

MINUTES

Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs
September 1, 2006, 9:00 – 10:30 a.m., President's Board Room

Present: Kevin Ayoub, Christi Boone, Allen Campbell, Lou Gorr, Pat Hyer, Frances Keene, Charles Lytton, Jerry Niles, Kelly Oaks, Susan Puffenbarger, Kerry Redican, Carl Stafford, and Linda Woodard

Absent: Zheng Cai, Ryan Gleeson, and Joan Moore

Guests: Tony Gambill, Maggie Sloane, and Kirk Wehner

1. Welcome and introductions

- Commission Chair Frances Keene welcomed those in attendance.
- Members introduced themselves.
- Dr. Ray Ali, incoming Cooperative Extension Director of Field Operations, will join CAPFA as an *ex officio* member in October. He replaces Dr. Cathy Sutphin as the *ex officio* representative from Extension.

2. Re-cap of 2005-06 commission activities

- In October 2005, CAPFA conducted a survey of all A/P faculty with the intent of (1) capturing the mood of the A/P faculty and (2) forging a plan of work for 2006-07.
- In May 2006, commission members held a day-long retreat to thoroughly review the survey results. They identified issues of common concern among the four A/P faculty groups (i.e., academic support, extension, general administration, and student affairs), and proposed ways that CAPFA might address those concerns/issues.
- Commission members found these major themes to be of concern to many survey respondents:
 - compensation;
 - performance management system;
 - professional/career development;
 - work environment;
 - leadership.
- Commission members proposed the following action plan:
 - Create and disseminate the CAPFA survey report to members of the A/P community.
 - Visit with administrative leaders to review the report in advance of its release to the A/P community.
 - Increase CAPFA's visibility by establishing a CAPFA web site and sponsoring forums for A/P faculty.

- Address A/P faculty compensation and performance management concerns by:
 - gathering information about how salary decisions are made and sharing that information with the A/P faculty;
 - recommending that a study of A/P faculty compensation be conducted;
 - conducting private meetings with administrative leaders;
 - collecting information about best practices for standard performance evaluations and advocating the implementation of a standard performance evaluation for A/P faculty;
 - developing a Faculty Activity Report (FAR) for A/P faculty.
- Address A/P faculty professional/career development concerns by:
 - sponsoring leadership teams to create workshops and conferences for A/P faculty;
 - recommending that a professional development conversation be part of the performance management system;
 - recommending the establishment of guidelines for funding and offering opportunities for A/P faculty professional/career development.

3. Survey report update

- P. Hyer prepared a draft version of the survey report and invited comment. Commission members suggested various revisions to the document.
- P. Hyer will incorporate those changes and send a revised report to commission members for their further comment/revisions. All changes must be forwarded to Hyer no later than September 15. The final report will be distributed to commission members soon thereafter.
- The following teams will meet with administrative leaders (* = meeting coordinator):
 - Extension reporting team — R. Ali, L. Gorr, P. Hyer*, S. Puffenbarger, and C. Sutphin
 - Student Affairs reporting team — F. Keene*, P. Hyer, J. Moore, and K. Ayoub
 - General Administration reporting team — P. Hyer, F. Keene, and L. Woodard* (this team will meet separately with the Provost's Council and the Executive Vice President's staff).
- L. Gorr will contact Drs. Mark McCann and Mike Lambur to suggest the following presenters and topics for the VCE Staff Development Conference in January 2007:
 - F. Keene = CAPFA survey and report;
 - P. Hyer or M. McNamee = university strategic plan and update.

4. Suggested work item for 2006-07: performance management

- Discussion was delayed until the October 6 meeting.

5. Update on reconciliation/mediation services

- M. Sloane presented information regarding mediation services now available to the university community.
 - Mediation is a voluntary, confidential process that helps willing participants find solutions that are best for their situation.
 - Trained mediators do not have a stake or opinion in how the problem is solved; rather, they facilitate discussion between participants to identify solutions.

- No decision is made unless—and until—it is acceptable to all parties.
 - Mediation does not prevent the filing of a formal complaint or grievance.
- P. Hyer presented information regarding reconciliation services now available to all A/P faculty.
- CAPFA has a unique role in the university governance system. Unlike staff or teaching faculty, the A/P faculty do not have a senate; therefore, CAPFA plays a formal role in the A/P faculty grievance process. The CAPFA chair is responsible for coordinating the establishment of grievance panels, as needed.
 - Services of a reconciliation coordinator are now available to the A/P faculty. The university has bought out one-fourth of Dr. Ken Eriksson's time to serve as a faculty reconciliation coordinator.
 - As chair of the Faculty Senate Reconciliation Committee, Dr. Eriksson has substantial experience and success in reconciling differences that have reached an impasse.
 - If reconciliation is pursued, the grievance process is formally halted for 60 days while Dr. Eriksson meets separately with the parties to find a mutually-agreeable solution.
 - In the case of A/P faculty reconciliation, Dr. Eriksson chooses an A/P faculty member to join him in the meetings and in finding a solution.
 - Should reconciliation fail, the grievance process resumes.
6. The next CAPFA meeting will be held on October 6, 2006, 9:00 – 10:30 a.m. in the President's Board Room, 210 Burruss Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzie Karlin
Provost's Office
skarlin@vt.edu, 231-2350

MINUTES

Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs
October 6, 2006, 9:00 – 10:30 a.m., 325 Burruss Hall

Present: Ray Ali, Kevin Ayoub, Zheng Cai, Allen Campbell, Lou Gorr, Pat Hyer, Frances Keene, Kelly Oaks, Susan Puffenbarger, and Carl Stafford

Absent: Christi Boone, Ryan Gleeson, Charles Lytton, Joan Moore, Jerry Niles, Kerry Redican, and Linda Woodard

1. Survey report

- After some discussion, commission members agreed that the report in its current form appeared to be ready for use in meetings with senior administrators. Several minor comments will be incorporated in the final version.

