinguished Professor receives a base salary supplement from the endowment established by the Alumni Association and operating funds for scholarly support, as available, from eminent scholar programs.

Given the high level of performance expected of this select group of faculty members, university and college administrators are cognizant of the particular needs of each individual Alumni Distinguished Professor for appropriate support personnel and sufficient space, within acknowledged fiscal and physical constraints.

**Nomination and selection procedures:** Each academic year the provost, in consultation with the president and the Alumni Association, determines if there will be one or more appointments to the Alumni Distinguished Professor rank and, if so, issues a call to the academic deans for nominations. The deans, in turn, invite nominations from academic departments. Screening procedures at departmental and collegiate levels involve appropriate personnel or executive committees. Nominations dossiers include a current curriculum vitae, letters of nomination.
from both the departmental and collegiate screening committees, letters of support, and other evidence attesting to the quality of the nominee’s scholarly contributions.

The provost appoints an Alumni Distinguished Professor Selection Committee that includes two current Alumni Distinguished Professors, one current University Distinguished Professor, and one faculty member recommended by the Commission on Faculty Affairs. The committee reviews the nominations and makes a recommendation to the provost. The provost’s subsequent recommendation is sent through the president to the executive committee of the Board of Directors of the Virginia Tech Alumni Association for its review and recommendation. The president makes the final recommendation to the Board of Visitors for its approval.

The Board of Visitors confers upon an individual the rank of Alumni Distinguished Professor for a period of 10 years; the appointment may be renewed.

**Procedures for renewal of appointments**: An ADP may request renewal of his or her appointment at the end of the initial, or any subsequent, 10-year appointment period. A current curriculum vitae and five-page personal statement of accomplishments during the appointment term is requested by the office of the provost and reviewed by two current ADPs. The reviewing ADPs each make a recommendation regarding reappointment to the provost, who then forwards a recommendation to the president and Alumni Association for consideration. Final reappointment recommendations are made to the Board of Visitors for its approval. Renewed appointments are also for a period of 10 years.
### 3.2.2 Alumni Distinguished Professor

**General conditions and definitions:** The Alumni Distinguished Professorship (ADP) is a pre-eminent faculty appointment, reserved by the Board of Visitors for recognition of faculty members who recognize—demonstrate extraordinary accomplishments and academic citizenship through substantive scholarly academic citizenship contributions across all three of Virginia Tech’s core mission areas of teaching, research or creative activity, and engagement. The provost determines the number of Alumni Distinguished Professors in consultation with the president and the Alumni Association. There is no quota by college or department or distinguished service within the Virginia Tech community. In recognition of the importance of alumni to the university, the Alumni Distinguished Professorship is a pre-eminent faculty appointment, reserved by the Board of Visitors for recognition of faculty members who, over time, have made outstanding contributions to the instructional program of the university and, in so doing, have touched the lives of generations of Virginia Tech alumni.

The Board of Visitors confers upon an individual an appointment as Alumni Distinguished Professor for a period of 10 years; the appointment may be renewed. The number of Alumni Distinguished Professors is determined by the provost, in consultation with the president and Alumni Association. There is no quota by college or department.

**Eligibility and criteria for selection:** Since the hallmark of the Alumni Distinguished Professorship is distinguished contribution—over time—to Virginia Tech, newly arrived faculty are not eligible for nomination. While there is no specified minimum number of years of service required for eligibility, the selection committee places strong emphasis on the magnitude, and character, and quality of the candidate's each nominee's impact scholarly accomplishments as they contribute to the global land-grant mission on academic programs at Virginia Tech. Nominees should also have well-established outstanding personal records of substantive scholarly accomplishment in teaching, research or creative scholarly activities, and engagement at Virginia Tech.

**Nomination and selection procedures:** Each academic year the provost determines if there will be one or more appointments to the Alumni Distinguished Professor group and, if appropriate, issues a call to the academic deans for nominations. The deans, in turn, invite nominations from academic departments. Screening procedures at departmental and collegiate levels involve appropriate personnel or executive committees in place. Nominations are accompanied by a full dossier of relevant materials including current curriculum vita, letters of nomination from both the departmental and collegiate screening committees, letters of support, and other evidence attesting to the quality of the contributions of the nominee(s).

The provost appoints an Alumni Distinguished Professor Selection Committee that includes two current Alumni Distinguished Professors, one current University Distinguished Professor, and one faculty member recommended by the Commission on Faculty Affairs. The committee reviews the nominations and makes a recommendation to the provost. The provost's subsequent recommendation is sent through the president to the executive committee of the Board of Directors of the Virginia Tech Alumni Association for its review and recommendation. The president makes the final recommendation to the Board of Visitors for its approval.

Updated 4/3/2018 per discussion from CFA first reading, Provost feedback, and further review by ADPs
**Perquisites and Responsibilities:** Each Alumni Distinguished Professor is provided a base salary supplement from the endowment established by the Alumni Association and matched by available funds, if available, from the eminent scholar program. The ADPs receive a salary supplement and operating allocation from the university comparable to that provided for other endowed professorships.

Each Alumni Distinguished Professor is expected to continue making scholarly contributions in teaching, research or creative activities, and engagement in service to the department, the college, and the university at the same high level evident at the time of appointment. This includes continued contributions to the department and college and may include contributions to other departments, colleges, and units, subject to the professor’s interests and the ability of the department head or chair and college dean to accommodate such latitude. The Alumni Distinguished Professor is encouraged to teach, when invited, in other departments of the university or in collegiate or university courses (e.g., honors colloquia). Alumni Distinguished Professors may also elect, in a given term, to divert energies from the usual classroom activities or responsibilities to other valued scholarly activities or pursuits appropriate to this university-level appointment, such as substantive curriculum revision or textbook preparation.

Alumni Distinguished Professors embody the university’s land-grant mission in their scholarly work and are also crucial faculty ambassadors within and beyond the university community. As such, they are also called upon from time to time, individually and as a group, to share their scholarship with university alumni or other interested groups, as well as to render special service or to offer particular advice to the university at large.

