Minutes
University Council Meeting
September 17, 1990

Dr. McComas called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Present:J. McComas, C. Forbes, M. Ridenour, R. Smoot, E.F. Carlisle, J. Hillison, T. Goodale, C. Steger, P. Gherman, L. Harris, R. Heterick, Jim Johnson (for J. Nichols), Helen Crawford (for H. Doswald), R. Sorensen, Dianne Robershaw (for J. Buffer). G.W. Clough, S.J. Ritchey, P. Eyre, L. Moore, C. Parry, A.J. Davis, L. Rees, R. Small, C. Carrig, F. Thye, R.A. Heller, L. Geyer, D. Kingston, J. Crittenden, L. Eng (for N. Marriott), S. Batie, A. Snoke, Phyllis Volhein (for J. Riddle), Tony Townsend (for D. Adams), C. Vargo, J. Budd, G. LoCascio, P. Radcliffe, M. Byrne, P. Larkin

Guests: Bill Burleson, Spectrum; Cornel N. Morton, Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Office

Absent: G. Hooper, N. Eiss

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Dr. McComas opened the first University Council meeting of the 1990-91 academic year by welcoming new and returning members.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda as distributed. The motion PASSED.

3. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF MAY 3, 1990

The University Council minutes of the meeting of May 3, 1990 were approved as distributed.

4. IN SUCCESSIVE MOTIONS, COUNCIL APPROVED THE MINUTES OF THE FOLLOWING MEETINGS.

a. Commission on Faculty Affairs, April 20, 1990.

Dr. Hillison called attention to item IV of the minutes of April 20 on the effect of the elimination of mandatory faculty retirement. As a matter of information, Mr. Ridenour reported that the Virginia State Department of Personnel and Training and the Office of the Attorney General are still pursuing the possibility of an early retirement program. Dr. McComas added that state approval would be required to implement such a program and that we expect further information later in the year.

5. FOR INFORMATION

a. Minutes of the University Committee on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action, April 24, 1990.

Dr. Morton stated that the Committee was currently in the process of

revising the university's sexual harassment policy to be more inclusive

of "hostile environment" considerations, as well as complaints involving consensual relationships.

b. Minutes of the University Communications Resources Committee, March 28 and April 25, 1990.

6. PROGRESS REPORT FROM THE TASK FORCE ON UNIVERSITY COUNCIL, UNIVERSITY COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

Dr. Moore, Chair of the Task Force, reminded Council that the Faculty Senate had developed a Senate Task Force report concerning the University Council constitution. A committee comprised of the members of the Faculty Senate and the Task Force was been formed to generate a revised proposal concerning commissions, committees and the structure of University Council. That document is expected by January, 1991.

7. QUESTION/ANSWER FORUM

Dr. Crittenden, referencing the action of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies in approving the Black Studies concentration last spring, again expressed his concern that standard governance procedures had been violated. Stating that he was speaking for several colleagues, Dr. Crittenden maintained that the Black Studies concentration had bypassed routine review within the governance system. Dr. Carlisle responded by reviewing the approval process. A committee, chaired by Michael Ogliaruso, was formed to develop a proposal by the end of the spring semester so that courses could begin during the fall, 1990 semester. The committee, comprised of both faculty and administrative representatives, completed its work "very late" in the spring semester. The resulting proposal was then put before the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and approved. He concluded that the process had been accomplished "reasonably and responsibly" and that governance procedures had been respected and observed as they will be in the future. Dr. Crittenden maintained that governance procedures had not been observed and expressed concern about other constituencies using the example of the Black Studies program as a means of pushing through future courses or programs. Dr. Carlisle reiterated his belief that on occasion there may be reasonable and responsible exceptions to standard procedures, but that established governance procedures have been and will continue to be respected.

Dr. McComas initiated discussion about budgetary concerns with an announcement that a presentation on the current budget will be given at the upcoming faculty meeting, and at a second meeting scheduled for classified personnel. Briefly, Dr. McComas reported that our current staffing reductions are exacerbated by our having absorbed 2,000 students in the past without the addition of the faculty and staff called for by state guidelines. Dr. McComas expressed his gratitude to university personnel for their supportive and sensitive response to a difficult situation. Dr. McComas cautioned, however, against ascribing all difficulties to budget cutbacks, something that would create needless negative publicity. He added that other Virginia institutions are not dwelling openly on the impact of budget reductions. Thus, if Virginia Tech is perceived to be the only university doing so, prospective students may be discouraged from seeking admission here. Dr. McComas stressed the importance of maintaining enrollment momentum, especially during the coming 4-5 years of anticipated decrease in high school graduates.

Mr. Ridenour then reported on the outcome of recent meetings in Richmond. Governor Wilder did approve a plan recommended by the Secretary of Education to address the general fund reductions. He explained that of Tech's overall annual budget of nearly $400 million, about $195 million is provided through tax-payer dollars. This is the category in which the reductions will occur, estimated at a total of $22.8 million this year.

The Governor approved a surcharge for all students amounting to a total of approximately $3.5 million, but this will need to be approved by the Board

of Visitors before it can be implemented. Thus, the overall reductions for 1990-91 are calculated at about $20 million.

Dr. McComas asked Mr. Ridenour to address the notion that Virginia Tech has been harder hit than other state institutions. In response, Mr. Ridenour described the unique tripartite mission of this university, and the separate funding we receive from the state for instruction, extension and research. He reported that while all state-supported universities seem to have been hit equally in instructional fund reductions, Virginia Tech's other two components (research and extension) have suffered reductions which cannot be augmented from generated income. Mr. Ridenour added that funds cannot be transferred within the three divisions without legislative approval. Thus, greater layoffs are anticipated within extension and research. Mr. Ridenour also stated that every position would be protected as much as possible, and spoke of the transfer process that would be used when layoffs are necessary.

Dr. McComas asked Dr. Johnson to comment on the complexity of extension layoffs, noting that many employees receive only part of their salaries from the state and university. Dr. Johnson noted that while most extension agents receive salaries ranging from $24-35,000, the net savings to the university from a single extension layoff amounts to only $5,808 because of the other sources of funds. Therefore, a significant number of layoffs will be required to generate extension's share of the reductions. In response to a question, Mr. Ridenour clarified that although dollars cannot be circulated among three division, the layoff policy allows employees to transfer from one division to another.

Mr. Townsend expressed concern about the possible loss of graduate student assistantships and inquired about how those funds could be protected. He strongly advocated that present graduate students be supported with those funds -- thus enabling them to finish their degrees -- before new students are supported. Dr. Clough indicated that Engineering is losing several assistantships, but is attempting to make up those losses through other means. He expressed that he was not optimistic about the ability to do that again next year. Dr. McComas added that he believed most departments would value and support the work of current graduate students before supporting new students.

Dr. Kingston inquired about the public relations aspect of these budget reductions. He asked Dr. McComas to clarify whether Virginia Tech was operating under a "gag order." Dr. McComas clarified that confidentiality had been requested on two specific occasions: 1) immediately following the Governor's televised address on the budget and 2) the specifics of our budget reduction plan while it was under review. These events are long past. Dr. Kingston asked if it would be helpful for the Faculty Senate to speak publicly about the potential harm of the budget cuts? Dr. McComas responded that while it was not inappropriate to do so, it might be more helpful for members of the faculty to share their concerns with local legislators. Dr. Kingston also inquired whether the administration had considered reducing student enrollments? Dr. McComas indicated that such a plan would be seriously considered unless revenue was provided to support the estimated 2,000 students now enrolled but "unsupported" by adequate faculty and staff. He also noted that state approval would be required to reduce enrollments.

Dr. McComas responded to a question about the legality of rescinding faculty salary increases by informing Council that an Executive Order from the Governor is anticipated that will provide the authorization for the 2% salary reductions, effective December, 1990. Dr. Carlisle noted that while a few institutions have already given the full designated raise, Virginia Tech has implemented a staged approach. Thus, those universities that have

already awarded the full percentage increase may have to recover it from faculty.

Mr. Townsend asked why the graduate community would be paying a higher surcharge than undergraduates? Mr. Ridenour cited stated policies that require the difference and offered to provide a statement explaining the surcharge in detail. Mr. Tonwsend also asked if graduate student delegates could attend the fall faculty meeting. Dr. McComas responded that one or two representatives would certainly be welcome. Mr. Budd then inquired if a similar meeting could be scheduled for undergraduates as well. Dr. McComas indicated that he would schedule a joint meeting for graduate and undergraduate students interested in these budget considerations.

Dr. McComas closed the meeting by stressing the importance of working to maintain quality instruction and service as much as possible.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
October 1, 1990

Dr. McComas called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Present:J. McComas, R. Smoot, J. Wolfe (for E.F. Carlisle), J. Hillison, T. Goodale, C. Steger, P. Gherman, L. Harris, G. Hooper, J. Nichols, H. Doswald, R. Sorensen, D. Robertshaw (for J. Buffer), J. Osborne (for G.W. Clough), S.J. Ritchey, P. Eyre, L. Moore, D. Hewitt, A.J. Davis, L. Rees, R. Small, C. Carrig, F. Thye, R.A. Heller, L. Geyer, N. Eiss, D. Kingston, J. Crittenden, L.A. Eng (for N. Marriott), P.F. Scanlon (for S. Batie), A. Snoke, R. Chuises (for J. Riddle), A. Townsend (for D. Adams), C. Vargo, G. LoCascio, P. Radcliffe, M. Byrne, P. Larkin

Guests: David Lush, SGA; David Bousquet, Admissions Office; Bill Burleson, Spectrum

Absent: M. Ridenour, C. Forbes, R. Heterick, J. Budd

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda as distributed. The motion PASSED.

2. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 17, 1990

The University Council minutes of the meeting of September 17, 1990 were approved as distributed.

3. IN SUCCESSIVE MOTIONS, COUNCIL APPROVED THE MINUTES OF THE FOLLOWING MEETINGS.

a. Commission on Graduate Studies, April 18, 1990.

Dr. McComas noted that the CGS Resolution attached to these minutes (concerning the reinstatement of the "D" grades for graduate credit) is excepted from approval. Dr. Hooper added that this resolution will be submitted to Council as new business at the next meeting.

b.Commission on Research, April 11, 1990.

Dr. Kingston inquired about the status of the Misconduct in Science statement. Dr. Hooper responded that the NIH has indicated that they have not accepted Virginia Tech's proposed guidelines. Dr. Stout, representing the Commission on Research, is working with the NIH to develop an acceptable set of standards.

c. Commission on Undergraduate Studies, February 26, March 26, April 9, April 23 and May 2, 1990.

Dr. Kingston requested that in the future Council receive Commission minutes on a more timely basis. Dr. Wolfe noted that the departure of Dennis Hinkle as CUS secretary resulted in some loss of continuity that explained so many sets of minutes at one time.

4. For Information

a. Minutes of the University Committee on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action, May 29, 1990.

b. Minutes of the Computer Committee, April 4, 1990.

c. Commission on Research, Annual Report, 1989-90.

Dr. Kingston noted that this report does not include a discussion of the overhead rate for off-campus facilities and inquired about the status of this issue. Dr. Hooper responded that this topic has been discussed in preliminary form and will be an item for further discussion within both the Commission on Graduate Studies and the Commission on Research. Dr. Hooper elaborated that several faculty members at off-campus centers such as Telestar feel that the general overhead rate policy and the way those funds are distributed within the wider university needs an adjustment so that more funds flow to where the work is being done. Dr. Kingston indicated he was also concerned about the overhead rate for research facilities in Blacksburg that are not located on campus. Dr. Hooper responded by saying this matter is also under discussion.

d. University Computer Committee, 1989-90 Annual Report.

5. REPORT OF ADMISSIONS PRACTICES

David Bousquet, Director of Admissions, reported that the eight members of Virginia Tech's admissions review staff examined 17,600 applications for fall, 1990, admissions. Of that number, 29 were later brought before the Admissions Advisory Committee for additional consideration. This committee consists of three professors, the director of Admissions, and a member of the department bringing forth the appeal. The students brought before the committee are young men and women who might bring to the university extraordinary talents in the fields not adequately assessed in the normal admissions evaluation, such as arts or athletics. Of the 29 cases reviewed last year (19 in athletics; 10 in the arts), 19 were offered admission (11 in athletics; 8 in the arts). Mr. Bousquet explained that when the Admissions Advisory Committee reviews an application, they may vote to 1) extend an offer of admission, 2) uphold the denial, or 3) extend an offer of admission with conditions (7 of the 19 offered admission fell into the latter category).