2. Update on meetings with senior leadership

- Meetings with senior administrators are scheduled as indicated below. A copy of the CAPFA report will be shared with senior administrators prior to the meetings.
 - October 9 – L. Gorr, P. Hyer, S. Puffenbarger, and C. Sutphin meet with R. Ali, M. McCann, and S. Quisenberry
 - October 25 – P. Hyer and L. Woodard meet with members of J. Hyatt's executive staff
 - October 30 – K. Ayoub, F. Keene, L. A. Sheppard, and L. Woodard meet with C. Bonner and Z. Hikes
 - November 7 – P. Hyer, F. Keene, and L. Woodard meet with members of the Provost's Council
- Following the November 7 meeting, CAPFA chair F. Keene will share the report with all administrative and professional (A/P) faculty. Her e-mail message to the A/P faculty will include a link to the report, which will be posted on the CAPFA web page.

3. Performance management

- The CAPFA survey responses will guide the 2006-07 commission's plan of work. Survey responses revealed that major themes of concern to respondents were compensation, the performance management system, professional/career development, work environment, and leadership.
- F. Keene proposed that the commission's work for 2006-07 begin with the theme of performance management since it may cross over into issues of compensation as well as professional/career development. Commission members agreed and the following work plan was established:
 - Commission members will work in sub-groups to gather information, formalize their findings in writing, and present the information at the December 8 CAPFA meeting:
 - Academic Support – C. Boone, J. Moore, J. Niles, P. Hyer, and K. Redican
 - Extension – R. Ali, L. Gorr, C. Lytton, S. Puffenbarger, and C. Stafford
 - General Administration – A. Campbell, K. Oaks, and L. Woodard
 - Student Affairs – K. Ayoub and F. Keene
 - The sub-groups will gather information from a sampling of VPs, directors, mid-managers, and employees in their assigned areas:

- VP/Director questions:
 - How—and how often—are expectations set for your A/P faculty?
 - Are they evaluated over the course of a year, and if so, how?
 - Is the evaluation formal (written documentation) or informal (casual meeting)?
 - In practice, what is the evaluation process? What do you think it should be?
 - Is the evaluation process effective and fair?
 - What information do you request from your A/P faculty in advance of an evaluation?
 - How do your A/P faculty convey results?
 - How do you provide feedback to your A/P faculty?
 - Do you think this process motivates them to perform to the best of their abilities?
 - To what extent does the evaluation lead to increased compensation or professional development for your A/P faculty?

- Employee questions:
 - How—and how often—are expectations set for your position?
 - Are you evaluated over the course of a year, and if so, how?
 - Is your evaluation formal (written documentation) or informal (casual meeting)?
 - In practice, what is the evaluation process? What do you think it should be?
 - Is the evaluation process effective and fair?
 - What information do you submit to your supervisor in advance of an evaluation?
 - How do you convey results to your supervisor?
 - How is feedback conveyed to you?
 - Does this process motivate you to perform to the best of your ability?
 - To what extent does your evaluation lead to increased compensation or professional development?

- Mid-manager questions:
 - The mid-manager should be asked to respond to the questions from two different perspectives—that of being the evaluator and that of the person being evaluated.
 - See both sets of questions above.

- At the November 10th CAPFA meeting, sub-groups will report on their progress. The commission may discuss widening their study of performance management to a sampling of Virginia Tech peer institutions to help determine “best practices.” (A listing of peer institutions may be found at http://www.irpa.vt.edu/vt_peers.htm.)

- Tony Gambill, Director of Leadership and Employee Development, will be invited to join the December 8th CAPFA meeting. The commission will be discussing the establishment of workshops for managers and employees. The workshops will, ideally, be designed to reduce the gap between what is happening and what should be happening with regard to performance management.

4. The next CAPFA meeting will be held on November 10, 2006, 9:00 – 10:30 a.m. in the President’s Board Room, 210 Burruss Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzie Karlin
 Provost’s Office
skarlin@vt.edu, 231-2350

MINUTES

Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs
November 10, 2006, 9:00 – 10:30 a.m., 210 Burruss Hall

Present: Ray Ali, Christi Boone, Allen Campbell, Lou Gorr, Pat Hyer, Frances Keene, Joan Moore, Kelly Oaks, Susan Puffenbarger, Kerry Redican, and Carl Stafford

Absent: Kevin Ayoub, Zheng Cai, Ryan Gleeson, Charles Lytton, Jerry Niles, and Linda Woodard

1. Survey distribution

- The CAPFA survey report has been posted at www.provost.vt.edu/CAPFA/CAPFA.php.
- CAPFA Chair Frances Keene will send an e-mail to all A/P faculty to inform them that the CAPFA survey report is available.
- CAPFA Chair Frances Keene will send an e-mail to all A/P faculty each time that commission minutes have been posted on the CAPFA web site.

2. Meetings have occurred with the senior leadership in Academic Support, Extension, General Administration, and Student Affairs.