Nomination and selection procedures: Each academic year the provost, in consultation with the president and the Alumni Association, determines if there will be one or more appointments to the Alumni Distinguished Professor group rank and, if appropriate, issues a call to the academic deans for nominations. The deans, in turn, invite nominations from academic departments. Screening procedures at departmental and collegiate levels involve appropriate personnel or executive committees in place. Nominations dossiers include a full dossier of relevant materials including a current curriculum vitae, letters of nomination from both the departmental and collegiate screening committees, letters of support, and other evidence attesting to the quality of the contributions of the nominee(s), the nominee’s scholarly contributions.

*Updated 4/3/2018 per discussion from CFA first reading, Provost feedback, and further review by ADPs*
The provost appoints an Alumni Distinguished Professor Selection Committee that includes two current Alumni Distinguished Professors, one current University Distinguished Professor, and one faculty member recommended by the Commission on Faculty Affairs. The committee reviews the nominations and makes a recommendation to the provost. The provost’s subsequent recommendation is sent through the president to the executive committee of the Board of Directors of the Virginia Tech Alumni Association for its review and recommendation. The president makes the final recommendation to the Board of Visitors for its approval.

The Board of Visitors confers upon an individual an appointment as the rank of Alumni Distinguished Professor for a period of 10 years; the appointment may be renewed.

**Procedures for renewal of appointments:** An ADP may request renewal of his or her appointment at the end of the initial, or any subsequent, 10-year appointment period. A current curriculum vitae and five-page personal statement of accomplishments during the appointment term is requested by the office of the provost and reviewed by two current ADPs. The reviewing ADPs each make a recommendation regarding reappointment to the provost, who then forwards a recommendation to the president and Alumni Association for consideration. Final reappointment recommendations are made to the Board of Visitors for its approval. Renewed appointments are also for a period of 10 years.

*Updated 4/3/2018 per discussion from CFA first reading, Provost feedback, and further review by ADPs*
WHEREAS, nanoscience and nanomedicine are rapidly emerging fields that encompass areas within biological sciences, chemistry, geosciences, and physics (disciplines that lie at the core of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) education); and

WHEREAS, nanomedicine is an increasingly important aspect of health sciences as demonstrated by multiple major international conferences each year and nanomedicine centers and institutes at many research universities; and

WHEREAS, nanomaterials and nanoscale devices can provide improved therapeutics and diagnostics for human and animal diseases, with several already being employed and many others under clinical trials; and

WHEREAS, the Bachelor of Science in Nanoscience has established Virginia Tech as a leader in education for one of the most critical technology areas of the future; and

WHEREAS, the Bachelor of Science in Nanoscience attracts similar numbers of students interested in the health sciences and in the physical sciences, and the majority of those students interested in the health sciences have indicated a desire for a Major in Nanomedicine; and

WHEREAS, the creation of the Major in Nanomedicine will establish two strong educational paths for students in the Bachelor of Science in Nanoscience interested in physical sciences (Nanoscience major) and health sciences (Nanomedicine major) that will prepare them well for employment in the private sector, employment in state and federal government agencies, and for post-baccalaureate training appropriate to their area of interest; and

WHEREAS, the Major in Nanomedicine will be the first of its kind in the United States.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Major in Nanomedicine be approved for addition to the Bachelor of Science in Nanoscience effective Fall 2018 and the proposal be forwarded to University Council and the President for approval.
WHEREAS, the workload associated with the transition from CLE to Pathways has gone beyond the two-year time frame outlined in the Implementation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Pathways Ad Hoc Review Committee has efficiently reviewed approximately 300 courses and 12 minors over the two-year span; and

WHEREAS, there are approximately 50 proposals that will appear before the committee in the fall, and it is expected that more courses and minors will come forward in the coming year; and

WHEREAS, recognizing the added responsibilities and workload associated with the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) Chair and University Curriculum Committee for General Education (UCCGE) Chair also serving as the Co-Chairs of the Pathways Ad Hoc Review Committee; and

WHEREAS, the Pathways Ad Hoc Review Committee membership includes two members from UCC and two members from UCCGE; and

WHEREAS, there is a need for continuity of Pathways General Education Curriculum policy background and implementation plan experience, and in support of having a faculty member that has gained experience and historical knowledge on the committee to serve as chair;

THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Pathways Ad Hoc Review Committee be extended for one more year as outlined in the Implementation Plan; furthermore, it is recommended to amend that the chair be nominated and elected by members of the UCCGE committee.

AND that the Pathways Implementation Plan (https://www.pathways.prov.vt.edu/content/dam/pathways_prov_vt_edu/8pdf/PathwaysImplementationDocumentOfficial2-26-18.pdf) be amended as follows:

1. Revision of the Pathways Implementation Plan (p. 4, last paragraph) from a “two-year period” to a “three-year period.”
2. Addition to the Pathways Implementation Plan (p. 5) to allow for “Chair nominated and elected from committee faculty members.”

3. Revision of section “B. After Transition” header of the Pathways Implementation Plan (p. 5) from “Fall 2018 and beyond” to “Fall 2019 and beyond.”
Whereas, Virginia Tech, Virginia’s premier land grant institution founded in 1872, recognizes and honors the Monacan-Tutelo people – the historical stewards of the land now occupied by Virginia Tech, and;

Whereas, race integrity laws in Virginia discouraged American Indians from attaining public education until 1963; many of these tribes, as well as tribes from across the United States and Canada, are represented among the students, faculty, and staff at Virginia Polytechnic and State University, and;

Whereas, Indigenous students at Virginia Tech study in nearly every college on campus and represent at least 14 Indigenous communities such as the Tohono O’odham, Cherokee, Osage, Blackfeet, Delaware, Coharie, Quechua, Chickahominy, Lumbee, Shinnecock/Unkechaug, Hawaiian, Anishinaabe, Peepeekisis Cree and Navajo (Diné), and;

Whereas, our Principles of Community guide our interactions with one another but also require action when necessary, and;