Dr. Hillison inquired if these students generally had lower academic credentials? Mr. Bousquet replied that while they did possess somewhat lower credentials than students who are typically offered admission, they generally presented sufficient academic qualifications to be successful at Tech and could be expected to bring to this institution and the community exceptional talents in music, theatre arts, art, or athletics.

Dr. Kingston asked if records were kept on the performance of these special admission students. Mr. Bousquet replied that this information is incomplete because the first class has not graduated, but that this information would be available in two years and would encompass a five year period.

Dr. Crittenden asked the identity of the three faculty members currently serving on the committee and how were they selected? Mr. Bousquet replied that the three individuals (Charlie Yates, Department of Aerospace and Ocean Engineering; Mary Ann Lewis, College of Education; and Derek Myers, Art and Art History) were appointed by the Provost. Dr. Crittenden inquired about the equity of the system, in that many students are denied admissions who never have an opportunity to appeal. Mr. Bousquet responded that students who do benefit from this system can be expected to make an additional contribution to the university. He gave the example of a music student who might increase the classroom performance of their classmates. Mr. Bousquet stressed that the students who are admitted under

these conditions DO have the ability to be successful in the classroom, quite apart from whatever exceptional talents they also bring to the university. Dr. Crittenden noted that he had never seen any written statement of these special admissions practices, and added his belief that they should be included on admissions forms. Mr. Bousquet responded that it is described in the catalog, although not in any great detail. He added that every year several hundred students ask to have their application reconsidered, and, depending on the space available and the strength of their credentials, those students may also be granted admissions. Dr. Crittenden asked if a more comprehensive explanation of Tech's special admissions practices could be included in future catalogs. Mr. Bousquet indicated that it could and thought it would be a matter to bring before the Provost. Dr. Wolfe asked that Dr. Crittenden contact him directly about this matter.

Dr. Scanlon questioned the wisdom of having the fifth member of the special admissions committee be a member of the department bringing the appeal. Mr. Bousquet responded that when former Provost David Roselle formed the committee (with the approval of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies) it was thought that the department involved should have both a voice and a vote. He noted however, that the department bringing the appeal still has to convince a majority of the remaining committee members to agree with the appeal. Dr. Scanlon also noted the inappropriateness of the department representative being from the athletic department in the case of athletic appeals, as athletics is not an academic department. Dr. McComas agreed that this is a legitimate concern.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. McComas described the recent EXPO recruitment trips to Northern Virginia, Richmond, and Virginia Beach and expressed his appreciation to the faculty, staff and students who participated in the activities. He emphasized the need to maintain the quality of Tech's undergraduates through concerted recruitment efforts -- especially given the declining pool of high school graduates and the keen competition among colleges for new students. Dr. McComas added that Virginia Tech is one of the few Virginia institutions that has experienced an increase in applications.

Dr. McComas expressed regret and concern about the estimated 77 layoffs necessitated by the budget cutbacks. He informed Council that the university was attempting to personalize the process by informing employees in person as well as by letter. Across the colleges and departments, there will be 18 layoffs of classified personnel in Cooperative Extension, 32 in Agriculture and Life Sciences, 3 in Architecture and Urban Studies, 6 in the College of Veterinary Medicine, 17 in Physical Plant, and 1 in University Relations. He noted again the difficulty of maintaining the quality of services offered at this institution with fewer faculty and staff. Dr. McComas said that he would be meeting with students on Tuesday, and with classified staff on Wednesday to describe the current budget situation. He also informed Council that a special meeting of the Board of Visitors had been called to address these issues. Dr. McComas then informed Council that approximately 90 fewer Ph.D. students had enrolled because lack of support funds (48 of whom represent lost assistantships; the others being new students who could not be offered financial support). He stressed the seriousness of this trend, given that it could affect this institution's ability to carry out research. In response to a question from Dr. Geyer, Dr. McComas stated his intention to assemble and distribute a summary of the faculty and staff positions frozen or eliminated through layoffs.

Dr. Eiss requested that continued dialogue be maintained among faculty and administrators concerning the planning process and the reallocation of resources. Dr. McComas concurred. Dr. Crittenden then inquired whether the Hotel Roanoke could still be returned to Norfolk Southern Railroad if a developer cannot be found to underwrite the costs of renovation. Dr. McComas described the several options open to the university should that happen including 1) returning it to the Norfolk Southern Corporation, or 2)

opening and operating it with minor alterations.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
November 6, 1990

Dr. Carlisle called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Present:E.F. Carlisle, L. Eng (for J. Hillison), T. Goodale, C. Steger, P. Gherman, L. Harris, G. Hooper, R. Heterick, A. Swiger (for J. Nichols), H. Doswald, R. Sorensen, J. Buffer, P. Kurstedt (for W.G. Clough), S.J. Ritchey, P. Eyre, D. Hewitt, L. Rees, C. Brown (for R. Small), J. Johnson (for F. Thye), R. Heller, L. Geyer, N. Eiss, D. Kingston, J. Crittenden, N. Marriott, S. Batie, A. Snoke, J. Riddle, D. Adams, C. Vargo, J. Budd, P. Radcliffe, P. Larkin

Guests: Mike Ogliaruso, College of Arts and Sciences; Bill Burleson, Spectrum; Cornel Morton, Office of EO/AA

Absent: J. McComas, C. Forbes, M. Ridenour. R. Smoot, L. Moore, A.J. Davis, C. Carrig, G. LoCascio, M. Byrne

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda as distributed. The motion PASSED.

2. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF OCTOBER 1, 1990

The University Council minutes of the meeting of October 1, 1990 were approved as distributed.

3. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON GRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1990-91 A, CONCERNING REINSTATEMENT OF THE "D" GRADES FOR GRADUATE CREDIT.

Dr. Hooper explained that this resolution would reinstate the "D+," "D," and "D-" grades in the graduate grading system in order to provide greater congruity between the undergraduate and graduate grading scales. In so doing, he added, Virginia Tech would conform to most of Tech's peer institutions, which already permit the use of these grades. Dr. Snoke noted that the resolution was unanimously approved by the Commission on Graduate Studies last year, and was one vote short of receiving unanimous approval from the Faculty Senate. Dr. Heller, speaking on behalf of the College of Engineering, noted that he and many of his colleagues oppose the policy, preferring to maintain the grading standards currently in place. Lud Eng then asked if a graduate committee could require a student to repeat a class if he or she received a D grade. Dr. Hooper responded that while the resolution does not speak to that particular issue, a graduate committee is empowered to direct a student as it deems appropriate, including requiring that individual to retake a course. The resolution was carried forward for second reading.

4. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1990-91 A, CONCERNING RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT.

Dr. Ogliaruso described the current policy that allows only 10 of a student's last 30 hours to be transferred from another institution. He noted some of the problems associated with this practice. First, a student

would not be considered full-time carrying just 10 hours. Second, in most cases, 10 credits do not correspond to a set number of courses. Third, the current policy only allows those credits to be elective credits, thus prohibiting a student from transferring required coursework. The proposed resolution allows undergraduates to transfer a maximum of 18 of their last 45 hours from another institution -- foreign or American -- and also permits those credits to consist of required as well as elective credits, provided prior approval has been obtained from the students' academic dean. In response to a question posed by Dr. Kingston, who asked how many students this resolution would affect, Dr. Ogliaruso observed that this policy would impact about 280 student within the College of Arts and Sciences alone. Dr. Sorensen inquired if this resolution conforms to the Southern Association Guidelines. Dr. Ogliaruso responded that it does. The resolution was carried forward for second reading.

5. FIRST READING, CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY SENATE.

Dr. Eng described the proposed changes in the Faculty Senate Constitution that have already been approved by the faculty and Faculty Senate. These changes include 1) increasing membership from 40 to 51; 2) altering the election process of senators; 3) minor textual revisions; 4) changing the function and duties of the Senate Cabinet; 5) changing the process of electing the Credentials and Elections Committee chairperson; and 6) including the Faculty Review Committee in the list of Standing Committees.

Dr. Eng made reference to Article VIII, Section IC, "Amendments to the Constitution," which currently states that "at least one-half of the eligible faculty members must vote. An amendment to the Constitution becomes effective upon approval by a two-thirds majority of the faculty members voting." Dr. Eng noted that this provision makes it very difficult to effect a change in the constitution and bylaws. However, a revision of this clause was not included on the ballot, thus the present provision remains in the constitution.

Dr. Doswald requested clarification of the section dealing with the functions and duties of the Faculty Review Committee (Section B.1.). As background information, Dr. Eng informed Council members that the previous text called for an initial investigatory phase, followed by the option of a hearing if the principals so desired. In practice, he added, everyone wished to have a hearing, so to shorten the cycle time it was expected that a hearing would be held, although this does not preclude the possibility of calling for more witnesses. The new language, he explained, does not contradict or negate in any way the current practice. Dr. Carlisle added that this section parallels what is currently in the Faculty Handbook. He also noted that a new draft of the grievance procedure is now undergoing approval and includes a provision for hearings.

Dr. Ritchey inquired whether the new constitution recognizes that a number of representatives from Extra-Collegiate Extension faculty have recently been relocated to the College of Agriculture? Dr. Eng responded that faculty now considered to be members of that College's faculty would be represented accordingly.

Dr. Hooper asked how the increasing number of faculty at the Northern Virginia Graduate Center, the Equine Center, and other off-campus facilities would be represented? Dr. Eng noted that they were still considered to be parts of their respective colleges and would continue to be represented through that college.

6. IN SUCCESSIVE MOTIONS, COUNCIL APPROVED THE MINUTES OF THE FOLLOWING MEETINGS.

a. Commission on Extension, April 10, 1990.

b. Commission on Faculty Affairs, September 7, 1990.

c. Commission on Graduate Studies, September 19, 1990.

d. Commission on Student Affairs, April 19 and September 20, 1990.

Dr. Kingston inquired about the status of the "Fine Dining" services at Hillcrest Hall and the resulting dislocation of students for dinner. Dr. Goodale responded that "substantial dollars" had been lost in providing the evening meal for graduate students, and thus it is being moved to Cochrane Hall. Graduate students will continue to be served breakfast and lunch in Hillcrest. The "Fine Dining" experience is now being managed by the students of the Hotel and Restaurant Management program. Dr. Hooper added that discussions are ongoing with the graduate community about the provision of their meals.

e. Commission on Undergraduate Studies, September 10, 1990.

Dr. Goodale asked about the progress of the telephone registration system. Dr. Carlisle responded that it is primarily a cost issue at this point and has yet to be resolved.

7. FOR INFORMATION

a. Minutes from the University Committee on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action, September 11, 1990.

8. QUESTION/ANSWER FORUM

Dr. Kingston inquired about the status of the budget cuts. In response, Dr. Carlisle highlighted several recent events, beginning with receipt of a letter from Governor Wilder that addressed 1) the disproportionate reduction in the instructional budget, 2) layoffs, and 3) the Hotel Roanoke. In response to that letter, Dr. McComas, Mr. Ridenour, Ms. Kathye Johnston, and Dr. Carlisle met with Secretary of Education, James Dyke, to review these issues. Dr. Carlisle described the meeting as cordial and productive. In particular, Dr. Carlisle reported that, in fact, the instructional budget had taken a lower proportional cut than other budgets. He informed Council that Virginia Tech allocates a higher percentage of its E&G budget to instruction (64%) than any of the other doctoral-granting institutions in the Commonwealth (the average being less than 60%). However, the instructional budget took 53% of the budget cuts while the administrative side, which constitutes 35% of the budget, absorbed 43% of the reductions. They then indicated to Secretary Dyke that the number of layoffs was going to be precisely the number indicated in the previous plan. In fact, the surcharge did indeed eliminate the necessity for 182 layoffs. Dr. Carlisle also reported that the circumstances surrounding the Hotel Roanoke acquisition and renovation were clarified. Last week, Secretary Dyke recommended by letter that the budget be approved as originally submitted.