- Academic Support: P. Hyer, F. Keene, and L. Woodard met with members of the Provost's Council on November 7th.
 - Members of the Provost's Council suggested that the last section of the survey report should be revised from "Common Themes" to "Common Concerns." Commission members agreed.
- Extension: L. Gorr, P. Hyer, S. Puffenbarger, and C. Sutphin met with R. Ali, M. McCann, and S. Quisenberry on October 9th.
 - Meeting ended on a positive note.
 - At the statewide meeting of Extension faculty on January 17th, L. Gorr, P. Hyer, and F. Keene will participate in a panel discussion regarding the CAPFA survey report.
- General Administration: P. Hyer met with members of Executive Vice President James Hyatt's staff on October 25th.
- Student Affairs: K. Ayoub, F. Keene, and L. Woodard met with Vice President for Student Affairs Zenobia Hikes and Chief of Staff Cynthia Bonner on October 30th.
 - Survey was taken one month into Dr. Hikes' tenure as vice president. If a survey were taken today, results might be quite different.
 - Drs. Hikes and Bonner are already gathering information regarding the evaluation process used by the Student Affairs directors. The evaluation process is now being studied to improve and standardize.
 - Dr. Hikes offered to meet with CAPFA at any time.

3. Members of the Provost's Council suggested that strategic planning forums should be held for A/P faculty in Academic Support, Extension, General Administration, and Student Affairs. CAPFA will

support opportunities for discussion of key university initiatives, with a tie-in dialogue regarding the survey results.

- Extension – statewide meeting of all Extension agents will be held in January.
- Student Affairs – division directors will meet with Dr. Hikes and Provost McNamee – date to be determined.
- Academic Support and General Administration – CAPFA will organize a meeting, open to all A/P faculty (but particularly for the academic support and general administration A/P faculty) to present the foundational piece of the strategic plan and discuss the survey results on a date to be determined.

4. A/P faculty representatives to committees and commissions

- S. Karlin will send the CAPFA minutes to the A/P faculty representatives on university committees and commissions. The representatives will be invited to attend the January 19th meeting to provide updates regarding the activities of their committee or commission:
 - Academic Support Committee – Elaine Matuszek
 - Athletics Committee – Thomas Giffin
 - Building Committee – Elizabeth Reed
 - Employee Benefits Committee – Steve Kleiber
 - Intellectual Property Committee – Tom Caruso
 - Transportation and Parking Committee – Brad Martens
 - Commission on Classified Staff Affairs – Alicia Cohen
 - Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity – Patricia Smith
 - Commission on Faculty Affairs – Bill Sanders
 - Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies – Tim Mack
 - Commission on Research – Sherri Turner
 - Commission on Student Affairs – Gary Kinder
 - Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies – James Penven
 - Commission on University Support – Christine Kastan
 - University Council – Therese Lovegreen
 - University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning – Mary Ann Lewis

5. Performance management

- Commission members reviewed the performance management checklist provided by Frances Keene. They arrived at the following checklist, which will be used by the work groups¹ to obtain benchmarking information:
 1. Define your performance management process for your AP faculty and its purpose to your department/unit.
 2. How do you set expectations for your AP faculty employees? How often is this done?
 3. Do you request annual goals or a plan of work for the year from your AP faculty employees? When and in what format do you request it?
 4. Do you require an annual faculty accomplishments report? If so, is there a preferred format and/or specific instructions regarding the content of the report? (If so, ask for a copy.)

¹ Work groups are as follows: Academic Support (Boone, Moore, Niles, Hyer, Redican), Extension (Ali, Gorr, Lytton, Stafford), General Administration (Campbell, Oaks, Woodard), and Student Affairs (Ayoub, Keene).

5. How do you share your evaluations your AP faculty employees? Do you have formal meetings or informal meetings? Is any evaluative information/feedback provided in writing? If so, in what format and when?
 6. Provide a timeline or annual cycle for performance evaluation in your unit.
 7. Is there a connection between your formal evaluation process and rewards/recognition/compensation decisions?
 8. Does the performance management process differ for different levels of AP faculty in your organization?
 9. How could the process be improved?
- Update on plans to gather materials
 - C. Bonner is willing to share with F. Keene information gathered in the Student Affairs review of the performance evaluation process.
 - Extension has implemented the electronic Faculty Activity Report (FAR) system. A demonstration of the e-FARs system would be helpful.
6. Sexual harassment education
 - Maggie Sloan, Associate Director for Compliance and Conflict Resolution, offered to make a one-hour presentation to CAPFA regarding sexual harassment education. The group agreed that although the presentation is worthwhile, many commission members have already seen it at other venues. CAPFA declined the offer.
 7. Executive leadership and A/P faculty
 - Tony Gambill, Director of Leadership and Employee Development, will make a presentation to CAPFA at the December 8th meeting regarding the 360-evaluation program for administrative leaders.
 8. Sue Puffenbarger notified the commission that she is leaving the university.
 - Commission members thanked Sue for her valuable service.
 - Suzie Karlin will contact the Extension A/P faculty member (Michelle Adcock) who ran a close second to Sue in the May 2006 elections. Ms. Adcock will be invited to serve the remainder of S. Puffenbarger's 3-year term.
 9. The next CAPFA meeting will be held on December 8, 2006, 9:00 – 10:30 a.m. in the President's Board Room, 210 Burruss Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzie Karlin
 Provost's Office
skarlin@vt.edu, 231-2350

Minutes

Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs
December 8, 2006

Members present: Keene, Boone, Adcock, Gorr, Lytton, Campbell, Oaks, Niles, Hyer, and Woodard

Guest: Tony Gambill, Director, Leadership and Employee Development

Keene called the meeting to order with three agenda items:

- 1) Performance Management Project Update,
- 2) Diversity Accomplishments for A/P Faculty Evaluations, and
- 3) 360° Performance Evaluation Presentation.