Whereas, Virginia Tech strives to cultivate a more positive and welcoming environment for Indigenous students and visitors at Virginia Tech, as well as to strengthen reciprocal partnerships with the eleven tribal communities of Virginia;

Therefore, be it resolved, Virginia Tech recognizes the second Monday in October each year as “Indigenous Peoples’ Day” and directs the Office of the President to designate the day as such, on university calendars and other appropriate materials.
Commission on Faculty Affairs
Minutes
April 13, 2018
10:30 a.m.-12:00 p.m.
130 Burruss Hall

In Attendance: B. Hicok (chairing today), G. Amacher, R. Blieszner, S. Chien, J. Finney, V. Groover, M. McGrath, T. Schenk, J. Spotila, P. Young

Absent: R. Willis, G. Daniel, D. Stoudt, M. Parette, L. Brogdon, J. Ferris, R. Speer

Guests: M. Pratt Clarke, E. McCann, P. Becksted, A. Porter, E. Plummer, D. Musick

Upcoming Meetings: April 27, 2018 (130 Burruss)

1. Welcome and Verbal Approval of Agenda. B. Hicok
Meeting called to order at 10:30 am.
The agenda was approved unanimously.
M. McGrath will take the minutes today.
General introductions of commission members and guests.

2. Approval of March 30, 2018 Minutes B. Hicok
The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. University’s Strategic Plan (proposed mission, vision, core values and objectives) M. Pratt-Clarke
Vice President for Strategic Planning Mena Pratt-Clarke presented the current draft of the University’s Strategic Plan. This began with a review of the strategic planning process, its relationship to Beyond Boundaries and current Initiatives, and the strategic planning committee structure. The process began late last fall (December 2017) with a series of presentations regarding the institution as a whole (stakeholders). Previous strategic plans were reviewed, including the last holistic plan from 2001 (subsequent plans were updates). The draft of the 2019 plan including proposed mission, vision, core values and objectives was presented. The presentation to the CFA is part of a series of presentations across the University for input. The following link includes a copy of the power point presentation as well as a survey: http://www.beyondboundaries.vt.edu/strategicplanning.html

The committee discussed the objectives in view of the core responsibilities of a University to students and society. Pratt-Clarke positioned Beyond Boundaries as a long-range strategic response to areas of rapid change in the global educational environment. The current strategic plan requires meaningful metrics that can be attached to tactics aimed to move the institution towards the thirty-year target of joining the top 100 global universities. Prior plan review confirmed that we are not very good yet at measuring our achievements, and this planning process is predicated on doing better at assessing our progress towards objectives and being able to incrementally reposition the University to address change going forward. It is intended that the Strategic Plan framework, when implemented at the College level, and integrated in the PIBB, will provide better a more robust structure for the University to make informed decisions on where to make investments. Action items and priorities will be done at the College and unit level. These will be evaluated/assessed by University to see how as a whole we are progressing towards our vision. The Strategic Plan will inform and shape PIBB, not vice versa.

The committee asked whether we were studying the current plans of other Universities. Pratt-Clarke responded that a consulting firm has been engaged to provide this information. Universities across
the country are engaging in some form of Beyond Boundaries Initiatives that are based on establishing signature areas of research. The aim should be to not only ascertain who has done this well and learn from them, but also to consider the advantage to being first. How risk comfortable are we as an Institution?

The committee discussed the scale that the University leadership has chosen to work: We aren’t incubating or piloting change in incremental phases. Pratt-Clarke remarked that as a Land Grant University, given the political nature of some the initiatives if you are only doing one agenda, plurality at scale makes sense. That said, she observed that the Institution became big on a small foundation, and that we need to develop our infrastructure to support our magnitude of growth. We need to consider what is a 30-year infrastructure, how do we develop that as we move forward, and how do we invest while we want to achieve objectives now?

The committee discussed the impact of University level initiatives on what faculty are expected to do, and whether we are structured appropriately as an institution to support these endeavors. Pratt-Clarke recognized that the campus community needs to discuss together how to support faculty productivity towards achieving the Institute’s goal while preserving key values under the precept of Ut Prosim such as our significant mentoring relationships with students and experiential learning.

4. **Second reading of a revision to section 3.2.2 of the Faculty Handbook -- Alumni Distinguished Professor**

   **J. Finney**

   Jack Finney presented the revision to section 3.2.2 in response to the CFA’s concerns expressed in the initial reading regarding scholarship’s predominance in the description. The committee’s aim was to elevate all missions of the university, not to diminish value of teaching. The word “Scholarly” is used to define teaching & engagement as scholarship (to “ennoble them”).

   After some discussion, the revision was approved unanimously.

5. **Other business**

   **B. Hicok**

   Jim Spotila reported back that the Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity (CEOD) recently passed a resolution to add new caucus members. To keep the size of the commission manageable, the CFA member has been taken away, as well as one Senate member. All groups that have three representatives have been reduced to one representative.

   The CFA discussed that since some issues such as inclusion and diversity span the two commissions, it is useful to have someone there from CFA. John Ferris (CFA Chair) has already requested that the voting position be retained, but CEOD denied the request. It was suggested that the CFA seek an Ex Officio position, or consider appointing someone to attend the meetings and report back.

   The CFA discussed the overall communication between Commissions. Ellen Plummer provided background of the structure that was set up when constituting the University Council and Commissions. Each Commission was allocated an administrator. One of the allocated roles of the administrators was to coordinate horizontally what goes on in the Commissions.

   No action was taken on this issue today.

6. **Adjourn**

   **B. Hicok**

   Motion to adjourn was unanimously approved at 11.49 am.
MINUTES
Commission on Graduate Studies & Policies
April 4, 2018
3:30 – 5:00 p.m.
Graduate School Conference Room


Absent with notification: Karen DePauw (ex officio), Lesa Hanlin, Annie Pearce, and Robert Sumichrast.

Absent without notification: Tyler Walters (ex officio) and Hannah Whiteman.

Visitors and invited guests: Janice Austin, Madlyn Frisard, and Bill Huckle.

Call to Order
The meeting was called to order by Dr. Edgar at 3:30 p.m.