Dr. Snoke asked if the rumor of a 3rd budget cut were true. Dr. Carlisle responded that it was a possibility, although there has been no official announcement from Richmond.

Dr. Heller asked how graduate student stipends would be affected by the budget cuts. Dr. Carlisle responded that, effective December 1st, all state employees' salaries will be reduced by 2%, including graduate students (both hourly wages and stipends). Attempts were made to shield those students, but the decision was made at the state level to treat all state employees uniformly. Dr. Hooper added that the mechanics of how the cuts will be handled are still being worked out. A new schedule of stipend levels will be issued shortly.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
December 3, 1990

Dr. McComas called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Present:J. McComas, E.F. Carlisle, L. Eng (for J. Hillison), L. Cross (for T. Goodale), P. Gherman, L. Harris, G. Hooper, A. Swiger (for J. Nichols), G. Crofts (for H. Doswald), H. Bonham (for R. Sorensen), D. Robertshaw (for J. Buffer), S.J. Ritchey, P. Eyre, L. Moore, D. Hewitt, L. Rees, R. Small, C. Carrig, F. Thye, R.A. Heller, P. Wilson (for L. Geyer), N. Eiss, D. Kingston, J. Crittenden, N. Marriott, S. Batie, R. Johnson (for A. Snoke), D. Adams, C. Vargo, J. Budd, G. LoCascio, P. Radcliffe, M. Byrne, P. Larkin

Guests: Brian McConnell, SGA; Kay Heidbreder, General Counsel's Office; Barbara Pendergrass, Student Affairs; Pat Hyer, Provost's Office; Bill Burleson, Spectrum; Cornel N. Morton, Office of EO/AA

Absent: C. Forbes, M. Ridenour, R. Smoot, C. Steger, G.W. Clough, A.J. Davis, R.A. Heller, J. Riddle

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda as distributed. The motion PASSED.

2. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 6, 1990

The University Council minutes of the meeting of November 6, 1990 were approved with the correction of one mechanical error.

3. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON STUDENT AFFAIRS, RESOLUTION 1990-91A, CONCERNING THE ADDITION OF A NON-DISCRIMINATORY SEXUAL ORIENTATION CLAUSE TO THE VIRGINIA TECH EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION STATEMENT.

Dr. Landrum Cross, representing the Commission on Student Affairs, explained that, unlike other groups of faculty, staff, and students protected by the Commonwealth's non-discrimination policy, gays, lesbians, and bisexuals are not currently included in the statute. This resolution addresses that omission. Despite the fact that there is no statutory weight behind this resolution, the Commission on Student Affairs seeks to take action on behalf of these individuals. Dr. Gherman expressed concern about the liability of the university if it were to act favorably on the resolution. In response, Ms. Kay Heidbreder, Associate General Counsel, explained that an Assistant Attorney General had addressed a similar issue at Radford University and determined that the university was not legally prohibited from including the clause in its EO/AA statement. Dr. Kingston then commented on the general tenor of the resolution. He questioned the increasingly "piecemeal approach" to the statement and wondered if the university might be unintentionally excluding certain groups from the non-discrimination statement by not specifically mentioning them. He advised that the university develop a simpler, more inclusive statement, such as not discriminating on all non-academic and non-employment related grounds. Mr. Brian McConnell, a senator from the Student Government Association who drafted the resolution, agreed that while simplifying the clause

makes sense, the wording is based on the advice of legal counsel who indicated that the university is bound to a more specific statement for legal purposes. He added that he felt the "climate" in southwest Virginia for this constituency justified the proposed modification of the statement.

Dr. Kingston made a motion to refer the resolution to the University's Committee on EO/AA. President McComas commented that other interested groups could also review the resolution if they wished. Mr. Gregg LoCascio advised that any group reviewing the resolution should have a representative from the General Counsel's Office present to respond to questions concerning legal matters to expedite discussion.

The resolution was REFERRED to the EO/AA Committee.

4. FIRST READING, UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EQUAL/OPPORTUNITY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, RESOLUTION 1990-91A, SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY.

Dr. Morton, Chairperson of the EO/AA Committee, shared the history and rationale for the new sexual harassment policy. He explained that the new document is written in a more understandable and explicit way. Specifically, 1) the rationale for the policy is more clearly stated, 2) the language concerning relationships between faculty and students is more explicitly stated, 3) a clearer definition of "faculty member" is included, and 4) prohibited acts are both stated and exemplified for additional clarity. In addition, the new policy includes a section on consensual relationships and a more condensed section on grievance procedures. Dr. Eiss inquired as to whom a complaint should be directed if a graduate teaching assistant is charged with any form of sexual harassment. Dr. Morton responded that such a complaint would come under the purview of the EO/AA Office. Dr. Batie expressed her support for the new policy and also noted that the university could benefit from a series of workshops dealing with sexual harassment. Dr. Eng observed that the new policy would directly impact faculty and asked that the resolution be referred to the Faculty Senate.

The resolution was REFERRED to the Faculty Senate.

5. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON GRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1990-91A, CONCERNING REINSTATEMENT OF THE "D" GRADES FOR GRADUATE CREDIT. FIRST READING, NOVEMBER 6, 1990.

Dr. Hooper noted that this resolution, effective Fall 1991, adopts the same grading standards for graduate students as are applicable to undergraduates. He moved approval of the resolution.

The motion CARRIED.

6. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1990-91A, CONCERNING RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT. FIRST READING, NOVEMBER 6, 1990.

Dr. Carlisle observed that the former policy was largely based on requirements associated with the quarter system and moved approval of the resolution.

The motion CARRIED.

7. SECOND READING, CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY SENATE. FIRST READING, NOVEMBER 6, 1990.

Dr. Eng reminded Council of a question asked at the previous meeting concerning the number of faculty remaining in the Extra-Collegiate Extension Division. He estimates that about 70-80 individuals remain in this division--about the same number as in the library and the College of Veterinary Medicine. He moved approval of the Faculty Senate Constitution.

The motion CARRIED.

8. IN SUCCESSIVE MOTIONS, COUNCIL APPROVED THE MINUTES OF THE FOLLOWING MEETINGS.

a. Commission on Graduate Studies, October 17, 1990.

b. Commission on Research, October 10, 1990.

c. Commission on Student Affairs, October 18, 1990.

d. Commission on Undergraduate Studies, September 24 & October 22, 1990.

9. FOR INFORMATION

a. Minutes of the University Committee on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action, October 10, 1990.

Dr. Morton noted the establishment of the Affirmative Action Incentive Grants Program, detailed in the minutes. Application forms will be available from the Equal Opportunity Office in early December.

10. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. Carlisle reported that the contingency plans submitted to the Secretary of Education's office for the possible third round of budget cuts have been accepted without comment.

Dr. McComas described the concerns being expressed by the state's agricultural groups about the proportionally greater budget cuts being made in agriculture programs and the extension division. He emphasized that the university has made significant efforts to protect agriculture in the first two rounds of cuts and, as a result, additional layoffs have been avoided. The agriculture units, particularly the Agriculture Experiment Station and the Extension Service may take cuts totaling 17.5% (as compared to 15% in the other divisions). Dr. McComas added that we will continue to work to minimize additional cuts to Agriculture and Extension.

In describing capital improvements, Dr. McComas noted that projects have been delayed that place certain programs, such as Veterinary Medicine and the Colleges of Architecture and Urban Studies and Engineering at risk. A total of $27 million is no longer available for capital projects and this loss could affect the accreditation status of these colleges--not for programmatic reasons, but as a result of facilities deficits. Because lottery money has been reallocated in support of the general budget, there is talk of issuing general obligation bonds to support capital projects, as other states do. But the public mood evidenced in November's election results has not been supportive of issuing bonds. He reported that the university will continue to work with the state legislature on ways to provide support for these projects.

11. QUESTION/ANSWER FORUM

Dr. Eiss inquired about reports that academic program review might be delayed until next December. He also conveyed a concern of the Faculty Senate about the lack of program planning occurring at this time. Dr. Carlisle responded that there are currently two forms of program review: 1) administrative and support services, and 2) academic programs. He indicated that it made sense to him for the latter review to be conjoined with the planning process and that this could not be realistically accomplished until next fall, especially given the present anxiety surrounding budgetary issues, but that he expected administrative and support services review to begin perhaps as early as January.

Dr. Batie asked about the status of congressional funding for a biotechnical building on campus. Dr. Hooper responded that for the past two years Congress has authorized planning money, to be matched by state funds. This past year, over $900,000 Federal dollars were authorized to initiate planning of the estimated $9 million biotechnical building. To access those funds, however, the the state would have to pledge the same amount. Virginia Tech has requested that the state's share for the building be made available, at which time Congress would take steps to commit its share. Dr. Hooper indicated that if the university is not able to provide some evidence that it can raise half of the total costs, the entire project could be jeopardized. Dr. Swiger added, however, that those federal funds will be available for several years so long as the state and university provide some indication that efforts are being made to generate their portion.

Mr. Budd asked how student groups might be represented on the Building Committee. Dr. Carlisle responded that the Building Committee has not been meeting regularly but that he would provide that information to Mr. Budd.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
January 21, 1991

Dr. E.F. Carlisle called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Present:E.F. Carlisle, J. Hillison, T. Goodale, C. Steger, P. Gherman, L. Harris, G. Hooper, G. Jubb (for J. Nichols), G. Crofts (for H. Doswald), R. Sorensen, J. Buffer, S.J. Ritchey, J. Osborne (for G.W. Clough), L. Moore, D. Hewitt, R. Small, C. Carrig, F. Thye, R.A. Heller, L. Geyer, N. Eiss, D. Kingston, J. Crittenden, N. Marriott, S. Batie, A. Snoke, L. Barroso, D. Adams, J. Budd, W. Kuster, P. Radcliffe, M. Byrne, K. Konopka (for P. Larkin)

Guests: Brian McConnell, SGA; Pat Hyer, Provost's Office; Cornel N. Morton, Office of EO/AA; Tom McAnge, University Communications Resources Committee; Lud Eng, Faculty Senate; Elizabeth Alexander, M.D., Student Health Services; Landrum Cross, Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs

Absent: J. McComas, C. Forbes, M. Ridenour, R. Smoot, R. Heterick, P. Eyre, A.J. Davis, L. Rees, C. Vargo

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda as distributed. The motion PASSED.

2. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF DECEMBER 3, 1990

The University Council minutes of the meeting of December 3, 1990 were approved with minor changes.

3. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON STUDENT AFFAIRS RESOLUTION 1990-91A, CONCERNING THE ADDITION OF A NON-DISCRIMINATORY SEXUAL ORIENTATION CLAUSE TO THE VIRGINIA TECH EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION STATEMENT.

Dr. Carlisle prefaced the discussion of this resolution by reminding Council that this item was referred to the EO/AA Committee during the last meeting, so it now comes before Council for First Reading. He called on Dr. Goodale, who reiterated that the Commission on Student Affairs passed this resolution with a vote of 10 in favor, none opposed, and four abstentions. He voiced his strong support for the resolution, framing it as a human rights issue that ought to be included in this university's non-discrimination statement. Dr. Morton then summarized the EO/AA Committee's discussion of this item during its December 11th meeting, stating that both Dr. David Kingston and Mr. Brian McConnell, author of the resolution, spoke effectively to the issues. He reported, however, that the EO/AA Committee voted by secret ballot not to approve the resolution by a five to three margin. When asked to elaborate on the reasons for the failure of the resolution, Dr. Morton responded that several concerns were raised about its legality -- especially concerning personnel decisions. Dr. Morton indicated that he believed no single factor resulted in the negative vote, and stated that he felt the complexity of the issues, especially those concerning legal and personnel questions, resulted in its veto.