Keene welcomed Michele Adcock, Extension Agent (Montgomery County), to the commission.

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROJECT UPDATE

Commission members were divided into four workgroups to collect data on AP Faculty Performance Evaluations. Woodard, Oaks, and Campbell presented their findings from the General Administrative units:

- The majority of the areas surveyed had some sort of process in place.
- The most common approach linked evaluations to the department's strategic operating plans.
- The general concept is that feedback occurs on a routine, day-to-day basis.
- The formats used are not consistent across the board.
- Assistance in improving the process is welcomed (best practices).
- A complex and forms driven process is not ideal.
- Directors are not in favor of a process similar to the one used for classified staff.
- Process heavily concentrated in July; not a good time; cycle should be earlier, maybe May-June instead of July-August; concerns with fiscal year closeout, BOV meetings.

Gorr concluded that evaluations are "spotty" in Extension and that there is a lack of uniformity. In Spring 2005, a document was circulated that listed guidelines for evaluating all faculty. There is uncertainty as to whether it is currently being utilized. According to Gorr, the document was management oriented, succinct, and relevant to all areas. However, regardless of whether the employee received an exceptional, acceptable, or not acceptable evaluation, everyone received a salary increase.

Boone reported that there is no separate, or formal evaluation process for A/P faculty in engineering; the process is the same as the instructional faculty. Directors meet annually to conduct face-to-face evaluations. The Dean is in favor of establishing a process. Employees are allowed to set their own goals and expectations; there is a verbal exchange with the supervisor; and the appraisal is somewhat tied to compensation.

Hyer is still in the process of connecting with the directors who report to the provost. She explained that Karen Sanders has established a thorough process that is linked to the strategic plan. An annual meeting, facilitated by the director, is held to negotiate goals and to discuss progress. Hyer expressed her concerns with the possibility of creating a standard form as it may not address every department's needs.

Niles alerted the commission to the difference between AP Faculty with tenure and those without – he has both reporting to the dean's office. He concurred that there should be an assessment system; but commented that the creation of a "one-size fits all" approach would not be conducive. He advised the

commission to offer a variety of options with fundamental operating principles or tools for directors to choose.

Seventy-five percent of the Student Affairs units employ an evaluation system that focuses on departmental/division initiatives and individual goals and achievement. Cynthia Bonner is working on formal process that links evaluations to merit increase. Keene reported that staff members are unclear as to how compensation information is being conveyed to assistant and associate vice presidents. Her findings also included:

- Almost every unit has a face-to-face meeting
- There is on-going feedback within the departments
- Lack of consistency across departments in terms of forms used
- Directors support a flexible framework; a timeline would be useful – there is a gap between pay raise letters and when evaluation occurs

Keene solicited suggestions on how to move forward with the data collected. Lytton cautioned the group not to generate more forms due to the complexity of departments. Niles encouraged the creation of a results-oriented process. This discussion led into Tony Gambill's presentation on the 360° Performance Evaluation.

PRESENTATION ON 360° PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Gambill described 360° Performance Evaluation as a simple, non bureaucratic process. It allows creativity, keeps track of progress, and focuses on the future. This tool measures *perceptions* of respondents; it also assesses impact and not the manager's intentions.

The 360° can be used for either developmental or performance-related purposes. This method is different from traditional evaluations where feedback is from a single source. 360° involves a team (four-way mirror): self, peers, direct reports, and managers. When using the evaluation for developmental purposes, the employee chooses her/his own respondents. The information collected is confidential and not shared with the supervisor, unless the participant chooses to do so. The participant's goals can be shared with the supervisor. The 360° results may also be used in the context of Annual Performance Evaluations or Mandatory Performance Improvement.

The use of peer review may be subjective, intimidating or viewed as a weapon, however, it allows managers to know the climate of the office.

Gambill shared information on the Direct Report Review which can be a less expensive, time-friendly, un-mandated evaluation method. Additionally, it does not require the use of an outside consultant. This process offers insight into how direct reports and peers view a manager. It provides an opportunity for direct reports to share their opinions. Employees currently complain that they never get a chance to evaluate their managers.

Woodard addressed concerns with confidentiality. Supervisors have a right to view all documents and employees may have concerns with the disclosure of information if they are asked to respond to a survey. She suggested that the group explore this issue further. Woodard also expressed concern about using such evaluations for performance reviews when we have not yet offered managers the opportunity to develop their leadership skills through appropriate training.

Keene asked commission members to forward all sample forms and information collected (mail code 0277) to her prior to the January 19th meeting. Keene will assign commission members a peer institution to contact for more information about their evaluation processes.

DIVERSITY ACCOMPLISHMENTS FOR A/P FACULTY EVALUATIONS

Hyer presented a document prepared by a subcommittee of the Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity. It provides a framework for reporting Diversity Accomplishments. The categories were

developed based on faculty reporting in promotion and tenure dossiers, where this requirement has been in place for two years, and from annual activity reports in the College of Agriculture, which is using an electronic reporting system.

