

**COMMISSION ON UNIVERSITY SUPPORT
MEETING MINUTES
November 19, 2009
Burruss Hall, Room 325**

PRESENT:

Members: Leslie O'Brien, Chair, Jim Tokuhisa, Richard Stratton, Daniel Wubah, Brandon Carroll, Michael A. Evans, Sherwood Wilson, Amro Ahmed, Bradley Scott, Pat Rodgers (for Erv Blythe), Angela Hayes (for Betsy Flanagan), Tom Tillar, Jim McCoy (for Mike Coleman), Guy Sims (for Ed Spencer).

Recorder: Vickie Chiocca, Administrative Assistant

1. Approval of agenda

L. O'Brien called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

2. Announcement of approval of October 15, 2009 minutes

L. O'Brien announced that minutes from last meeting were posted and electronically approved; asked for any comments or questions. There were none.

3. Old Business

Resolution on representation from the Commission to the Transportation and Parking committee was distributed ahead of meeting and presented for second reading and vote. L. O'Brien wasn't certain how far through governance it would need to go but will check with Kim O'Rourke in the President's office. Motion was made to approve the resolution, seconded and approved unanimously. This will probably go into effect next year.

L. O'Brien began the discussion on the Computing and Communications Resources committee that reports to the Commission but had been disbanded.

The question came up of whether to change the membership or reconstitute or officially disband the committee and take out of University Governance or, some other change yet to discuss.

L. O'Brien then reported on meeting she had with IT on October 23, 2009 where Pat Rodgers and Erv Blythe were present along with most of their senior administrators.

In early 2000, the committee was disbanded by the Commission on University Support because it was seen as too unwieldy and didn't really serve the purpose that it was established to serve.

The charge and the membership of the committee is too broad in scope to effectively report what's happening. The IT committee pushed back against disbanding this committee but it was disbanded anyway, so it hasn't been meeting.

To fill that void, Erv Blythe decided they needed to try something new. Since, IT has evolved into at least 5 areas they developed a similar structure for the IT Advisory Committee with the intention to create a dialogue with the university community. There are currently 5 “subcommittees” that are regularly meeting and this has been in play about 1 ½ years.

The membership is somewhat self-selective; people who are interested in the issues of IT are invited or ask to be appointed to these committees.

L. O’Brien distributed the information on the current committee/subcommittees (Information Technology Advisory Committees) along with the charge and governance structure of the Computing and Communications Resources committee.

The committees that are in place right now don’t quite fit with the charge. Members or non-members may submit topics for review to the advisory committee. The membership has expanded as needed for both political buy-in as well as technical support.

One area that doesn’t seem well represented is student membership; the SGA has been invited to submit names for membership. B. Carroll said he met with Judy Lilly and others in IT to make sure they have student feedback on all their subcommittees. They have 5 students identified for each of the subcommittees. L. O’Brien noted that student representation is one area that differed from the original charge/structure of the committee.

Most subcommittees post their minutes online and she was able to find some, but not all of the IT committees minutes. Pat Rodgers said they need to make them easier to find. They meet twice a semester.

L. O’Brien asked for input from the commission on how to proceed with this issue. Pat Rodgers said all 5 memberships of the individual committees meet annually as a group.

L. O’Brien proposed the following questions for discussion:

1. Would there be some formal action needed?
2. What should be the reporting structure?
3. Do these committees fulfill the spirit of what was intended as the original charge?

L. O’Brien stated it would be good to resolve this question of this committee before the end of this academic year and before the new commission begins. P. Rodgers pointed out some advantages of the current structure:

- You’ve got individuals involved that are interested in each topic
- There will be minutes from these advisory committees, available online that anyone can take a look out
- Erv Blythe would be glad to come to the Commission to update and answer any questions that result

- The key is communication with the Commission

Discussion followed on how committee communicates and reports to the Commission and on the structure of the committee. Extensive discussion took place on how to integrate the current committee structure into the governance structure and regarding the selection process for the committee members:

L. O'Brien noted that this Commission has the authority to disband or continue the committee and pointed out these specific questions to address:

1. Do these subcommittees and their reporting structure correspond to what the governance structure asks for this committee to do?
2. The committee has been disbanded so do we feel that it is adequate to use this current sort of structure in place of one committee with the members elected as laid out in the charge?
3. Do we feel that this is adequate or no?
4. Even if we feel that it is adequate is there something that we need to do?

There was general agreement that the current IT Advisory committee/subcommittee structure probably has adequate representation to meet the governance bylaw requirements, but the appointment process differs since it is by self-selection versus the process set forth in the governance bylaws. The Commission members then discussed methods for having the committee representation recognized by the University Council as well as the reporting mechanism between the Computing committee and the Commission. A proposal was made to do a resolution to increase the student representation as well as possibly adding a Commission representative to the committee. In addition, a chair and vice-chair could be elected in the near future. For the next meeting L. O'Brien stated we will summarize these discussions, send the IT committee minutes for review and have further discussion on choosing the direction to take and/or writing a resolution. There was also interest in having chairs of the IT subcommittees periodically attend Commission meetings to report on their work.

4. Reports from Committee Chairs/Representatives

J. Tokuhisa highlighted some of the major things from the Oct. 15, 2009 Transportation and parking committee meeting. There was a guest speaker on carpooling. There doesn't seem to be available resources to sustain the carpooling and limited access to find out potential car poolers. The speaker asked if the committee could modify things in that regard. However, they learned because of privacy concerns that is very difficult to do. The other issue is whether groups that aren't currently part of the carpool program, for instance, Corporate Research Center (CRC) and Virginia Tech Foundation (VTF), could be added to the program, but this would be difficult to do. The committee decided to focus on two issues in the coming year:

1. Trying to recover more funds and the possibility that we could get more funds through the athletic reimbursement. We decided to invite relevant people there to come and talk to the committee; and
2. CRC permits: currently CRC permit holders have the ability to park for free on campus. There was a concern that this policy might have been good early on when there were a limited number of CRC folks, but as it stands now and looking into the future there could be many more CRC permit holders who would have this ability to park for free on the main campus. There was a concern that we should look into charging them for parking.

Jim McCoy briefed the committee on the October Energy and Sustainability committee meeting. The bulk of the meeting was spent discussing proposed modifications to the Energy and Water policy. Executive Order (EO) 82 mandated state agencies either develop an Environmental Management System or policy that would reflect energy and water usage and waste reduction. Through conversions we had on environmental quality it was pretty clear that the best route for the University to comply with EO 82 is to take existing policy 5505 and augment it to incorporate items from EO 82 in the policy. They are currently working on proposed changes and distributed these for the members to review. They are close to having a final ready for executive review. They have until January 1st and are confident they will meet that deadline. Residence Dining Programs did a presentation on sustainability efforts undertaken by dining services with respect to waste reduction and use of local food being grown in the surrounding area. We also talked about some of the initiatives that Facilities Services is currently engaged in:

1. Modification of thermostat settings (74^o in summer; 68^o in winter)
2. Set back of air handling units in certain buildings and certain times, focusing on 3rd shift so climate is not same as when occupied with further reduction during break periods.

5. Acceptance of Committee Minutes

Committee minutes were accepted electronically for filing with no further discussion

6. Next meeting date

Next meeting will take place on January 21, 2010

The Commission adjourned at 2:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Vickie Chiocca