Dr. Kingston then reported the result of the Faculty Senate's discussion of the resolution. He noted that the Senate had a lengthy debate on this issue that resulted in two separate votes -- the first on wording to amend the resolution and the second on the revised version which removed the phrase "sexual orientation" and added a clause to the effect that Virginia Tech does not discriminate on any non-academic and non-employment related grounds. The Senate, he reported, voted against the amended resolution by a vote of 10 to 9. Dr. Kingston then stated his own objections to Council passing this resolution. He stated that he found it philosophically objectionable, unnecessary, unwise, and unclear. First, he reiterated his objection to a statement that includes an increasingly longer list of people against whom the university does not discriminate. Second, he noted that the preamble to the resolution states that "gay, lesbian, and bisexual students, faculty and staff are the subject of frequent and overt harassment and discrimination at universities nationwide," and added that the new sexual harassment policy would, in principle, protect gays and lesbians from harassment. He added that Dr. Morton had previously reported no knowledge of any personnel decision that had been affected by such discrimination. Thus, he concluded, it does not appear to be a pervasive enough problem to warrant the resolution. (Dr. Morton later noted that he did know of a personnel decision at the University of Maryland that had been affected by discrimination; he also reported knowledge of several instances of gays and lesbians being "harassed" on this campus and others.) Dr. Kingston also noted that state and federal guidelines do not require that we include "sexual orientation" on our statement, and that by so doing, we would be in conflict with other statutes. Third, he listed four reasons for his opinion that the resolution is unwise. 1) Because sodomy is still a felony in the state of Virginia, it is inappropriate to adopt language that appears to condone it. 2) There might be potential conflicts if both this and the sexual harassment policy are approved. 3) The "awkward question" of measuring our conformity to the policy could require very personal questions on application or admissions forms. 4) Occasions when deliberate, but highly selective, "discrimination" might be advisable, such as avoiding hiring a homosexually or heterosexually promiscuous person as a resident advisor. Fourth, Dr. Kingston stated that because the resolution is not binding "in matters of conflicting jurisdiction with the United States Department of Defense," it is unclear and unworkable.

Dr. Small noted that many of the arguments voiced by Dr. Kingston could apply equally well to political or religious affiliation, even though the university does not demand such information on application or admissions forms. He added that the resolution rightly sends a signal to gays and lesbians that there are avenues available for recourse should harassment occur, and also sends a message to potential discriminators that this university does not condone such harassment. Dr. Kingston responded that (unlike sexual orientation) political and religious affiliation are mandated by the state.

Dr. Batie then clarified the vote of the Faculty Senate. She noted that the Senate never actually voted on the contents of the original resolution, but rather on the amended version. She also added that she knows of several senators who voted against the amended version to show support for the original resolution. Dr. Batie reiterated her support for the resolution and advised that it be referred back to the Faculty Senate.

Mr. McConnell then requested time to counter Dr. Kingston's concerns. Regarding his philosophical objections to the current statement's "piecemeal approach," Mr. McConnell stated that Federal statutes currently mandate an item-by-item list. To the charge that the resolution is unnecessary, Mr. McConnell responded that the sexual harassment policy deals primarily with unwanted sexual advances, while this resolution concerns employment and admissions discrimination and harassment within the university community. He stressed that it is not related to sexual behavior. He also objected to Dr. Kingston's comments about homosexual promiscuity, stating that homosexuals are no more promiscuous than are heterosexuals. To

the charge that the resolution is unwise because it appears to condone sodomy, Mr. McConnell noted that sodomy laws apply equally to heterosexuals. He again stressed that the resolution deals with sexual orientation, not behavior. He added, however, that he would be willing to amend the resolution to read "gender preference," if that was more acceptable. Mr. McConnell agreed that Dr. Kingston's concern about enforcement and conformity issues was viable. He explained, however, that last year he sought assistance in developing and conducting an anonymous survey to assess the extent to which discrimination against homosexuals is a problem, but because the resolution was not in place at that time, Institutional Research was reluctant to conduct the survey. He concluded that if the policy were in place, viable ways could be developed to assess conformity while maintaining confidentiality. In countering Dr. Kingston's comments about justifiable discrimination, as in the case of resident advisors, Mr. McConnell again stressed that gender preference should not be confused with sexual behavior. Mr. McConnell then addressed the question of the resolution's conflict with Department of Defense policies. While he agreed that this issue could not easily be resolved, he maintained that the final resolve clause in the resolution would protect the university in the unlikely event of a lawsuit. He added that the disclaimer reflects a difference in policy between the military and civilian sector that he hoped would be eliminated.

Mr. William Kuster, a student senator, informed Council that although the resolution was extensively debated, it was passed by the Student Senate by a sizeable margin. Ms. Paula Radcliffe, President of the Class of 1991, endorsed the resolution on behalf of her class officers. Mr. Budd then reinforced Mr. McConnell's argument that homosexuality deals with more than sexual practices. He also stated (and was supported by Dr. Morton) that this university is at liberty to expand the non-discriminatory statement beyond the minimal Federal and state guidelines. He, too, endorsed the passage of this resolution.

Dr. Hillison moved that the resolution be referred to the Faculty Senate for further discussion. The motion FAILED.

The resolution was carried forward for Second Reading.

4. FIRST READING, UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION RESOLUTION 1990-91A, SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY.

Dr. Pat Hyer reminded Council that this item appeared on First Reading at the previous meeting, but was referred to the Faculty Senate. Dr. Hyer noted that while the overall tone and substance of the policy were subsequently approved by the Senate, she stated that senators were most concerned about the lack of peer review in complaint resolution. The policy was then referred to the Commission on Faculty Affairs which assisted in developing a panel review system (second paragraph of item 2A in the "Formal Complaint" section) that could be initiated if the Director of EO/AA finds evidence to support the charge. Dr. Hyer stated that the Committee decided on this sequence because involving a panel from the onset of the complaint would make the process "unworkable." It would also destroy the important aspect of confidentiality. She then described several minor changes to the policy. She concluded her report by stating that the revised policy had been approved by the Faculty Senate and the Commission on Faculty Affairs.

Dr. Crittenden asked Dr. Morton to estimate the number of formal sexual harassment complaints per year. Dr. Morton responded with a figure of 2-3 complaints. Dr. Crittenden indicated that he did not view this as too many cases to ask a group of peers to review. He also objected to the fact that the Director "is the investigator, judge and jury" of sexual harassment complaints. Dr. Morton responded that he works with a group of colleagues during each phase of the investigation, adding that he is "relatively comfortable with the quality control part of the process." Dr. Crittenden

asked if the panel review process could be initiated before the Provost is informed of the final decision to avoid the possibility of bias. Dr. Morton responded that he would not support that modification because, as

Director of EO/AA, he feels he pays full attention to detail and fairness, as is demanded of the principal investigator.

Mr. William Kuster reported that the Student Senate unanimously approved the early draft of the policy. Mr. Gherman asked if records were kept for an informal complaint and also wondered whether the "accused" was notified of a complaint at the informal level. Dr. Morton responded that records were kept as needed, adding that the accused was not notified unless the complainant decided to formally pursue the charge. Ms. Lisa Barroso then inquired what would happen if several "informal" complaints were filed against a single individual. Dr. Morton responded that if he felt sufficient reason existed (he gave the example of 3-4 complaints against a single individual in the course of 18 months), he would contact the proper authorities.

The resolution was carried forward for Second Reading.

5. IN SUCCESSIVE MOTIONS, COUNCIL APPROVED THE MINUTES OF THE FOLLOWING MEETINGS.

a. Commission on Extension, October 5, 1990.

b. Commission on Faculty Affairs, October 5 and November 2, 1990.

Dr. Hillison briefly commented on the revision of the grievance procedure which has been approved by CFA and will be on the February agenda of the Faculty Senate. He also noted that the CFA is beginning to work on the involuntary transfer policy and, given the complexity of this issue, he welcomed input from colleagues.

c. Commission on Graduate Studies, November 7, 1990.

Dr. Hooper announced that the Graduate School is now open on Wednesday evenings with limited services available.

d. Commission on Research, October 24 and November 14, 1990.

e. Commission on Student Affairs, November 1 & 15, 1990.

Dr. Goodale noted that the Committee for University Security for Student Events is under further consideration by CSA and will come before Council for its approval. Dr. Goodale also thanked members of University Council who attended the convocation related to the war in the Middle East.

f. Commission on Undergraduate Studies, November 12, 1990.

6. FOR INFORMATION

a. University AIDS Policy

Dr. Cross reported that the State Council for Higher Education had encouraged the development of an institutional policy. In response, the AIDS Education Committee of University Student Health Services was formed several years ago and has recently completed its charge. Dr. Elizabeth Alexander, chair of the committee, provided some epidemiological information about AIDS. In particular, she noted that because the incubation period is so long (8 to 10 years), at the present time health workers would be more likely to treat faculty and staff than they would students. Thus, this policy was purposefully written to include these constituencies in order to provide education and to protect employees who may come into contact with the disease. Dr. Hillison inquired whether a strong enough

statement was made on the subject of safety precautions? Dr. Alexander responded that if an individual is adhering to the "Universal Precautions to Prevent Transmission of HIV," as advised in the policy, he or she would be sufficiently protected. Dr. Marriott wondered whether the Committee had addressed the food services area? Dr. Alexander noted that both Dining Services and Residential Programs have been provided with AIDS education programs.

b. Minutes of the Computer Committee, September 5, October 10, and November 7, 1990.

Dr. Sorensen noted that the Committee is collaborating with the University Library Committee and the University Communications Resources Committee to develop a mission statement for computer utilization in the future.

c. Minutes of the University Committee on Athletics, October 11 & November 8, 1190.

Dr. Ritchey made reference to the issue of admissions requirements. He stated that while the minutes describe the issues quite clearly, they do not resolve two important issues. First, is Virginia Tech justified in requiring a third year of math prior to admission? And second, should this institution accept earth sciences to meet its laboratory science requirement? Dr. Ritchey noted that Virginia high schools count earth science courses toward graduation. He concluded that the Committee was still discussing these issues and would keep Council informed of its progress.

Dr. Crittenden inquired about minimum admissions requirements in the case of student-athletes. Dr. Ritchey responded that Virginia Tech has not admitted any student that does not meet the NCAA guidelines for academic performance, although he agreed that these are generally low standards. Dr. Ritchey added that there are other groups on campus, such as Performing Arts, who are also interested in the two issues he mentioned earlier. In response to a question from Dr. Heller concerning graduation rates for student athletes, Dr. Ritchey noted that students on athletic scholarship graduate at about the same rate as non-student-athletes.

d. Minutes of the University Committee on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action, November 13, 1990.

e. Minutes of the University Communications Resources Committee, October 31, 1990.

Mr. McAnge reported that the Committee had clarified its charge (page 2 of the minutes).

f. Minutes of the University Library Committee, September 6, October 3, and November 7, 1990.

Dr. Gherman noted that serial subscriptions will face approximately $200,000 in cuts. He briefly elaborated on ways that the Library is seeking to cope with these losses.

7. QUESTION/ANSWER SESSION

Dr. Crittenden requested that, in the future, convocations such as the one devoted to the Gulf Crisis, be scheduled after normal class hours.

Dr. Eng asked why the University AIDS policy had come to Council for information only and not for approval? Dr. Carlisle responded that because this is an administrative policy, Council approval was not required. He added that the policy had undergone review by the Commission on Student Affairs, the Commission on Faculty Affairs, and the Classified Staff Affairs Committee. Dr. Cross then noted that because the AIDS policy was state mandated, and does not contain any controversial material, the AIDS Education Commit-

tee did not think it necessary to seek Council's approval. Dr. Harris added that a similar situation exists with the state mandate on recycling. He agreed with Dr. Eng that the approval process for such policies as this and similar issues is not always clear. Further discussion on the proper routing of policy matters would be helpful, he said.

Dr. Marriott asked Dr. Carlisle if there was any news concerning the budget. Dr. Carlisle stated that Governor Wilder has submitted a series of amendments to the appropriations act, which will be dealt with by the General Assembly. Many of these amendments, he explained, simply institute into law the reductions that the university has already made. Another amendment authorizes the Governor to make an additional 3% reduction in the state budget, depending on revenue projections available in August, 1991. In addition, Dr. Carlisle described the Governor's proposed six-day furlough of all state employees. These two further reductions would amount to another 4.5% cut in state expenditures. A proposed early retirement program has also been submitted by the Governor, but Dr. Carlisle explained that this university and others are attempting to work with the legislature to make it a more attractive package for both the employee and employer. Dr. Carlisle also stated that the state's contribution to TIAA and VRS retirement plans is being discussed by the General Assembly and may be reduced to 10.2% (from the current level of approximately 12%).

Dr. Carlisle then described several amendments that the university has submitted that would result in $3.5 million additional support. These amendments seek support for various fixed-cost items (such as insurance and workmen's compensation), mandated programs, and several acute program needs, as well as amendments for capital projects that were removed from the lottery funds.