Please forward feedback no later than early January.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

There is a vacancy for an A/P faculty representative on the Commission on Research. Recommendations are needed to fill this position.

Recorder: Tracey Cameron, Office of the Provost

MINUTES

Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs
January 19, 2007

Members Present: M. Adcock, K. Ayoub, C. Boone, A. Campbell, L. Gorr, P. Hyer, F. Keene, C. Lytton, K. Oaks, and L. Woodard

Members Absent: R. Ali, Z. Cai, R. Gleeson, J. Moore, K. Redican, and C. Stafford

Guests: T. Caruso, G. Kinder, S. Kleiber, T. Lovegreen, J. Penven, B. Sanders, and P. Smith (all A/P faculty representatives to university governance committees or commissions)

Keene called the meeting to order with two agenda items:

- 1) Updates from A/P Faculty Representatives to committees and commissions, and
- 2) Performance Evaluations.

Updates from A/P faculty representatives:

Employee Benefits Committee (Steve Kleiber, A/P faculty representative): Kleiber reported on the complexity of healthcare billing and that the Benefit Committee will invite the DHRM Ombudsman to a future meeting to discuss these concerns. The committee has also taken an interest in educating the growing population of aging faculty and staff. In addition to those four areas, the benefits committee will also focus on short-term disability for restricted employees and the restructuring and University Staff benefit issues.

Intellectual Property Committee (Tom Caruso, A/P faculty representative): This past year, members redefined the meaning of "intellectual property" and restructured how the committee handles different types of intellectual property. Caruso presented documents (www.research.vt.edu/formsandpolicies/VT%20Intellectual%20Property%20Final.pdf and www.policies.vt.edu/13000.html) that summarized the university's policies and practices. He highlighted two of the nine practices created by the committee.

- a) Faculty and staff must go through the processes of disclosure to ensure that outside consulting assignments are properly signed off. Without approval, the university assumes ownership of intellectual property.
- b) "Digital works" applies to electronic textbooks or digital text supplements and open source software not intended to generate royalties.

The committee is only convening in cases of disputes and issues involving the work of graduate students.

Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity (Patricia Smith, A/P faculty representative): The commission has identified five task forces: policies (categorization of diversity activities); strategic plan (update to current plan); multicultural education, events and programs (i.e. Diversity Summit), and campus climate (SafeWatch). Smith's report focused on the SafeWatch program, which is an online mechanism for community members to report incidences of harassment, discrimination, or intolerance. The program was launched last spring and the Commission will conduct an assessment of its use this year. Early estimates identify 40-50 reports so far. Depending on the nature of the allegations, an investigation will take place. The SafeWatch website is accessible at <http://www.safewatch.vt.edu/>.

Campus Climate Taskforce is working to evaluate the Diversity Strategic Plan, goal 2, specifically addressing university-wide reporting. We are examining Safe Watch, Campus Climate

Committee, Campus Climate Check Up, Race and the Institution, CEOD, and the University Life Roundtable. Goal 2 reads: "Develop and implement activities and programs that are designed to improve the university climate for students, faculty, and staff and that are aligned with one or more of the University Core Values."

Events and Programs Taskforce has been working on the Diversity Summit, which was held 1/19/07 from 2-5pm in the Owens Banquet Room.

Multicultural Education Taskforce has a two-part agenda including gathering information from faculty regarding academic offerings surrounding multiculturalism. The other component is focused on the diversity competency initiative, which is going before the Task Force on Race and the Institution.

Diversity Strategic Plan Taskforce is working to contribute to the new strategic plan revisions. In the spring semester there will be opportunities for dialogue with the full commission as well as the community.

Policies Taskforce has been working on the categorization of diversity activities for the Faculty Activity Report. It should be ready for distribution in the next month.

Commission on Faculty Affairs (Bill Sanders, A/P faculty representative): Issues of equity relative to the tenure and promotion process, along with faculty evaluations are the focal points for the Commission on Faculty Affairs. According to Bill Sanders, the Commission worked on the stop-the-clock policy, which allows pre-tenured faculty an opportunity to deal with life-changing events without being penalized. The commission has also worked on developing a modern Student Evaluation of Teaching system. Sanders noted that A/P faculty evaluation is parallel to that of academic faculty in that there is no consistent administration of the process across all departments. Caruso added that there also should be a focus on career development for A/P faculty to assist professionals with developing a career trajectory that assists with identifying long-term goals, as well as growth within the organization.

Commission on Student Affairs (Gary Kinder, A/P faculty representative): The Commission on Student Affairs has identified two major projects for the fall semester: a) Student Legal Services Survey and b) CSA Student Issues Survey. The results of the Student Legal Services Survey found that almost 1000 students sought legal advice or services during the 2005-2006 academic year. 121 of those students were surveyed regarding the quality of service received. Overall, the results were positive, however, the office will concentrate on building awareness of the services offered. An additional assessment instrument was distributed to all CSA organizations. Again, the findings concluded a lack of awareness of the services that the office provides. Students also identified other services that would be beneficial: legal counsel for court appearances, contracts, wills, and powers of attorney.

As a result of the CSA Student Issues Survey, the Commission will establish a subcommittee to drive the internal operations of the student budget board. Additionally, Gary Kinder reported that another subcommittee will be formed to examine the students' request to have more history, tradition, and culture incorporated into the First Year Experience.