Approval of the Agenda
The agenda was approved as presented.

New Business
Dr. Frisard presented the first reading CGS&P Resolution 2017-18B. This resolution is a proposal for a Master of Science Degree in Nutrition and Dietetics. A second reading will be held at the next meeting.

Dr. Edgar requested nominations for the GCC chair for 2018-19. Dr. Hole was nominated as chair. Dr. Edgar requested nominations for the CGS&P chair. Dr. Bagchi was nominated as chair. Elections will be held at the April 18, 2018 meeting.

Old Business
The second reading of CGS&P Resolution 2017-18A was presented by Dr. Bodenhorn. A soft rollout has been added to the proposal and NLI has agreed to provide support and training about how to have the discussions with students in classes. Dr. DePauw attended the Faculty Senate meeting yesterday to answer any remaining questions and found the group supportive. The resolution was approved and will move forward to University Council.

The second reading of the GHS Constitution was presented by Ms. Lavender-Stott. The constitution was approved and will move forward to University Council.
The second reading of Michael Rhoades’ iPhD was presented by Dr. Huckle. The proposal was approved by the Commission.

**Announcements**

There are no announcements.

**Approval of the Minutes**

The minutes of March 21, 2018 were approved as presented.

**Committee Reports**

**Graduate Curriculum Committee**

The minutes of March 22, 2018 were accepted as presented. Revised minutes for January 25, 2018 and February 22, 2018 were also accepted as presented. Dr. Bagchi presented the untaught course report and it was accepted as presented.

**Graduate Student Appeals Committee**

There was no report.

**Degree Requirements, Standards, Criteria, and Academic Progress (DRSCAP) Committee**

Dr. Bodenhorn reported that the next meeting will discuss the stacking of certificates.

**Graduate School Update**

There was no report.

**Constituency Updates**

**Graduate Student Assembly**

Dr. Hyler reported elections will be held April 19th. A request for support from CGS&P for the street fair will be forthcoming.

**Graduate Honor System**

Ms. Lavender-Stott reported there are three cases under consideration. Ms. Lavender-Stott has submitted her resignation as Chief Justice effective at the end of spring semester.

**University Library Committee**

Dr. Petters reported that work continues within departments to pilot procedures and policies to improve graduate student data management. Efforts are being made to assist graduate student advisors in
understanding how data is managed and what products exist. This effort continues to move forward, and additional departments are expected to become involved.

Faculty Senate

Dr. Abrahams reported the Faculty Senate members extends their thanks to Dr. DePauw for providing additional clarification of the CGS&P Resolution 2017-18A during her visit this week. The discussion was well-received and the Faculty Senate will support the resolution going forward.

Student Government Association

In Ms. Whiteman’s absence, Dr. Hyler reported election results will be announced shortly.

Board of Visitors

Mr. Netto reported the 2% stipend increase will be effective November 25, 2018. The increase for health insurance has not been decided yet. Zo Amani is the new BOV representative for 2018-2019.

University Council and Commission Updates

Dr. Edgar reported many new course proposals were presented at the last University Council meeting. There were no other commission updates.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/

Marilynn R. King
On behalf of Karen P. DePauw, Ph.D.
Vice President and Dean for Graduate Education
Minutes

COMISSION ON RESEARCH

March 14, 2018

130 Burruss Conference Room

3:30pm-5:00pm

Attendees: Jennifer Irish (Chair), Virginia Pannabecker (Vice-Chair), Connie Marshall (for Theresa Mayer), Stefan Duma, Alan Michaels, Sid Madhavan, Robert Vogelaar, Myra Blanco, Saied Mostaghimi, Kevin McGuire, Ken Miller, Thomas Bell, Deborah Milly, Rachael Rupnow, Benjamin Corl, and Chris Tysor (Recorder).

Absent: Van Crowder, Sally Morton, Andrew Neilson, Kurt Zimmerman, Dipankar Chakravarti, Uri Kahanovitch and Steve Nagle

Guests: Dennis Grove, Tom Dingus, Ellen Plummer

I. Approval of the Agenda- Approved by vote with modification that Saied Mostaghimi would be leading us through the 2nd reading of the revisions to the faculty handbook instead of Peggy Layne.

II. Announcements

   a. None

III. Unfinished Business

   a. Upcoming Elections- Call for nominations for Vice Chair for the 2018-2019 year. The Vice Chair term is 2 years with the first year serving as Vice Chair and second year serving as Chair. Please consider nominating or self-nominating and send those nominee names to Jen Irish and Virginia Pannabecker.

   b. Report of Ongoing Activities

      a. Revisions to the Faculty Handbook, Second Reading of all three – S. Mostaghimi

         i. CoR Resolution 2017-18 B to Clarify Faculty Handbook Language on Overload Compensation for Research Faculty Members Teaching Credit Classes. There was much discussion around the use of the term “overload” pay. Bruce V. wasn’t clear on how one could receive more salary if their time commitment was already at 100%. He brought up the point this could look funny and could lead to someone decreasing their % LOE to below 100 on a grant, then adding, for instance, a course to teach which would bring their time above 100% and salary increase as well. Ken Miller described the process for the attendees. Jen Irish read from a memo published by Jack Finney in February 2012 which precipitated this topic and attempted to show there needed to be a process in place to allow research faculty to be compensated for teaching classes over and above their usual job responsibilities. Such a process was then piloted successfully and this resolution’s goal is to modify the faculty handbook to describe this as an official process. Jen asked if removing the term “overload” from the title of the resolution would help to eliminate confusion while not changing the spirit of the resolution. Saied countered with leaving the term in the title.
since this resolution had already been seen and “approved” by multiple commissions and faculty groups who did not raise an issue. Decision was made to leave “overload” in the title. Ken Miller further explained the intent of what he understood the resolution was trying to accomplish. This resolution is concerning university effort versus consulting/personal effort. Following discussion, Jen Irish brought the resolution to a vote. It passed with all in favor, none opposed.