Dr. Heller requested further information about this university's recycling efforts. Dr. Harris responded that Mr. Spencer Hall, Assistant Vice President for Facilities, has been appointed as coordinator of these efforts and is now in the process of studying the costs and means of implementing an institutional plan.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
February 4, 1991

Dr. James D. McComas called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Present:J. McComas, R. Smoot, E.F. Carlisle, J. Hillison, T. Goodale, C. Steger, F.O. Painter (for P. Gherman), L. Harris, G. Hooper, H. Doswald, R. Sorensen, J. Buffer, J. Marchman (for G.W. Clough), J. Lee (for Peter Eyre) L. Moore, A.J. Davis, L. Rees, D. Hewitt, R. Small, F. Thye, R.A. Heller, L. Eng (for L. Geyer), N. Eiss, P.F. Scanlon (for D. Kingston), J. Crittenden, N. Marriott, N. Canestaro (for S. Batie), A. Snoke, L. Barroso, J. Budd, W. Kuster, P. Radcliffe, M. Byrne, C. Vargo

Guests: Brian McConnell, SGA; Pat Hyer, Provost's Office; Cornel N. Morton, Office of EO/AA; Bill Burleson, Spectrum; Kay Heidbreder, Office of the General Counsel; Josh Goodman, student; Lorie Pizecha, student; Lisa Taranto, student; Thomas Maroney, student; Terri Dawson, student

Absent: C. Forbes, M. Ridenour, J. Nichols, S.J. Ritchey, R. Heterick, C. Carrig, D. Adams, P. Larkin

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda as distributed. The motion PASSED.

2. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF JANUARY 21, 1991

The University Council minutes of the meeting of January 21, 1991 were approved as distributed.

3. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1990-91C, CONCERNING ACADEMIC ELIGIBILITY.

Dr. McComas called on Dr. Marchman to provide the history and rationale for the resolution. Dr. Marchman explained that this resolution results in part from a recommendation contained in the University Self Study calling for the review of the academic eligibility policy once the semester system had been in place for several years. A CUS subcommittee, comprised of faculty and students, drafted the document which makes the academic eligibility statement in the UNDERGRADUATE CATALOG more consistent with the way the policy is currently applied. The major change, he explained, is to allow a student on academic drop greater flexibility in raising his or her QCA to the required level. Dr. Marchman noted that appeals have increased from students who could not attend summer school because of required military reserve duty or the need to work during the summer. Thus, this resolution adds flexibility to the academic eligibility policy currently on the books -- allowing students to choose summer or fall to remedy an academic deficiency. He also described a change to the language in the UNDERGRADUATE CATALOG that would henceforth state that a student on academic suspension for two years could appeal for readmission in order to raise the QCA to the minimum standard. Failure to meet the minimum standard, however, would result in permanent academic dismissal. The resolution also substitutes "probation" and "suspension" for "academic drop."

The resolution carried forward for second reading.

4. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON STUDENT AFFAIRS RESOLUTION 1990-91A, CONCERNING THE ADDITION OF A NON-DISCRIMINATORY SEXUAL ORIENTATION CLAUSE TO THE VIRGINIA TECH EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION STATEMENT.

Dr. Goodale, chair of the Commission on Student Affairs, made reference to the minutes of the previous University Council meeting (dated January 21, 1991) detailing the legislative history of this document. He moved adoption of the resolution. Dr. McComas then called for discussion. Dr. Hillison reiterated that the Faculty Senate had not voted on the resolution as written, only on an amended version. Mr. McConnell informed Council about action taken at the University of Virginia recently to broaden its non-discrimination policy to cover homosexuals. He stressed that a policy prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation is now in place at "well over one hundred schools nationwide."

Dr. Crittenden voiced his opposing view, noting that what other universities have done should not dictate Virginia Tech's policy. He added that the present statement is sufficient to meet state and federal requirements and advocated that this resolution not be passed.

Mr. Kuster, representing the Student Senate, noted that the Senate has supported adoption of this resolution for several years. He voiced his strong support of the document. Dr. Snoke stated that although he does not like the kind of "grocery list" statement we currently have, the case is well-made to include "sexual orientation" on that list. He, too, advocated passage of the resolution.

Mr. McConnell asked Council members to "put themselves in the shoes" of those who would be most affected by the resolution, which he added, is really only about 10% of faculty, staff and students. He noted that while the practical effect on most of the university population would be nil, adoption of the resolution nevertheless would send an important symbolic message about this institution's stance against discrimination of any kind.

Mr. Budd reiterated the Student Government Association's support of the resolution. Dr. Morton, Director of the Office of Affirmative Action, also encouraged Council to support the resolution. Dr. McComas then called for a vote on the resolution.

The resolution was PASSED.

5. SECOND READING, UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION RESOLUTION 1990-91A, SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY.

Dr. Morton noted that members of the EO/AA Committee who drafted the sexual harassment policy have been working with the Faculty Senate and the Commission on Faculty Affairs to ensure that the policy statement is useful and productive for resolving complaints.

Dr. Small, representing the Executive Committee of the College of Education, distributed a five-page response to the policy. He moved to defer action on the policy and then offered several reasons for so doing. First, he stated the Committee's belief that the EO/AA Office is accorded too much power in the investigatory process. As stated in the response, "the Office of EO/AA is designated counselor-resolution negotiator, investigator-prosecutor and also the 'judge' of the issue. . . this presents a situation of potential prejudice and bias which could be easily challenged." He wondered if there was some way to eliminate those multiple roles. Second, Dr. Small expressed concern about the ambiguous nature of the section on consensual relationships. The policy states that "questions of favoritism frequently arise and undermine the work or learning environment for many others." Dr. Small gave a hypothetical example of an office worker who was uncomfortable with or offended by a relationship between two co-workers.

Could that person, he asked, make a charge of sexual harassment against those two individuals, even though that relationship may not impact the third party in any tangible way? He stated, that a "tremendous amount of power" is accorded to that third person and he asked how the EO/AA Office would deal with such a charge? Dr. Small concluded that this section needs modification.

Dr. McComas, speaking to the nature of the motion itself, noted that a deferral at first reading results in a six-week delay. During that time, he explained, the sponsoring group has the option of incorporating suggested modifications or leaving the policy as is. Dr. Steger asked if the Office of the General Counsel had reviewed the policy -- especially in relation to the section on consensual relationships. Dr. Hyer responded that Ms. Kay Heidbreder, Associate General Counsel, had been present during the drafting of the resolution. While Ms. Heidbreder did not comment on the legality of the section on consensual relationships, she did state that the university needs to decide whether it wants to include this section in its policy statement.

Dr. Carlisle expressed some concern that these objections were being brought forward so late in the approval process, especially in light of the fact that the proposed policy has been in circulation for some time. He noted that it makes it is difficult for the drafters of the policy to respond effectively, and added that it is "reasonable and important" to include a section on consensual relationships. He also invited Council to think about the way that various complaints are handled within universities. They are not treated, he stated, in the same manner as they would be in the external legal system. As an example, Dr. Carlisle noted that the Faculty Review Committee acts in multiple roles in dealing with grievances. He also stressed that "there are reasonable people" involved in complaint resolution who are qualified to determine whether or not a charge is justified. He concluded by stating that there are good reasons not to defer this resolution.

Dr. Morton, who also expressed frustration about receiving the College of Education's Executive Committee's response so late, reiterated that it is unfortunate and misleading to imply that the Director of EO/AA sits as judge and jury. He again stressed that he works with a panel in complaint resolution.

In response, Dr. Small described the process by which the College of Education's Executive Committee brought forth their written objections to the policy. He indicated that the Committee had acted in as timely a manner as possible. Dr. Small noted that, given the fact that a sexual harassment policy is already in force, a deferral is entirely appropriate to resolve these concerns.

Dr. Crittenden announced that he will propose an amendment to the policy at the next University Council meeting and stressed that a deferral is justified. Mr. Kuster, representing the Student Senate, also advocated deferring the policy until these issues could be resolved.

Dr. Hyer commented that the issues raised by Dr. Small are precisely those dealt with by the Commission on Faculty Affairs. She stated that those recommendations have been incorporated into the document. In response, Dr. Buffer stressed that the College of Education is not attempting to "stonewall this issue." Revisions to the sexual harassment policy are needed and they want to contribute to a more responsive document. Dr. Steger recommended that the General Counsel's office prepare a statement concerning the legality of the policy. Dr. Harris responded that he would ask Mr. Jerry Cain to do so, and also informed Council that any amendments or recommendations concerning the sexual harassment policy should be forwarded to him for distribution. Dr. McComas then suggested that anyone with additional objections to the policy meet with the EO/AA Committee directly in order to expedite this matter.

The motion to defer the resolution CARRIED. It will come back for second reading.

6. IN SUCCESSIVE MOTIONS, COUNCIL APPROVED THE MINUTES OF THE FOLLOWING MEETINGS.

a. Commission on Extension, December 4, 1990.

b. Commission on Student Affairs, December 6, 1990 and January 10, 1991.

Dr. Goodale called attention to the fact that the Board of Visitors has approved the process to allow nominees for the student member of the BOV to include any enrolled student. Previously, he explained, the student member nominees represented only organizations sitting on the Commission on Student Affairs.

c. Commission on Undergraduate Studies, November 26, and December 10, 1990.

7. FOR INFORMATION

a. Minutes of the Computer Committee, December 5, 1990.

b. Minutes of the University Library Committee, December 5, 1990.

c. Dr. Moore, chair of the Task Force on University Council, Standing University Commissions and Committees, reported that his group has been conferring with constituencies and individuals across campus. He expects to submit a proposal to University Council by late-March or early-April. He invited further input from any interested party.

8. QUESTION/ANSWER SESSION

Dr. McComas described recent legislative events surrounding proposed funding for higher education. He indicated that the House of Delegates and the Senate had recommended differing levels of support for the University and those differences will be resolved through a conference committee. He then directed his comments to the proposed furlough plan. He reported that while the Governor recommended furloughs of up to fifteen days, the House and Senate both developed different plans, with the latter recommending that $100 million be used from the $200 million reserve prior to the imposition of any furlough. The House of Delegates, on the other hand, has recommended a maximum of eight days furlough, with an unspecified funding mechanism. Dr. McComas also shared with Council how several furlough plans translate to annual salary reduction. He noted that one day would equate to a .4% decrease, one week = 1.9%, two weeks = 3.9%, three weeks = 5.8%. He also noted that the university is concerned about the proposed early retirement system because the positions lost through retirement would be frozen, along with the resultant salary savings. Dr. Carlisle noted that the tuition increase would be used to restore faculty levels to 90% of the state guidelines (Virginia Tech is currently at 82%), to increase equipment levels, and to somehow buffer the effects of tuition increases on graduate students.

Dr. McComas reported on a meeting with the Senate Finance Committee on the proposed bond issue for higher education, which includes approximately $42 million for Virginia Tech. This figure includes $25 million for a engineering/architecture structure recommended by SCHEV. If approved by the House and the Governor (it has already been approved by the Senate), it will come before the public as a general referendum. He described a recent poll indicating that 62% of voters would support a general obligation bond.

Dr. McComas asked Mr. Budd to describe a meeting of several student body presidents with the Higher Education Subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee. Mr. Budd felt that the Senate was very responsive to their

concerns, especially regarding the general obligation bond. He plans on initiating a letter-writing campaign directed at the House of Delegates, as well as the Governor and the Secretary of Education.