The development of a "fair" process for space requests is also being investigated.

Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies (James Penven, A/P faculty representative): The academic calendar and honor system are two topics of discussion for the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies. The Commission is examining the implications of shifting fall breaks to two days instead of one. James Penven also spoke on the Commission establishing a subcommittee to look into educating students on the honor system that goes beyond orientation.

University Council (Therese Lovegreen, A/P faculty representative): Lovegreen directed attendees to the University Council website, www.governance.vt.edu and explained to the meeting schedules

and minutes can be obtained from that site. She also announced that if Commissions needed anything approved for the March Board of Visitors meeting, February 5th was the deadline.

Lovegreen also reported on the resolutions heard by the Council.

Several committee or commission A/P faculty representatives were unable to attend the January 19, 2007 meeting, but submitted the following written reports:

Academic Support Committee (Elaine Matuszek, A/P faculty representative): Matuszek reported that this committee has met twice during Fall 2006 semester. Primary task was to make recommendations for changes to the University Calendars, 2008-2013. Various points were discussed, including how changes to the calendar might impact Saturday exams, change to fall break, and disruption of lab sections. A motion was made and seconded to incorporate a version that has a two-day fall break on Thursday and Friday. These calendars will now be presented to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies.

Committee began a discussion on the University's Financial Aid/Scholarship Report summary data, to eventually determine the exact content of the report.

Future considerations for this committee may also include the availability of courses to ALL Students.

Commission on University Support (Christine Kastan, A/P faculty representative): Kastan reported that CUS is considering topics such as, a smoking policy regarding smoking away from buildings; parking garages (sufficient parking and locations continue to be an issue); standardization of publication boxes around campus; how and when fringe benefit rates are formulated, changed and communicated; need to reinstate the Committee on Computing and Communications Resources; formulate policy for use of golf carts on campus. Transportation and Parking items forwarded from that committee to CUS are: cost and ridership of the route to the CRC, and general parking and transportation issues.

Transportation and Parking Committee (Brad Martens, A/P faculty representative): Martens reported that during the fall semester, the committee focused on developing its Service Vehicle Enhancement Plan. This plan will help control service vehicle parking on campus by identifying acceptable areas for serve vehicles to park and unacceptable areas such as those areas that block handicap access, are under trees, etc.

Vendor, business, contractor vehicles will be ticketed when found parking in unacceptable areas. State-owned service vehicles will not be ticketed because state funds cannot be used for paying parking tickets and fines. Instead, an email will be sent to the department of the offending vehicle.

The Service Vehicle Enhancement Plan also addresses the overnight parking of state-owned service vehicles. Any of these vehicles parked for extended periods of time in F/S or C/G/R parking lots will be required to relocate to a more remote lot (currently the Duck Pond lot). If this causes an undue hardship, a department can apply to Parking Services for an exception.

The committee has started discussing a policy concerning bicycle regulations on campus. The committee would like to have this policy in place by the end of Spring Semester 2007. This timeframe will allow it to be included in the orientation packets given to in-coming freshmen. The current concept is concrete for pedestrians and asphalt for bicycles. However, since there is no state law governing bicycles, the campus police cannot issue tickets for riding bicycles on sidewalks. Please note that there were no reports of bicycle/pedestrian accidents during Fall Semester 2006.

Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies (Tim Mack, A/P faculty representative): Dr. Mack will attend the February 2, 2007 CAPFA meeting to report on the activities of the CGSP.

Performance Evaluation:

Keene distributed the information that Commission members collected via interoffice mail. Those findings will be discussed at the February 2nd meeting. Members are asked to report on information collected from SCHEV peers. Keene challenged commission members to think about how this data can be used (what is the end result?).

Recorder: Tracey Cameron, Office of the Provost

MINUTES

Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs
February 2, 2007

Members Present: M. Adcock, C. Boone, A. Campbell, P. Hyer, F. Keene, J. Niles, and L. Woodard

Members Absent: R. Ali, K. Ayoub, Z. Cai, R. Gleeson, L. Gorr, C. Lytton, J. Moore, K. Oaks, K. Redican, and C. Stafford

Guests: T. Mack, Associate Dean for Information Technology and Distance Education, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, and A/P faculty rep to the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies
R. Plaza, Project Specialist for Diversity Initiatives, Office of Multicultural Affairs

Keene called the meeting to order with five agenda items: 1) Report on CGSP Activities, 2) Presentation on the Electronic Faculty Activities Report, 3) Role of the Faculty Senate Ethics Committee, 4) Employee Advisory Committee regarding Restructuring and 5) Discussion of Performance Evaluation Information.

Faculty Senate Ethics Committee

Ray Plaza discussed recent conversations of the Commission on Equal Opportunity Diversity (CEOD) that focus on how staff-related violations of the Principles of Community (POC) would be facilitated. The Faculty Ethics Committee is responsible for addressing incidents relative to academic faculty. However, a system is not in place for administrative/professional faculty. CEOD suggested the reinforcement of an existing structure for ALL faculty. Woodard explained that several offices (Human Resources, Equal Opportunity) have convened to develop strategies on how the Principles of Community intersect with the entire community. The Principles of Community are not policy. They were not approved by the Board of Visitors. The group suggests developing a matrix that incorporates current policies and supports the Principles of Community. Hyer recommended that instead of drafting a resolution, a publication could be created. According to Keene, the Principles of Community are our value statements and the matrix would relate the standards back to our policies.