ii. CoR Resolution to Clarify Faculty Handbook Language on Research Faculty Promotion Process – 2017-18 A - The spirit of this resolution was to clarify guidelines for research faculty promotions: professorial ranks and research faculty promotions: non-professorial ranks. Professorial ranks promotion follows normal tenure track channels while the non-professorial ranks promotion follows a different process, so it was necessary to break the two out. Jen Irish brought the resolution to a vote. It passed with all in favor, none opposed.

iii. CoR Resolution to Clarify Language in Faculty Handbook on Search Requirements and Removal Processes for Research Faculty Members – 2017-18 C. Since the first reading, the resolution was modified to exclude search requirements. Following a motion to approve the resolution, it was discussed that “search requirements” should be removed from the resolution title as it is no longer addressed in the resolution. Jen Irish proposed an editorial change to remove "(additions in italics, deletions in strikethrough)", to be consistent with the other two resolutions. Jen Irish brought the resolution as amended to a vote. It passed with all in favor, none opposed as CoR Resolution to Clarify Language in Faculty Handbook on Removal Processes for Research Faculty Members – 2017-18 C.

b. Faculty Senate – B. Vogelaar – EFARs still remain a high priority topic in the senate as well as the backlog in research through IRB delays. Promotion and Tenure criteria are under review, and review will continue into next academic year. Academic Analytics (https://www.academicanalytics.com/) is another priority topic - how is this being used to evaluate people across the university? Though decisions based on this are described as aggregate, these filter down and affect individuals. Discussions will continue this year and into the following semester. Bruce also mentioned the inclusion and diversity component being discussed to be added to graduate education. Bruce informed the group he would look into Collegiate Faculty and their promotion process as it may be different than the others discussed since it is a new category. Will bring more information to the group later.

c. Committee on Research Competitiveness – no update in the interest of time

d. Update to Policy 13005 – no update

e. University Library Committee- V. Pannabecker requested CoR members share any ideas you and your departments may have for use of library space. The library is collecting requests for recommendations for future library space renovations. Responses received to date include co-working areas for large, interdisciplinary groups, data visualization capabilities, etc. They are compiling the requests for a report in May/June. If you have any ideas, please pass them to Virginia Pannabecker.
f. Open Access Policy Draft announcement—V. Pannabecker—There are 3 NLI sessions upcoming in March and April, and the facilitators are interested in visiting department / college / research group meetings to get specific feedback from a faculty around the university. Contact the working group members at openaccess@vt.edu and we’ll schedule at time that works for your group. Also, it was discussed that more types of faculty (e.g., different Department and College representation) be included in the commission discussions to ensure all voices are represented. The working group website is regularly updated and has the Draft OA Policy, FAQ, and Presentation Slides at: https://sites.google.com/a/vt.edu/cor-oa-policy-working-group/

g. Update on Commission Chairs meeting with President Sands—J. Irish—Commission for Outreach and International Affairs reaching out to international alumni in an effort to move Virginia Tech into the top 100 international university ranks. Kim O’Rourke has put together a policy committee that will provide feedback on resolution drafts.

IV. New Business

a. Plan for April CoR Agenda- Three major issues are affecting faculty at Virginia Tech and are affecting the ability to conduct research. These are long delays related to IRB approvals, Software Licensing, and Hiring Research Faculty on Grants. The plan for April is to hold a panel discussion with the following people invited to help inform the commission on these areas: Dr. Gary Sherman for IRB approvals, Dr. Jerri Kemp for Software Licensing and Ms. Lynn Byrd for Hiring. Dr. Theresa Mayer is also invited to attend. Connie Marshall stated Western IRB, an external firm, has been hired and they are getting IRB approvals moving quickly through the process.

b. VTTI’s Strategies for Attracting Large Grants and Diversifying its Funding Portfolio- Tom Dingus, Director VTTI

   a. Tom Dingus provided a brief overview and facts about how VTTI operates. VTTI contains 15 research centers and initiatives. They are considered the #1 Transportation Institute in the US by most metrics. They support 275 research faculty and staff (not including post-docs) and make up a significant part of the overall Virginia Tech research portfolio (~15%). VTTI rents all their space and therefore does not own any buildings. They earn approx. $9.8M in indirect funds and fund an average of 280 students. 85% of their personnel are soft funded. VTTI has a proposal hit rate of 82% with a dedicated pre and post awards proposal team to include technical writers. VTTI leverages every resource, hires entrepreneurs and innovators, is exceptionally nimble and maintains a large partnership network that they have cultivated over decades. They have been on proposals anywhere from $50,000 to millions of dollars with 30 partners and 25 subcontractors. VTTI makes it a point to travel and market themselves at conferences, trade shows and to the media. They host multiple sponsor visits weekly

   b. Jen Irish asked the question of how many multi-million dollar grants is VTTI bringing in: how are PIs supported and at what stages? VTTI maintains a proposal development team to include 8-9 folks on the pre-award side which is made of graphic designers, technical writers and contract specialists. A PI can submit to the team some writing/a formulated idea on paper and the proposal development team will turn it into a fully developed proposal with graphics and budget for submission. 92% of their external funding comes from contracts, not grants. Myra Blanco won
an $8M+ contract last fall. VTTI has received contracts from $50,000-$15M. The proposal development team provides the same type of assistance no matter the dollar amount of the proposed contract. VTTI goes after any contract no matter the dollar amount because there could be future benefit in any partnership.

c. Dennis Grove asked if going after grants/contracts was a top-down or bottom-up initiative. The response was both. There are approximately 50 full-time engineers and scientists on staff. Their workload ebbs and flows, but if you need them to put together an experimental vehicle for a particular contract, they can do so in a short time frame.

d. Nancy Dudek asked about marketing. VTTI tries to send teams to all major trade shows, conferences, etc applicable in the transportation space to include the Consumer Electronic Show 2018 in Las Vegas. It is worth it to spend money marketing themselves and having a staffed booth in order to generate potential new partners and interest in VTTI work and research.

e. Jen Irish asked when you have a tight-turnaround contract, how does VTTI manage T&R faculty who have many external commitments. VTTI provides them help and assistance. If the PI truly wants to be a part of the contract and are excited about the opportunity, they are responsive and provide information when asked.

f. Connie Marshall asked if working with companies and/or industry is restraining. VTTI tells the customer or partner what they NEED to hear, not necessarily what they want to hear and feedback they have received is this is the preferred way to communicate. Sometimes there is a required delay in publication for up to a few years after the project or after the product is on the market; other times there is no publishing delay required.

g. Jen Irish asked if there are challenges working with faculty in the P&T process? VTTI hires mostly research faculty so to date, they haven’t really had any issues with this. Time will tell.

V. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 1659

*The meeting minutes of February 14th, 2018 were voted on electronically. The absence of a response indicated a positive vote.

Please take note of the following upcoming meetings which will all take place in Burruss 130 from 3:30pm-5:00pm unless otherwise noted:

April 11, 2018

May 9, 2018
VTTI/VTT, LLC Organizational Structure

15 Research Centers/Initiatives/Groups

- Advanced Automotive Research
- Automated Vehicle Systems
- Data Reduction and Analysis Support
- Infrastructure-based Safety Systems
- Injury Biomechanics
- Partnerships, Public Policy, and Outreach
- Sustainable Mobility
- Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure
- Technology Development
- Truck and Bus Safety
- Vulnerable Road User Safety
- Motorcycle Research Group
- I-81 Corridor Coalition
- Global Center for Automotive Performance Simulation
- Center for Technology Implementation

Nationally Known Centers

- National UTC: Safety through Disruption
- National Surface Transportation Safety Center
- Automated Mobility Partnership

Zac Doerzaph, Director (BEAM/VTTI)
Shane McLaughlin, Director (VTTI)
Miguel Perez, Director (ISE/VTTI)
Ron Gibbons, Director (VTTI)
Warren Hardy, Director (ME)
Myra Blanco, Director (VTTI)
Hesham Rakha, Director (CEE/VTTI)
Gerardo Flintsch, Director (CEE)
Andy Petersen, Director (VTTI)
Rich Hanowski, Director (VTTI)
Jon Antin, Director (VTTI)
Shane McLaughlin, Group Leader (VTTI)
Andy Alden, Director (VTTI)
Frank Della Pia, Executive Director (VTT, LLC)
Mike Mollenhauer, Director (VTTI)

Zac Doerzaph, Director (BEAM/VTTI)
Jon Hankey, Director (VTTI)
Tom Dingus, Director (BEAM/VTTI)
Who We Are . . .

- We are the #1 Transportation Institute in the U.S., by most metrics
- We are the largest group of driving safety researchers in the world
- Many of our 275 research faculty and staff have 10+ years of service (not "post docs")
- We are a significant part of the VT research portfolio (~15%)
- We have never had any advancement funds invested in VTTI
- All of our space is rented; => the highest space utilization on campus
- The monetary investment by VT is modest (particularly at our current scale), thus we have the largest ROI at VT by a large margin
FY18 VTTI Funding Overview

VT Base Budget (unchanged since FY16) $4.3M
ETF $500k
Space $1.8M

Support VTTI's DA Effort $100k
DA Joint Positions $260k
CV Cost Sharing $284k

VT Total Support to VTTI = $7.2M

VTTI Indirect/F&A Earned $9.8M

VTTI $5.4M
VT Colleges & Depts. $475k
CCA I & II $830k
OVPRI $140k
State $2.9M

VTTI Support to VT = $6.5M

VTTI’s Net Cost for VTTI = $7.2M - $6.5M = $700k

• 280 Students
• 245 Faculty and Staff
• 30 VTT, LLC Employees (includes open positions)
Who We Are . . .

• We have 100+ sponsors and 300+ active projects
• We are 85% “soft” funded (the most at VT by a large margin)
• We write 200+ proposals/year; our current proposal hit rate is more than 80%
  • Mixed bag; everything from NSF/NIH to a guaranteed budget page
  • We let very few opportunities pass . . .
• We have worked with 175+ T&R faculty from 7 colleges, 18 departments, and 4 sister institutes in the last five years (initiatives, white papers, proposals, awards)
• We fund 280 students (mostly undergrads) on average each year, for at least part of a year
In Addition . . . (these are some key points)

• We are entrepreneurs and innovators
  ➢ Significantly expanded the “normal” bounds of transportation

• We leverage every resource
  ➢ If we get a car, truck, building, track, or source of funding . . . How do we turn it into a bigger initiative with more partners?

• We are exceptionally nimble
  ➢ We put together winning teams in a matter of days or weeks
  ➢ We have increased our efforts to achieve a greater proportion of private-sector funding to continue to grow

• We are part of a large network of partners
  ➢ We can quickly put substantial resources behind an initiative
VTTI Awards by Source % for 3 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Fed FlowThru</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Key Points . . .

- We have cultivated sponsor relationships over decades
- We are always “out there” (conferences, trade shows, media)

- We host multiple sponsor visits weekly
- We are always traveling to see potential sponsors (Germany, Japan, S Korea, California, Detroit . . . AND DC)
Another Key: Unique, Valuable, World-class Infrastructure
Cost $110M; Cost to VT, $8.25M
(VT is heavily leveraged . . . We all have to be creative)

- Smart Road opened in co-sponsorship with VDOT (2000)
- International Center for Naturalistic Driving Data Analysis at Virginia Tech (2006)
- National Surface Transportation Safety Center for Excellence (2006)
- Crash Sled Laboratory Partnership (2009)
- Global Center for Automotive Performance Simulation (Created in 2010; Opened in 2013)
- https://vimeo.com/websedge/review/161775116/a5f39e89ed

- Connected Vehicle/Infrastructure University Transportation Center (2012); Northern Virginia Connected-vehicle Test Bed (Opened 2013); Virginia Connected Corridors program (2014)
- Accelerated Pavement/Heavy-vehicle Simulator (2015)
- Smart Road Surface Street/Rural Road Expansion (underway)
VT Ti Smart Road Expansion Funding ~$12.7M