Dr. McComas noted a bill has been introduced that would reduce Virginia Tech auxiliary funds by $1.5 million. These dollars, generated by student fees, have been used in the past to improve residence and dining facilities. He also described how several other universities in the state would lose auxiliary funds. On a more positive note, Dr. McComas reported that cuts to public schools have been reduced by about one third. He stressed that the Commonwealth's national and international competitiveness rests in its public K-12 and higher education system. Thus, every effort is being made to minimize any further reductions.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
March 4, 1991

Dr. James D. McComas called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

Present:J. McComas, R. Smoot, M. Ridenour, E.F. Carlisle, J. Hillison, T. Goodale, P. Gherman, L. Harris, G. Hooper, R. Heterick, H. Doswald, R. Sorensen, J. Johnson (for J. Nichols), D. Robertshaw (for J. Buffer), J. Marchman (for G.W. Clough), S.J. Ritchey, L. Moore, A.J. Davis, L. Rees, D. Hewitt, E. Holford (for R. Small), F. Thye, L. Eng (for S. Batie), L. Geyer, N. Eiss, D. Kingston, J. Crittenden, N. Marriott, A. Snoke, L. Barroso, D. Adams, J. Budd, Kevin Mottley (for W. Kuster), P. Radcliffe, M. Byrne, C. Vargo, Kevin Konopka (for P. Larkin)

Guests: Bill Burleson, Spectrum; Pat Hyer, Provost's Office; Cornel N. Morton, Office of EO/AA;

Absent: C. Forbes, P. Eyre, R.A. Heller, C. Steger

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda as distributed. The motion PASSED.

2. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 4, 1991

The University Council minutes of the meeting of February 4, 1991 were approved with the correction of a typographical error.

3. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1990-91C, CONCERNING ACADEMIC ELIGIBILITY.

Dr. McComas called on Dr. Carlisle who moved adoption of the resolution, then asked Dr. Marchman to respond to questions. Dr. Kingston inquired about the projected impact of the resolution on summer school enrollments. Dr. Marchman responded that CUS had considered this question and determined that there would be very little change in enrollment numbers, as most students would continue to remedy their situations at the earliest opportunity. He reiterated that this resolution was developed to officially legitimize a practice that has been in effect for some time -- namely, allowing students to use the spring OR fall sessions to raise the QCA to the required level.

The resolution was PASSED.

4. SECOND READING, UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION RESOLUTION 1990-91A, SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY.

Dr. Hyer recounted the history of the policy, stating that it was initially developed in 1989 to strengthen the university's stand against sexual harassment and to simplify procedures for investigating complaints. The proposed draft of the policy incorporates suggested revisions from the Faculty Senate, the Commission on Faculty Affairs, the College of Education Faculty Association, and Dr. Barry Crittenden. Major revisions include 1) clarification of the section on consensual relationships, 2) the decision

to eliminate any written records at the "informal consultation" stage, and

3) the establishment of a panel review process -- if requested by the accused -- once a decision is rendered by the Director of EO/AA.

Ms. Barroso, representing the Classified Staff Affairs Committee, endorsed adoption of the policy and urged that it be widely publicized at all levels of the university.

The resolution was PASSED.

5. IN SUCCESSIVE MOTIONS, COUNCIL APPROVED THE MINUTES OF THE FOLLOWING MEETINGS.

a. Commission on Extension, January 8, 1991.

Dr. Kingston requested an update on the status of the Hotel Roanoke. Dr. Smoot reported that proposals for the development of the hotel and adjoining convention center were submitted several weeks ago. Those proposals are now under review by a committee comprised of Roanoke area business people who will report its recommendations shortly. Mr. Ridenour added that the General Assembly recently passed legislation that authorizes a commission responsible for the financing and building of the conference center as a joint project between the City of Roanoke and Virginia Tech. Mr. Ridenour noted that while the legislation prohibits using university funds to renovate the hotel, it is structured so that revenue generated through future conferences held at the site will be used to repay development and operation costs. He added, however, that a feasibility study will be conducted to document the anticipated volume of business before any renovation is undertaken.

b. Commission on Faculty Affairs, January 18, 1991.

c. Commission on Graduate Studies, December 5, 1990 and January 16, 1991.

Dr. Kingston asked if item 4 -- the definition of a "family" -- from the December 5, 1990 minutes had been determined. Dr. Hooper responded that the CGS was still receiving input on this issue as it relates to graduate student housing, and thus it remains unresolved.

Dr. Hooper then made reference to item 7 in the minutes of January 16, 1991, regarding discussion of the "I" grade resolution. Dr. Hooper reported that the commission is addressing two corollary issues: 1) the need to finalize those grades within the academic term following the incompletion, and 2) whether those "I" grades should count as an "F" for calculating QCA during that term? With regard to the latter issue, he informed Council that the CGS advocates that an "I" grade not be counted as an "F," as that action could jeopardize graduate assistantships. Dr. Hooper added that because other constituencies are involved in this debate (CUS and the Faculty Senate), the CGS has decided to withhold action. He asked that these minutes be approved, excepting this item.

d. Commission on Research, December 12, 1990.

e. Commission on Undergraduate Studies, January 14 and 28, 1991.

Dr. Carlisle noted item 5 in the January 14, 1991 minutes, the establishment of a program of individualized study for students graduating "in honors."

6. FOR INFORMATION

a. Commission on Research, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH CENTERS.

Dr. Hooper reported that this document reflects a formal effort to record the policies and procedures involved in the establishment and review of interdisciplinary research centers.

b. Minutes of the Building Committee, January 22, 1991.

Mr. Ridenour reported that these minutes recount discussion of issues associated with the capital outlay submission to Richmond on March 1st. He also explained that the university intends to bring the capital and budget planning process together in the future. Thus, the Building Committee would function as the group that would review the overall master building plan of the university, while the budgeting and planning committee would involve itself with related appropriations issues. Dr. Snoke inquired if these two proposed committees would report to an advisory committee or commission? Mr. Ridenour responded that although they would work in concert, the two committees would probably both report directly to Council.

c. Minutes of the Computer Committee, January 9, 1991.

d. Minutes of the University Committee on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action, December 11, 1990 and January 8, 1991.

e. Minutes of the University Communications Resources Committee, November 28, 1990.

Dr. Heterick was asked if there was going to be an access charge for faculty and students to use the campus communications network from off-campus locations. He replied that while there has long been an intent to levy a fee for such services, there has yet to be developed a technologically reasonable means for doing so. Dr. Heterick added that the committee is still attempting to develop a a viable way to measure and charge for these services.

f. Minutes of the University Library Committee, January 9, 1990.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS

o Dr. McComas asked Dr. Smoot to update Council on the status of the proposed parking deck for the lot adjacent to Squires Student Center. Dr. Smoot described plans for the jointly funded project by the Town of Blacksburg and the university that would result in approximately 500 parking spaces for faculty/staff, student, and public use. He anticipates that the projected cost of the structure and the town's share of those costs will be determined by the spring.

o Dr. McComas recognized Jim Budd as outgoing president of the Student Government Association, in addition to the other student leaders retiring at the end of this year. He then introduced Melissa Byrne as the president-elect of the SGA, and Kevin Mottley, the new SGA vice-president.

o Dr. McComas credited the work of Mr. David Bousquet, Director of Admissions, and his staff for their efforts to increase the number of undergraduate applications, particularly in light of the fact that many other Virginia and national institutions are experiencing declines in applications. He also informed Council that there are over 300 Merit Scholarship semifinalists across all university programs.

8. QUESTION/ANSWER SESSION

Dr. Kingston requested an update on issues related to the budget. Dr.

McComas responded by describing the status of capital projects. He stated that the House of Delegates and the Senate proposed two different bills related to capital funding, but because they could not reconcile the different funding requests, both bills failed. Dr. McComas reiterated the results of a public poll that showed sufficient support for a bond issue to support capital projects. Accordingly, the university must utilize this support to ensure that the next legislative session results in the passage of a bond for capital projects.

Dr. McComas then informed Council that the General Assembly did approve a $7.3 million tuition increase for instructional programs (not for research or extension). Mr. Ridenour then provided some specific information about other legislation. He noted, for example, that 1) Virginia Tech received authorization to increase the bond limits on Squires Student Center, 2) the new coal-fired facility will be funded through a debt-financing package, 3) the Equine Center in Northern Virginia will receive a total of $350,00 to support teaching and research, 4) UVa and Virginia Tech will each receive $12,500 to review and plan graduate programs in Northern Virginia, and 5) six additional positions were approved for the Extension Division. Mr. Ridenour then stated that the General Assembly stipulated that out-of-state students must pay 94.4% of their instructional costs (they currently pay 88%). Additionally, the General Assembly also recognized that more students will need financial aid by authorizing $475,000 in support for that purpose.

Dr. McComas then provided information related to a possible fourth round of budget cuts of up to 6.5%. Mr. Ridenour prefaced this discussion by stating that the $200 million reserve fund would be used prior to the imposition of another round of reductions. Dr. McComas then stated that provisions for a state employee furlough were removed, although he noted that individual agencies could still impose a mandatory furlough to meet deficits, especially if that action resulted in fewer layoffs. Mr. Ridenour asked Council to remember that the Research and Extension divisions were at greater risk for further reductions, as the $7.3 million raised through tuition increases would not be available to these two areas.

Ms. Vargo, representing the Graduate Student Assembly, commented that graduate school admissions are on the decline at this university, principally as a result of increased tuition and reduced stipend levels. Dr. McComas recognized her concerns and indicated that many individuals and constituencies are also troubled by these issues. Dr. Kingston, for example, reported the results of an informal survey in the chemistry department which revealed that Virginia Tech is "dead last" in financial support when tuition is subtracted from stipends. Dr. McComas concluded that this university would continue to work to reverse this adverse funding trend for graduate education.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
April 1, 1991

Dr. James D. McComas called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Present:J. McComas, C. Forbes, R. Smoot, M. Ridenour, E.F. Carlisle, J. Hillison, T. Goodale, C. Steger, P. Gherman, L. Harris, G. Hooper, R. Heterick, Helen Crawford (for H. Doswald), J. Johnson (for J. Nichols), J. Buffer, S.J. Ritchey, Blair Meldrum (for P. Eyre), L. Moore, D. Hewitt, A.J. Davis, C. Carrig, Janet Johnson (for F. Thye), R.A. Heller, L. Geyer, N. Eiss, D. Kingston, J. Crittenden, N. Marriott, S. Batie, A. Snoke, Russ Cole (for L. Barroso), M. Byrne, K. Mottley, Jennifer Tank (for C. Vargo), P. Radcliffe, K. Konopka, M. Cacheris

Guests: Bill Burleson, Spectrum; Cornel N. Morton, Office of EO/AA; Lud Eng, Faculty Senate; Jim Budd, SGA;

Absent: R. Sorensen, L. Rees, R. Small, D. Adams, G.W. Clough

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda as distributed. The motion PASSED.

2. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF MARCH 4, 1991

The University Council minutes of the meeting of March 4, 1991 were approved as submitted.

3. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1990-91D, CONCERNING THE INTERNAL TRANSFERS OF STUDENTS.

For an explanation of the resolution, Dr. Carlisle called on Dr. Ezra Brown, who noted that there are a number of academic programs on campus that must limit student enrollments because of budgetary constraints or other programmatic restrictions. He pointed out, however, that there is no published information regarding the policies and procedures for limiting program enrollments, a situation that is not fair to students. Dr. Brown then explained that the proposed resolution requires colleges or departments that wish to restrict internal transfers of students or to restrict the total number of students in their programs to seek university approval for doing so. Such a proposal will include a rationale statement, criteria for enrollment, method of communication to students, effective dates, contingency plans, and a statement on how the restriction might impact other programs. Approval of the department/program, the college curriculum committee, the college dean, the Commission on Undergraduate Studies, and the Provost will be required.

Dr. Crittenden inquired whether colleges or departments who already restrict enrollments must formally submit the required proposal, or whether they would be "grandfathered in." Dr. Brown noted that the resolution requires a college/department to justify every four years the continuation of a restricted program. Thus, programs that wish to maintain current enrollment restrictions would be required to submit a written request four years from the effective date of this resolution. Dr. Brown added that

restricted programs would be so designated in the undergraduate catalog and in course timetables.
The resolution was carried forward for second reading.

4. IN SUCCESSIVE MOTIONS, COUNCIL APPROVED THE MINUTES OF THE FOLLOWING MEETINGS.

a. Commission on Extension, February 5, 1991.

b. Commission on Faculty Affairs, February 8 and 22, 1991.

c. Commission on Graduate Studies, February 6 and 20, 1991.

d. Commission on Student Affairs, January 17 and February 7, 1991.

5. FOR INFORMATION

a. Minutes of the Computer Committee, February 6 and March 6, 1991.

Dr. Heterick reported that the committee continues to address issues related to acceptable use of computer systems and networks.

b. Minutes of the University Committee on Athletics, December 13, 1991.