A website that answered "frequently asked questions" was also proposed. Niles maintained that contextual information is needed due to a lack of clarity in the Faculty Handbook. He suggested that the website should identify the population covered by the policy and the office responsible for dealing with the violation. The following individuals will assist with data collection: Debbie Morgan (Human Resources), Ellen Plummer (student, abusive conduct), and Pat Hyer (faculty).

Timeline:

- To demonstrate a commitment to our community standards, the matrix project will be unveiled during the second anniversary of the Principles of Community (March 14th).
- A press release, with statements from the president and provost) will go on the website.
- Letters announcing the project will be sent to faculty.
- Formal publication developed over spring and summer; available by fall.

CGSP Activities

Tim Mack reported on two activities that the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies has worked on this year: 1) residency requirements for Ph.D. students and 2) admissions categories for graduate students. In order to accommodate students who have been out of school for awhile, but may have sufficient work experience, the GPA for "provisional" status admittance is being changed. Students with a "2.99 GPA or below" will now be admitted on a provisional basis. At the completion of the first semester, a 3.0 GPA is necessary for continued enrollment. Additionally, "conditional" status has been

added for students who meet the GPA requirement but not have enough courses for regular acceptance (i.e., engineering).

The commission is also looking into how the Bologna Declaration (agreement between 29 European countries) will affect enrollment. In 2010, the university will begin to accept these students who hold three year bachelor's degree.

Concerns regarding admissions for current employees were discussed. Woodard explained that if supervisors are expected to sign-off on plans of study, staff may be reluctant to apply for admissions. Woodard maintained that supervisors should not be gatekeepers. They should assist with educating the employee on the time commitment and expectations. The commission will look into this matter.

Electronic Faculty Activities Report

Tim Mack conducted a virtual tour of the Electronic Faculty Activities Report. According to Mack, the EFARS system was developed about two years ago and is currently being used by the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

Mack reported the following:

- The projected consisted of a two year timeline that included weekly meetings. Costs associated were in personnel; the database is in Oracle – no issue with storage.
- Faculty members are required to use this system; failure to do so could jeopardize salary increases.
- The report is consistent with what the university already requests regarding grants and student evaluations.
- It allows administrators to track progress and summarize the activities of faculty throughout the department. An automated summary report can also be downloaded into a word document.
- The College of Agriculture and Life Sciences requires faculty to include an annual report and impact statement; resume is optional.
- The system features a secure login and a user friendly "help" function. 82% of faculty and administrators reported use without problems, and 52% didn't think that they needed to use the help desk.
- The system has a function that allows supervisors to document meetings and perform evaluations. Upon completion, an email is sent where the faculty member is to acknowledge receipt of the evaluation.
- Faculty report that the system is time consuming. Adcock agreed and expressed confusion with the specifics of where to enter data. However, she adds that the advantage of the system is that you can keep up with your progress and enter information on a monthly basis and the system is accessible at work and home.

Employee Advisory Committee regarding Restructuring

As a result of the Higher Education Restructuring Act, Virginia Tech, UVA, and William and Mary will no longer hire employees as "classified staff." The new status, "university staff," governed by the Board of Visitors, will apply to all new employees and current classified staff will have the opportunity to convert. Woodard reported that during the months of November, December, January, and February, focus groups were/will be conducted with 300 randomly selected supervisors to generate input on a survey to be distributed this spring. Off campus focus groups are also scheduled for Salisbury and Suffolk.

The Employee Advisory Committee (EAC) will be formed to analyze the results of the survey and to discuss other issues that affect staff. The EAC will consist of about 20 classified and university staff members. The chair of the Commission on A/P Faculty Affairs will sit on the EAC and any other staff who is knowledgeable or interested in staff concerns (staff can self-nominate).

The 1st meeting will occur in March. Three to five design teams will be developed to serve as work groups for a topical area. These groups will research best practices and make recommendations.

Performance Evaluation Information

The last agenda item (Discussion of Performance Evaluation Information) was tabled until the next meeting. Keene asked that committee members digest the e-FARS information and make recommendations for how that system can be used for A/P Faculty.

Recorder: Tracey Cameron, Office of the Provost

MINUTES

Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs
March 2, 2007

Members Present: M. Adcock, R. Ali, C. Boone, A. Campbell, L. Gorr, F. Keene, and J. Moore

Members Absent: K. Ayoub, Z. Cai, R. Gleeson, P. Hyer, C. Lytton, J. Niles, K. Oaks, K. Redican, C. Stafford, and L. Woodard

Guest: Christina Brogdon, Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Coordinator and co-chair of the Faculty/Staff subcommittee of the Race and the Institution Task Force

Keene called the meeting to order with three agenda items: 1) Race Task Force Progress Report, 2) Elections, and 3) Performance Evaluation.

Race Task Force Progress Report

Christina Brogdon discussed the progress report and preliminary recommendations of the Faculty/Staff subcommittee. (Please see http://www.provost.vt.edu/documents/ritf_progress_rpt.pdf.) The subcommittee is identifying best practices, as well as ways in which departments might collaborate campus wide to establish consistent and sustained efforts in recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty and staff. The task force is also examining the accountability and sustainability of university recruitment, retention, and enrichment policies and programs.

Elections

The following commission members volunteered to serve on the CAPFA nominations subcommittee: R. Ali, C. Boone, and F. Keene.

F. Keene will send an e-mail to all A/P faculty welcoming indications of interest from those who would like to be nominated and who are willing to serve, if elected, on the following committees or commissions:

- Academic Support Committee: one A/P representative from the academic support area, student affairs area, or general administration area.
- Building Committee: one A/P representative from the academic support area, student affairs area, or general administration area.
- Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs: two A/P representatives from the academic support area and one A/P representative from the general administration area.
- Commission on Faculty Affairs: one A/P representative from any area.
- Commission on Outreach and International Affairs: one A/P representative from Extension.
- Commission on Research: one A/P representative from any area.
- Intellectual Property Committee: one representative from any area, but must have patent and copyright experience. This representative is not elected; rather, the CAPFA chair will nominate two people from which the President selects one to serve.
- University Council: one A/P representative from Extension; one A/P representative from academic support, general administration, or student affairs.

The CAPFA nominations subcommittee will review the list of nominees and will prepare a ballot for A/P faculty voting. Lou Ann Phipps in Human Resources will manage the electronic voting process.

Performance Evaluation

There was not sufficient time for performance evaluation discussion.

Commission members agreed that their April 6th meeting will focus on the content of performance evaluations. Discussion will be informed by the peer institution and university evaluation materials gathered during the past few months.

The May 4th meeting will focus on the type of performance evaluation process the commission will recommend (e-FARs, paper only, etc.).

Commission members may expand their discussions into a half-day retreat. The possibility of such a retreat will be discussed at the April 6th meeting.

Next Meeting

The next CAPFA meeting will be held on April 6, 9:00-10:30 a.m. in the Solitude Room, Skelton Conference Center, The Inn at Virginia Tech.

Recorder: Suzie Karlin, Provost's Office

MINUTES

Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs
April 6, 2007

Members Present: R. Ali, A. Campbell, L. Gorr, P. Hyer, F. Keene, K. Oaks, and K. Redican

Members Absent: M. Adcock, K. Ayoub, C. Boone, Z. Cai, R. Gleeson, C. Lytton, J. Moore, J. Niles, C. Stafford, and L. Woodard

Keene called the meeting to order with three agenda items: 1) Communicating with A/P Faculty, 2) Elections, and 3) A/P Faculty Performance Evaluations.

Communicating with A/P Faculty

- There are several university issues that may be of particular interest to the A/P faculty. In what way can the commission facilitate communication with A/P faculty on issues such as the diversity strategic plan, the university strategic plan, the task force on race and the institution, or the upcoming SACS re-accreditation?
 - Smaller meetings by group (academic support, Extension, general administration, Student Affairs) are preferred over a general town hall meeting of all A/P faculty.
 - A quarterly newsletter in pdf-format could keep A/P faculty informed of CAPFA activities and university issues.
 - The first of these newsletters will be developed over the summer.

Elections

- The Nominations Subcommittee is still taking nominations for various openings on the committees and commissions. Please forward the names of suggested nominees to F. Keene.
- In particular, there is a need for Extension nominees. F. Keene will contact Mike Roberts, VESA president to solicit further Extension nominations.
- The ballot will be finalized next week and distributed to the A/P faculty.
- The list of elected representatives will be forwarded to the President's Office by the end of April.

A/P Faculty Performance Evaluations

- The commission members began their discussion of the A/P faculty performance evaluations by reading Section 3.8 of the *Faculty Handbook*, which states:

The supervisor is responsible for maintaining an up-to-date job description for each administrative and professional faculty member in the unit and for determining acceptable standards of performance. Goals and objectives shall be developed annually in consultation with the faculty member. These should relate closely to the functional title and job description of the position and should become criteria for judging professional performance in the subsequent year. All A/P faculty members should complete an annual faculty report at a time determined by the appropriate administrator, but usually near the end of the academic year, referencing their goals and objectives and citing their successes, shortfalls, and future directions. Additional

items to be mentioned are service to the university, creative scholarship, and other professional activities and recognitions during the year. The performance of each administrative and professional faculty member shall be evaluated annually in a discussion with the supervisor and by written response, which may be in conjunction with the annual reappointment letter. The annual faculty report and evaluation become part of the basis for salary adjustments and other personnel matters.

- Unless there is an administrative directive, CAPFA has no authority to request that departments or divisions modify their current evaluation procedures beyond what is currently found in the *Faculty Handbook*.
- There is a CFA-sponsored resolution currently before University Council that calls for mandatory written annual evaluations that must be acknowledged, in writing, by the faculty member.
- Extensive discussion of possible evaluation criteria, models, and methods followed.
- Commission members arrived at the following two-part approach:
 - Submit a letter to the president and provost, requesting administrative, technical, and financial support for an evaluation tool to be piloted by interested department(s) or division(s). This pilot program will require discussions with focus groups; technical support in creating an electronic evaluation document; and personnel dedicated to carrying the pilot project through to a conclusion. F. Keene will draft a letter to the president and provost, and will distribute the draft for commission members' comments.
 - The commission will look again at the e-FARs model. Can it be used/adapted for all A/P faculty evaluations? F. Keene will obtain the e-FARs material from T. Mack. It will be shared in pdf-format with commission members before the next meeting.

Next Meeting

The next CAPFA meeting will be held on May 4, 9:00-10:30 a.m. at the Skelton Conference Center, The Inn at Virginia Tech.

Recorder: Suzie Karlin, Provost's Office