VT $750k (includes debt service) 64%

VDOT $3.8M 30%

Rural Test-bed Debt Service $2M

Intern Hub Debt Service $3.5M

Intern Hub Outfitting/Support $750k

Urban & Rural Buildout $1.5M

Urban Debt Service $400k

VT $750k for Urban Expansion

VDOT SR Expansion $1.2M

VDOT Rural Test-bed Paving est. $2.6M (TBD)
VTT, LLC Funding Overview

- **$14M VTT Start-up and LTRe Investment**
- **Avg. Salary ~$70k**
- **64 Direct + Indirect Jobs Created in SoVA**
- **32 Direct-funded Jobs in SoVA as of Oct. 2017**
- **36%**
- **VT $4M (loan)**
- **GM $5M**
- **TIC $5M**
- **$16M in GCAPS Revenue FY13-FY17**
- **Funding Debt Service $5.3M to VT through FY28 and ~$400k to VTF FY18**

Revenue FY13-FY17 $16M in GCAPS Revenue.
Project Highlights
VTTI Research in Rapid-cycle Mode
AMP RESEARCH IN RAPID-CYCLE MODE CASE STUDIES

- Use-case Library of Real-world Driving Events
- Simulations based on Naturalistic Driving Data
- Track Testing Reconstruction
- Field Testing
AMP LIBRARY
Two Paths to Events or Epochs

Vehicle
Crashes, Near-crashes, Following Maneuvers, Etc.

Epochs Events

Environment/Operational Domain/etc.
Highways, Low sun angle, Traffic circles, Urban grids, Crosswalks, Etc.
Epochs and Events

AMP LIBRARY
Ordering Cases for Analysis and Simulation

Selection of Cases for AMP Library and Simulation
Real-world Case Frequency and Criticality Scores
Automated Driving System-Dedicated Vehicle
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Standards (ADS-DV FMVSS)

Develop technical translations to existing FMVSS and related testing procedure approaches for emerging innovative and non-traditional vehicle designs
• Crash avoidance
• Crashworthiness
• Low-speed standards

Phase 1: Short-term Technical Translations
• Start date: October 2017

Phase 2: Research/Long-term Needs
• End date: March 2121

Award
• $8.7M

Research Sponsor: NHTSA
NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION
Each lamp and reflective device must be installed in a location where it complies with all applicable photometric requirements and visibility requirements, with all obstructions installed on the vehicle.
Determine that mirrors are securely mounted and that the driver-side mirror and mounting do not protrude farther than the widest part of the vehicle body except to the extent necessary to produce a field of view meeting or exceeding the requirements.
Each *front outboard designated seating position* has a Type 1 or Type 2 seat belt assembly that conforms to Standard No. 209 and S7.1 through S7.3, and that meets the requirements of S5.1 with *front test dummies.*
Discussion
The meeting was called to order at 3:00 PM by D. Stauffer.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion to approve the agenda passed unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF APPROVAL AND POSTING OF MINUTES

D. Stauffer announced the March 26, 2018 minutes were electronically approved and can be accessed via the University Registrar’s website:

NEW BUSINESS:

Resolution 2017-18.U Resolution to Approve New Major, Nanomedicine, in Bachelor of Science in Nanoscience, First Reading

The motion was made and seconded to present for first reading Resolution 2017-18.U, Resolution to Approve New Major, Nanomedicine, in Bachelor of Science in Nanoscience.

D. Stauffer opened the floor for discussion on Resolution 2017-18.U.

Discussion and clarification topics included the following:

- Nanoscience and Nanomedicine will be the two majors available under the Bachelor of Science in Nanoscience degree.
• Confirmation of the first effective term to graduate.
• International and national conferences in the nanoscience field.
• The Commission suggested a few minor edits to the resolution to address the following: correct a typographical error, clarify that the Nanomedicine major reflects a second educational path under the degree, and update the governance pathway for approval.

Resolution 2017-18.U has been forwarded to Faculty Senate for comment. Following the Faculty Senate review and response, the second reading of Resolution 2017-18.U will take place at the next available CUSP meeting.

Resolution 2017-18.V Resolution to Amend Implementation for the Pathways General Education Curriculum to Extend Ad Hoc Review Committee, First Reading

The motion was made and seconded to present for first reading Resolution 2017-18.V, Resolution to Amend Implementation for the Pathways General Education Curriculum to Extend Ad Hoc Review Committee.

D. Stauffer opened the floor for discussion on Resolution 2017-18.V.

Discussion and clarification topics included the following:

• Ad Hoc Review Committee Chair and Membership selection.
• Appreciation for the hard work of the Committee.
• Suggestion to extend the Ad Hoc Review Committee for two more years.
• Parallel approval path (UCC/UCCGE) Pre- and Post- Ad Hoc Review Committee.
• The Commission suggested some clarifying edits to the resolution.

Resolution 2017-18.V has been forwarded to Faculty Senate for comment. Following the Faculty Senate review and response, the second reading of Resolution 2017-18.V will take place at the next available CUSP meeting.

REPORTS AND MINUTES FROM COMMISSION COMMITTEES/SUB-COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Support Committee

No Report.

Academic Policies Committee

No Report.
Athletics Committee
No Report.

Commencement Committee
No Report.

Honor Council
No Report.

Library Committee
No Report.

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
M. Kasarda presented the March 23, 2018 report of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. A motion was made and seconded to approve the March 23, 2018 report of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

The motion passed unanimously.

**UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT—MARCH 23, 2018**

FOR “FIRST AND SECOND READING”
UNANIMOUS APPROVAL

**Courses**

New:

**Fall 2018**

College of Engineering

AOE 4624 Foundations of Aero and Hydroacoustics (CM-4127)

AOE 4634 Wind Turbine Technology and Aerodynamics (CM-4128)

ESM 2114 Statics and Structures (CM-3811)
College of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences

CRIM 4454 Topics in Criminology (CM-4196)
SOC 4454 Topics in Sociology (CM-4209)

Revised:

Fall 2018

College of Engineering

AOE 4274 Intermediate Ship Structural Analysis (CM-4123)
ECE 3154 Space Systems – Design and Validation (CM-3932)

Discontinue:

Fall 2018

College of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences

SOC 4434 Advanced Topics in Criminology (CM-4196)

New:

Spring 2019

College of Science

BIOL 3814 Careers In Biological Sciences (CM-4292)

New:

Fall 2019

College of Engineering

AOE 4105 – 4106 Experiments for Aerospace Design (CM-3795)

Revised:

Fall 2019
College of Engineering

AOE 4065 – 4066 Air Vehicle Design (CM-3801)

AOE 4165 – 4166 Space Vehicle Design (CM-3796)

Discontinue:

Fall 2019

College of Engineering

AOE 4154 Aerospace Engineering Laboratory (CM-3795)

**DEGREES, MAJORS, OPTIONS, MINORS**

**Major:**

New:

Effective Graduating Calendar Year 2020

College of Science

Establishment of New Major: Nanomedicine (NMED) under Degree: Bachelor of Science in Nanoscience (BSNAN), first term to declare major: Fall 2018, first term and year to graduate: Winter 2020 (CM-4147)

Checksheet: Degree: Bachelor of Science in Nanoscience (BSNAN), Major: Nanomedicine (NMED) (CM-4147)

Revised:

Effective Graduating Calendar Year 2020

College of Engineering

Checksheet: Degree: Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering (BSCE), Major: Civil Engineering (CE) (CM-3986)

College of Science

Checksheet: Degree: Bachelor of Science in Nanoscience (BSNAN), Major: Nanoscience (NANO) (CM-4296)
Minor:

Discontinue:

Effective Graduating Calendar Year 2020

College of Natural Resources and Environment

Checksheet: Minor: Sustainable Natural Environments (SNEN), last term and year to graduate: Fall 2020 (CM-4057)

University Curriculum Committee for General Education

L. Zietsman presented the February 28, 2018 revised report of the Pathways Ad Hoc Review Committee. A motion was made and seconded to approve the February 28, 2018 revised report of the Pathways Ad Hoc Review Committee.

The motion passed unanimously.

L. Zietsman presented the March 28, 2018 report of the Pathways Ad Hoc Review Committee. A motion was made and seconded to approve the March 28, 2018 report of the Pathways Ad Hoc Review Committee.

The motion passed unanimously.

PATHWAYS AD HOC REVIEW COMMITTEE REVISED REPORT—FEBRUARY 28, 2018
FOR “FIRST AND SECOND READING”
UNANIMOUS APPROVAL

COURSES

Revised:

CLE Fall 2018/Pathways Fall 2018

College of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences

PHIL 3024: Topics in Philosophical Movements (Pathways Critical Thinking in the Humanities G02, Ethical Reasoning G10) (CM 3916)
New:

CLE Fall 2018/Pathways Fall 2018

**College of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences**

HD 3024: Community Analytics (CLE Area 5, Pathways Advanced Quantitative and Computational Thinking G05a, Ethical Reasoning G10) (CM 4133)

HIST 3864 (IS 3864) (AFST 3864): Development and Humanitarianism in Africa (CLE Area 2, CLE Area 7, Pathways Critical Thinking in the Humanities G02, Reasoning in the Social Sciences G03, Intercultural and Global Awareness G11) (CM 4158)

MUS 2124 (APS 2124): Music Traditions in Appalachia (CLE Area 2, CLE Area 6, Pathways Critique and Practice in Design and the Arts G06ad, Intercultural and Global Awareness G11) (CM 4055)

Revised:

CLE Fall 2018/Pathways Fall 2018

**College of Architecture and Urban Studies**

ARCH 3115-3116: Histories of Architecture (CLE Area 2, Pathways Critical Thinking in the Humanities G02, Intercultural and Global Awareness G11) (CM 4112)

ITDS 1224: Introduction to Interior Design (CLE Area 6, Critique and Practice in Design and the Arts G06d, Intercultural and Global Awareness G11) (CM 4109)

**College of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences**

CONS 2304: Consumer and Family Finances (CLE Area 5, Pathways Foundational Quantitative and Computational Thinking G05f, Ethical Reasoning G10) (CM 3974)
EDCI 3004: Pre-Education Seminar (CLE Area 3, Pathways Reasoning in the Social Sciences G03, Intercultural and Global Awareness G11 (Up to 3 Pathways credits)) (CM 4135)

RLCL 2124: Religion in American Life (CLE Area 2, Pathways Critical Thinking in the Humanities G02, Critical Analysis of Equity and Identity in the United States G07, Intercultural and Global Awareness G11) (CM 4047)

RLCL 2204 (AFST 2204) (WGS 2204): Race and Gender in Religion and Culture (CLE Area 2, Pathways Critical Thinking in the Humanities G02, Critical Analysis of Identity and Equity in the United States G07, Intercultural and Global Awareness G11) (CM 4048)

SOC 2024: Sociology of Race and Ethnicity (CLE Area 3, CLE Area 2 (when taken with AFST 1714), Pathways Reasoning in the Social Sciences G03, Critical Analysis of Equity and Identity in the United States G07, Intercultural and Global Awareness G11) (CM 4050)

Pathways Fall 2018

College of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences

ENGL 3764: Technical Writing (Pathways Advanced Discourse G01a, Ethical Reasoning G10) (CM 4132)

CONSTITUENT REPORTS

Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs

No report.

Staff Senate

No report.

Faculty Senate

No report.

Student Government Association

No report.
Graduate Student Assembly

No report.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**Nominations/Review of CUSP Sub-Committee Chairs and Representatives for Academic Year 2018-2019**

The following individuals accepted nominations to serve as Chairs and Representatives of CUSP Sub-Committees for Academic Year 2018-2019:

Academic Support Committee—Dan Thorp (No volunteer from Commission faculty representatives)
University Athletics Committee—Susan Sumner
University Commencement Committee—Lara Khansa
University Curriculum Committee for General Education—Lizette Zietsman

**ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 3:23 PM.

*Respectfully Submitted,*
*Megan Coulter, Office of the University Registrar*