Dr. Crittenden requested clarification of the discussion on special admissions policy. Dr. Carlisle reported that the committee is considering two issues: 1) can earth science be used to meet this university's admissions requirements in science, and 2) should the present math requirements be modified? Dr. Crittenden expressed concern that changes are being made outside the governance system. Dr. Carlisle responded that no changes have been made to Virginia Tech's current admissions requirements and, furthermore, no changes will be made unless approved by all the proper constituencies in the appropriate manner. Dr. Crittenden then stated that the current special admissions procedures have never been formally approved by all the units of the governance system. In response, Dr. Carlisle provided a brief history of special admissions and stated that it had been discussed by both the Faculty Senate and the Commission on Undergraduate Studies. He added that admissions procedures are administrative when they do not effectively change Virginia Tech's admissions requirements. Any change that involves admissions standards will be submitted for review by the governance system. Dr. Crittenden reiterated his belief that these special admissions policies have not been voted on by CUS, the Faculty Senate, or University Council and that they should be.

c. Minutes of the University Committee on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action, February 12, 1991.

d. Minutes of the University Communications Resources Committee, January 30, 1990.

e. Report from the Joint Task Force on University Council, Commissions, and Committees.

Dr. McComas called on Dr. Moore to provide information about how and when Council will review the Task Force Report. Dr. Moore reported that the Task Force would be circulating a final report on Wednesday, April 3rd. He asked that all previous copies of the document be discarded and recommended that the first reading of the report take place on April 11th, with the second reading to occur at one of this year's remaining University Council meetings. The report contains two resolutions: one concerning the composition of University Council, and the second addressing the number, structure, and charges of the university commissions. He added that the report contains provisions for two additional commissions (alternatives to the proposed Commission on Academic

Affairs and the Commission on Research and Public Service). Dr. McComas thanked Dr. Moore and his committee for their considerable efforts. After discussion of possible dates, an additional University Council meeting was scheduled for Thursday, April 25th, at 4:00 p.m., in the President's Boardroom, to discuss the report.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. McComas spoke briefly about the recent drug problems at several University of Virginia fraternities. He noted that drugs are problematic at many educational institutions in this state and stressed the importance of providing a drug-free environment for learning. Dr. McComas then noted that alcohol abuse continues to be a more pervasive problem at high schools and universities in Virginia. He added that Virginia Tech attempts to closely monitor all fraternities both on- and off-campus. Dr. McComas recognized the work of Dr. Goodale and his staff for their work in the areas of drug and alcohol abuse education and prevention.

Dr. Goodale indicated that law enforcement agencies in Montgomery County are working closely with Virginia Tech to curb alcohol and drug abuse. He stated, for example, that there were 600 student violations of the underage drinking law last year alone. He also stressed the seriousness of providing false identifications for underage students and described the consequences of one such incident (a Virginia Tech student was convicted of manufacturing false identifications and is now serving 3-10 years in prison). He stated that while drug use is certainly of concern at Virginia Tech, alcohol abuse continues to be a more serious problem, making up 68% of the disciplinary cases in residence halls on campus. He acknowledged the support of the student leadership in Virginia Tech's risk management program.

7. QUESTION/ANSWER SESSION

Dr. Crittenden asked if the recent investigation of Stanford University's improper use of overhead funds might have a spillover effect at Virginia Tech. Dr. McComas responded that while he felt the public image of higher education in general would suffer as a result of this incident, Virginia Tech has maintained strict internal controls regarding the use of overhead income. He did not envision any similar problems at this institution, but assured Council that a review had recently been undertaken to be doubly sure we are not vulnerable.

Ms. Melissa Byrne, President-elect of the SGA, introduced Ms. Mary Cacheris, the new President of the Class of 1992.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
April 11, 1991

Dr. James D. McComas called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

Present:J. McComas, C. Forbes, M. Ridenour, E.F. Carlisle, T. Goodale, P. Gherman, L. Harris, G. Hooper, R. Heterick, George Crofts (for H. Doswald), J. Nichols, R. Sorensen, John Crunkilton (for J. Buffer), G.W. Clough, L. Moore, D. Hewitt, C. Carrig, F. Thye, R. Small, L. Rees, L. Geyer, N. Eiss, D. Kingston, J. Crittenden, Ludeman Eng (for S. Batie), A. Snoke, L. Barroso, M. Byrne, K. Mottley, P. Larkin,

Guests: Bill Burleson, Spectrum; Cornel N. Morton, Office of EO/AA; Jim Budd, student; Clara B. Cox, CSAC; Sherilyn McConnell, CSAC; Joanne Eustis, Governance Task Force; Russ Cole, CSAC; Ezra Brown, CUS; Pamela Orcutt, CSAC

Absent: R. Smoot, J. Hillison, C. Steger, S.J. Ritchey, P. Eyre, A.J. Davis, R.A. Heller, N. Marriott, D. Adams, C. Vargo, P. Radcliffe, M. Cacheris

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Dr. McComas made two changes to the order of business. A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda as amended. The motion PASSED.

2. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF APRIL 1, 1991

The University Council minutes of the meeting of April 1, 1991 were approved as submitted.

3. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1990-91D, CONCERNING THE INTERNAL TRANSFERS OF STUDENTS. FIRST READING, APRIL 1, 1991.

Dr. Carlisle moved that the resolution be approved. The motion CARRIED.

4. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON RESEARCH RESOLUTION 1990-91A, CONCERNING SPECIAL RESEARCH FACULTY APPOINTMENTS.

Dr. Hooper explained that the growth in research and related activities at Virginia Tech has necessitated the modification of the FACULTY HANDBOOK as it relates to special research faculty appointments. The proposed resolution would add the classifications of senior research associate and postdoctoral associate to the HANDBOOK, redefine some of the existing classifications, and would clarify matters relating to the fringe benefits for these individuals. Dr. Hewitt noted that the qualifications for appointment to research scientist seem to be consistent with those for assistant professor, and those for senior research scientist are equivalent to those for full professor. Consequently, he inquired, is there a research appointment that equates to the level of associate professor? Dr. Hooper responded that while there was no "middle category," as such, the qualifications for research scientist are equivalent to those for an assistant OR associate professor.

When Dr. Geyer inquired if this resolution had been reviewed by the Commission on Faculty Affairs, Dr. Hooper responded that had not been. Dr. Geyer

then made a motion to refer the resolution to the Commission on Faculty Affairs. The motion CARRIED.

5. FIRST READING, REPORT OF THE JOINT TASK FORCE ON UNIVERSITY COUNCIL, COMMISSIONS, AND COMMITTEES: RECOMMENDED CONSTITUTION REVISIONS, APRIL 3, 1991.

Dr. Moore initiated discussion of the Report by acknowledging the assistance of the members of the Joint Task Force (JTF): Rosemary Bleiszner, James R. Budd, Russell D. Cole, Joanne D. Eustis, Daniel R. Farkas, David L. Lush, James D. Riddle, Patrick F. Scanlon, Richard E. Sorensen, and Anthony M. Townsend. He then provided the history of the document, initiated in December 1988, and stated that it represents a negotiated effort to unite this diverse university and provide a vehicle for improving the quality of life for the entire Virginia Tech community. Dr. Moore then provided a broad overview of the proposed university governance system, highlighting the following points: 1) all major university activities are represented in this structure of interlocking memberships; 2) the development of administrative internships for faculty and staff is proposed in order to further enhance an informed and knowledgeable citizenry; 3) governance becomes a year-long activity; 4) the size of University Council is increased to allow for more comprehensive representation (a maximum of 58-60 members, depending on the number of commissions); and 5) the number and configuration of the commissions is modified so as to better integrate all major university activities into the governance structure. Dr. Moore noted that the Report stresses shared leadership and provides for voting representation at all levels, including undergraduate and graduate students, classified staff, and non-administrative faculty.

On the subject of University Council membership, Dr. Moore described the proposed "congressional model" that includes the chairs of the commissions and the Council on Human Rights and Social Responsibility; representatives from the library faculty, extension faculty/staff, EO/AA, Alumni Relations, and the African-American community; three additional staff representatives; and two additional students. He stated that the new model permits important interest groups to participate, provides for comprehensive representation, and insures the representation of minorities. Dr. Moore then explained the rationale for designating a member of the African-American community on University Council (but not members of other minority groups), noting that other groups would have representation through the University Advisory Council on Human Rights and Social Responsibility. While Dr. Moore emphasized that Black faculty are eligible for election to any governance body, he acknowledged that they have not often been elected. (Dr. Randy Grayson later pointed out that there has been only one Black member on the Faculty Senate.) Dr. Moore explained that the JTF viewed the African-American seat on University Council as a short-term way of remedying that fact. However, several members of Council still expressed concern that African-Americans were singled out for Council representation, while other minorities were excluded.

Mr. Patrick Larkin expressed concern about the year-round governance structure, noting that only a few student leaders are required to be on campus during the summer. Dr. Sorensen responded University Council permits elected alternates with voting privileges, or substitute members with voting privileges.

There was some discussion about the proposed system of faculty/staff internships in University Governance and the necessary release time associated with that system. Several individuals suggested reducing the number of these internships and clarifying the issue of release time. Mr. Larkin also spoke to the need for students becoming more involved in and educated about university governance. He voiced his concern, however, about competing classroom obligations. Dr. Moore agreed that this is a valid issue and thought it should be addressed by the Student Government Association.

Dr. Moore briefly described how the commissions and advisory councils were

formed or restructured. He stated that the proposed structure: 1) provides for participation by students, staff, and faculty; 2) brings the classified staff, budgeting, planning, human relations, communications and related areas into the governance system; and 3) pools appropriate interest areas to attain a minimum number of commissions. On the last point, Dr. Moore noted that the present Commissions on Graduate Studies and Undergraduate Studies would be consolidated in a Commission on Undergraduate Affairs, while the Commission on Research would be expanded to include Research and Public Service. He added, however, that the JTF suggests that these two commissions be established with a sunset provision, meaning the new constitution would be written so that at the end of five years University Council can determine whether to continue this structure (described in Appendix C and D). After several members spoke against combining graduate and undergraduate studies, and others about combining research and public service, Dr. Moore stressed that these are issues that will be voted on during Second Reading on April 26. He reminded Council members that written amendments are requested by April 17.

Regarding the University Standing Committees, Dr. Moore stated that the commissions will be given the responsibility to study and recommend to University Council the establishment of such committees as are deemed necessary. He also stressed that every standing committee will report directly to at least one commission and will have on it a member of the commission to which it reports. Dr. Moore asked Council members to remember that the various standing committees listed in the document and their individual charges are only suggestions. Once formed, the committees will formulate their own mission statement. Regarding membership on the standing committees, the JTF recommends that, where possible, undergraduates, graduate students, faculty, and staff are to be ELECTED to serve.

Dr. Moore then described two new advisory councils -- the University Advisory Council on Human Rights and Social Responsibility and the University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning. He noted that these bodies would have a different relationship to the governance system because of the "confidential nature of certain charges" and because they will report directly to the President and to University Council. Dr. Moore pointed out that while the chair of the Advisory Council on Human Rights and Social Responsibility will be a member of University Council, the Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning will be represented on Council by its co-chairs (Sr. Vice President/Provost and Exec. Vice President/Chief Business Officer).

In summarizing the discussion of the Joint Task Force Report, Dr. Moore indicated that University Council would be asked to consider two resolutions concerning the following: 1) the structure and composition of University Council; 2) the structure and composition of commissions and advisory councils. He added that Council would also be asked to accept the sense of the document.

The resolutions were carried forward for Second Reading.

6. IN SUCCESSIVE MOTIONS, COUNCIL APPROVED THE MINUTES OF THE FOLLOWING MEETINGS.

a. Commission on Graduate Studies, March 6, 1991.

Dr. Hooper made reference to the previously submitted CGS minutes of January 16 in which the discussion of the "I" Grade was excepted from approval. With that discussion now resolved, Dr. Hooper asked that those minutes be approved in their entirety. The motion carried.

b. Commission on Research, January 23 and February 13, 1991.

Dr. Hooper distributed to Council members a proposed motion regarding the Professional Practices Institute (discussed in February 13 minutes). He

explained that this item was reviewed by the Commissions on Research, Extension, and Graduate Studies, and by the Faculty Senate where it has received initial endorsement. Dr. Hooper stated that with the help of a broad-based committee, the Commission on Research will be developing this summer or fall a resolution to establish the Professional Practices Institute.

c. Commission on Student Affairs, February 21 and March 7, 1991.

Mr. Kevin Mottley pointed out to Council the discussion in the February 21 minutes of the Two-Town Trolley. He noted that there would be a public forum to discuss this issue on April 23rd by the Blacksburg Town Council. Mr. Mottley also highlighted a discussion of class gifts in the March 7 minutes.

d. Commission on Undergraduate Studies, February 11, 1991.

7. FOR INFORMATION

a. Minutes of the University Committee on Athletics, February 7, 1991.

b. Minutes of the University Communications Resources Committee, February 27, 1991.

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS

At the request of Dr. McComas, Dr. Eng introduced the recently-elected Faculty Senate Officers: President, John Hillison; Vice President, Leon Geyer; and Secretary-Treasurer, Joseph Falkinham.

Dr. McComas then described to Council the state-wide study group that has been formed by Governor Wilder to look at drug-abuse on campus and the issue of assault and date-rape. He noted that an issue under consideration by this group is initiation of mandatory drug testing of all incoming freshmen and random testing of upperclassmen. He asked for Council's views on this subject. Mr. Larkin noted that because universities nationwide are becoming increasingly competitive for new admissions, instituting such a policy could deter effective recruitment for Virginia's universities. Mr. Gherman pointed out that if the policy is enacted, it should apply to all state institutions, not just colleges and universities. Dr. Geyer expressed his opposition to the policy, stating that it would set a "dangerous precedent." Ms. Byrne also disapproved of the policy as being punitive, rather than educational. Dr. Crittenden voiced his approval of the policy, PROVIDING that some substantive action be taken if a student is found to be using illegal substances. Dr. Snoke thought the policy unwise and impractical, especially since it ignores the more pervasive problem of alcohol abuse. Ms. Barroso expressed her belief that Virginia Tech should test for AIDS rather than drugs.

Dr. Moore reminded Council that written amendments to the Joint Task Force Report are requested by 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, the 17th of April.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
April 25, 1991

Dr. James D. McComas called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Present:J. McComas, R. Smoot, E.F. Carlisle, J. Hillison, T. Goodale, Doug McAlister (for C. Steger), P. Gherman, L. Harris, G. Hooper, Erv Blythe (for R. Heterick), Robert Paterson (for H. Doswald), J. Nichols, R. Sorensen, Dianne Robertshaw (for J. Buffer), Jim Marchman (for G.W. Clough), L. Moore, D. Hewitt, F. Thye, L. Rees, L. Geyer, N. Eiss, D. Kingston, C. Carrig, J. Crittenden, N. Marriott, Ludeman Eng (for S. Batie), A. Snoke, L. Barroso, Anthony Townsend (for D. Adams), C. Vargo, M. Byrne, K. Mottley, P. Larkin

Guests: Bill Burleson, Spectrum; Charles Stott, CSAC; Russ Cole, CSAC; Sheri McConnell, CSAC; Clara Cox, CSAC; Randy Grayson, PPWS; Rita Purdy, CUS; Kennith Martin, Extension Faculty Association; Charles Pinder, Black Caucus; Dixon Hanna, CAUS; Norrine Bailey Spencer, CUS; Cornel N. Morton, Office of EO/AA

Absent: C. Forbes, M. Ridenour, S.J. Ritchey, P. Eyre, A.J. Davis, R. Small, R.A. Heller, D. Adams, P. Radcliffe

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda as distributed. The motion PASSED.

2. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF APRIL 11, 1991

The University Council minutes of the meeting of April 11, 1991 were approved as submitted.

3. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF APRIL 15, 1991

The University Council minutes of the meeting of April 15, 1991 were approved with modifications to 1) Dr. Marriott's discussion of the establishment of an Academy of Public Service Excellence, and 2) Dr. Snoke's description of the minimum TOEFL requirements for international students.

4. FOR INFORMATION

a. Report on SCHEV's recommendations for new graduate degree programs.

As background information, Dr. Hooper described to Council the four decisions that SCHEV can render when evaluating new graduate study proposals. He stated that SCHEV can 1) encourage further development of the proposal, 2) endorse it, 3) approve it, or 4) deny it. Dr. Hooper then announced SCHEV's recommendations for several specific program proposals, as follows:

o Endorsed the M.A. in Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Management
o Denied the Ph.D. in Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Management
o Endorsed the M.A. in Spanish Studies

o Denied the Ph.D. in Exercise Physiology
o Endorsed the M.A. in Philosophy
o Encouraged the Ph.D. in Political Science
o Endorsed the M.A. in Music

He elaborated that denied program requests can be reevaluated after two years, while "endorsed" program proposals are fine-tuned (usually involving financial considerations) until approved by SCHEV at one of its monthly meetings. He advised Council members that the sponsoring departments receive detailed feedback from SCHEV on proposals as does the Provost's Office. Those interested can contact him for specific details concerning the programmatic decisions noted above.

5. IN SUCCESSIVE MOTIONS, COUNCIL APPROVED THE MINUTES OF THE FOLLOWING MEETINGS.

a. Commission on Research, March 27, 1991.

In reference to the discussion of special faculty research appointments, Dr. Hooper informed Council that the language of that resolution is not yet final and is now under review by the Commission on Faculty Affairs.

6. SECOND READING, STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION CONSTITUTION. FIRST READING, APRIL 15, 1991.

Ms. Byrne moved adoption of the SGA Constitution.

The SGA Constitution was APPROVED.

7. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON GRADUATE STUDIES AND COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1990-91E, CONCERNING THE INCOMPLETE GRADE. FIRST READING, APRIL 15, 1991.

Dr. Carlisle moved approval of the resolution.

The motion CARRIED.

8. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON EXTENSION RESOLUTION 1990-91A, CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ACADEMY OF PUBLIC SERVICE EXCELLENCE. FIRST READING, APRIL 15, 1991.

Dr. Marriott moved adoption of the resolution and deferred to Mr. Kennith Martin, President of the Extension Faculty Association, to provide additional rationale for passing the resolution. Mr. Martin noted that academic requirements for excellence in extension and public service are consistent with those for research and instruction. And while there is an Academy for Teaching Excellence, he observed, it has no counterpart in the Extension Division. He then read Virginia Tech's mission statement, highlighting within this statement additional justification for establishing the Academy. Finally, he stressed that the university is now encouraging greater public service, further justifying the creation of an Academy of Public Service Excellence.

Dr. Hillison reported that the Faculty Senate voted not to endorse the resolution (10 opposed, 7 in favor, 6 abstentions) for several reasons: 1) there are already reward systems for Extension faculty, 2) the definition of "public service" is ambiguous, and 3) there is no similar academy for excellence in Research.

Dr. Doug McAlister, Assistant Director for Community Resource Development, spoke in favor of the resolution, citing the Commission on Extension's unanimous support of the Academy, as well as CFA's prior endorsement of the concept of the Academy.

Dr. McComas then called for the vote. The motion CARRIED.

9. SECOND READING, REPORT FROM THE JOINT TASK FORCE (JTF) ON UNIVERSITY COUNCIL, COMMISSIONS, AND COMMITTEES: RECOMMENDED CONSTITUTION REVISIONS, APRIL 3, 1991. FIRST READING, APRIL 11, 1991.

Dr. Moore prefaced discussion of the Report by stating that approval of the Joint Task Force Report does not directly affect the constitutional by-laws of University Council; they continue to be in force. He also summarized the minor corrections and clarifications to the document (listed on one of the attachments), and distributed two organizational charts for the proposed new governance structure. Dr. Moore then reviewed the order of voting on the Report's recommendations, beginning with the two resolutions contained therein.

o RESOLUTION 4.2 ON ADVISORY COUNCILS AND COMMISSIONS

Dr. Moore moved adoption of the resolution recommending six commissions and two advisory councils. Dr. McComas then called for discussion.

Dr. Hooper moved approval of his proposed amendment to the resolution allowing for both a Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies AND a Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies (APPENDIX C: ALTERNATIVES FOR ACADEMIC COMMISSIONS). Dr. Marriott noted that both the Faculty Senate and the Commission on Extension support the two separate commissions. Mr. Townsend, representing the Graduate Student Assembly, also endorsed Dr. Hooper's amendment. The amendment, which provides for continuation of two separate commissions, CARRIED.

Dr. Moore moved approval of the amendment to 9.1.2 to add the University Librarian to the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies. The motion CARRIED.

Dr. Moore moved approval of the amendment to accept Appendix D (section 10.0) which would replace the proposed Commission on Research and Public Service with a Commission on Research AND a Commission on Public Service and Extension. The motion CARRIED.

Dr. Moore then moved approval of Resolution 4.2 in its entirety as amended. The motion CARRIED.

o RESOLUTION 3.1 ON UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

Dr. Moore next moved approval of the resolution establishing the membership of University Council. Dr. McComas called for discussion.

Dr. Crittenden presented and moved approval of his amendment to Resolution 3.1, which eliminates representation from the African American community. He argued that if one "special interest" group is singled out for Council representation, "all special interest groups not directly associated with instruction, research, and extension, as in the case with the BFSC [Black Faculty and Staff Caucus] and BOC [Black Organizations Council], should be represented equally." Dr. Hillison reported that the Faculty Senate voted "rather overwhelmingly" to endorse Dr. Crittenden's amendment.

Dr. Moore, Dr. Sorensen, and Mr. Townsend spoke to the history and rationale for the Task Force's decision to include an African American representative on Council. Specifically, Dr. Moore stressed that even though African Americans are by far the largest minority at Virginia Tech, there have been few African American representatives on any major governing body at this institution.

Dr. Goodale spoke against the amendment, stating that including an African American on University Council represents a move toward both equal opportunity and affirmative action, and would result in a more

democratic system of government. Mr. Gherman also voiced his opposition to the amendment, stating that University Council should be as large as it needs to be to represent all constituencies. Others who spoke against the amendment included Dr. Hooper, Ms. Byrne, Mr. Mottley, Dr. Geyer, Ms. Barroso, Dr. Eng, and Dr. Carlisle. Dr. Charles Pinder, President of the Black Faculty and Staff Caucus, also supported the need for African American participation on University Council.

Dr. Goodale called for the question and the motion was accepted. Dr. McComas then called for the vote on the amendment to eliminate the seat reserved for an African American. The motion FAILED.

Dr. Moore introduced and moved adoption of amendment to reserve two chairs on University Council for representatives of the African American community -- one elected by the Black Faculty and Staff Caucus, and one elected by the Black Organizations Council [representing students]. Those who voiced their support of the amendment included Dr. Goodale, Mr. Townsend, Dr. Hooper, and Dr. Sorensen. Dr. Grayson also spoke at length about the need for African American participation on University Council, stating that it could have important political ramifications for the future. He also said that Black student representation on Council could provide a recruiting point for Virginia Tech.

Dr. Moore called for the question and the motion was accepted. Dr. McComas then called for the vote on the amendment to include two representatives from the African American community. The motion CARRIED.

Dr. Moore introduced Dr. Kingston's amendment to review at the end of ten years the necessity to have a reserved seat(s) on University Council for the African American community. Dr. Kingston moved adoption of the amendment, voicing his hope that African American participation in university governance would increase through the regular election process, thus reducing the necessity for a reserved seat on Council. Mr. Gherman spoke briefly against the amendment, reminding Council that the representation of no other individual or group is slated for future review.

Dr. McComas called for the vote. The motion FAILED.

Dr. Moore moved approval of the amendment to include the chairs of the eight Commissions. The motion CARRIED.

o Dr. Moore moved to accept the sense of the Joint Task Force Report, recommending, however, that the proposed Faculty/Staff Internships in University Governance be opened to all faculty and staff members (rather than reserved for designated constituencies). The motion CARRIED.

10. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Having thanked Dr. Moore for his extraordinary efforts as chair of the Joint Task Force, Dr. McComas addressed Council on the importance of maintaining a sense of community. He noted that these have been challenging times for Virginia Tech -- not only in budgetary terms, but also with regard to human relations -- and asked Council members to recognize that "people of good will can differ." In closing, he stressed the importance of working together to support the diverse constituencies on this campus.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg