

**COMMISSION ON UNIVERSITY SUPPORT  
MEETING MINUTES  
February 20, 2020  
130 Burruss Hall – 2:00 p.m.**

**ATTENDEES**

**Members Present:** Judy Alford, Jonathan Bradley, William Dougherty *for Scott Midkiff*, Julie Farmer *for Charlie Phlegar*, Holly Bost *for Ken Miller*, Jacob Lahne, Phil Miskovic, Ryan Speer, and Robert Sumichrast (via Zoom)

**Members Absent:** John Benner, Martha Glass, Chris Kiwus, Bradley Klein (with notice), Polly Middleton, Ken Smith, Benjamin Tracy, Stephen Webber, and Sarah Woodward

**Guests:** Richard Ashley, Ken McCreary, Denny Cochrane, and Sarah Myers

**Recorder:** Kayla Smith

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

The Chair, Jonathan Bradley, called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Due to a lack of quorum, this item was skipped.

**3. Approval of the January 16, 2020 minutes**

Due to a lack of quorum, this item was skipped. These minutes will be distributed for an electronic vote.

**4. Old Business**

**a) Next Steps for the Software Procurement Discussion**

In advance of the meeting, William Dougherty provided an written update from the IT Services & Systems Committee (Attachment A). IT has also scheduled a meeting with Pamplin College of Business leadership to discuss their concerns. Dr. Pinkney has also been invited to provide a presentation at a future Commission meeting on the Institutional Excellence initiatives that are in flight to help address this topic.

Ken McCreary, Chief of Staff for the Division of Information Technology, provided additional context. The IT leadership team is looking at ServiceNow processes and considering requests such as adding additional requestors. They intend to assign a user experience expert to review the software procurement process from a user perspective and consider potential improvements that will help the university community members who are using the system. He pointed out that ITPALS can change the requestors when needed to address transitions and can add watchers to the ticket to help improve transparency.

A CUS member asked if there is a policy, procedure, or best practice document regarding who should be the requestor? IT cannot provide a policy or procedure for this, as it will vary across departments. However, IT leadership will also be talking to ITPALS about potential reporting mechanisms that can help resolve some of the current

confusion. They acknowledge that organization & streamlining of existing information to aid transparency is needed.

CUS members shared positive comments and feedback about Cobblestone over previous method. However, they still had several questions/concerns:

- Individuals find it challenging to look for software by software name, type of tool, tasks useful for accomplishing, etc. (rather than by parent company/master contract name). Is it possible to add more tags to the system, etc.? Ken indicated that IT will explore this.
- Is there a formal process for requesting resolution for long-pending items? Not at this time. Though 4-HELP does take a little action through surveys to follow-up now.
- How can individuals get support/help identifying alternatives if a piece of software is taking too long? Ken will think about a potential resolution.
- Members know of more open-source licenses that should be investigated. Is there a preferred manner for submitting those? Send to Ken for consideration.
- Student awareness/access to existing software – could a resolution to this concern be a potential collaboration among Libraries, TLOS, and ITPALS? Jonathan will look into.

The Chair encouraged members to send any additional comments to him or to William Dougherty so IT can address. He also thanked IT for their responsiveness and collaboration on this topic.

#### **b) Follow-up Discussion on Winter Closing Presentation**

Jonathan Bradley shared some feedback that had been provided to him following the last meeting (reflected in the January meeting minutes).

Jonathan reached out to the Commission on Staff Policies and Affairs (CSPA), Commission on AP Faculty Affairs (CAPFA), and the Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity (CEOD). At this point, he has only heard back from CAPFA. They are open to discussing whether the university should remain open during the 4 non-holiday days that currently comprise the winter closure. However, they did not want to address the staff leave issue as they feel that topic is better addressed by the bodies comprised predominately of staff employees.

Jonathan indicated that he had other conversations that verified the cost of remaining open was not a major consideration in the original decision to implement the winter closure. Security of facilities and a lack of classes (at the time the decision was originally made) were factors. The Libraries are receiving more requests from students to have those spaces available during the winter session. Would it be beneficial for some departments to have the flexibility to stay open?

One member noted that there are persistent issues with employees entering a leave-without-pay status under the current policy, which can impact their pay for the holidays, as well, and suggested that allowing flexibility may help.

Members questioned how the Commission could propose a change (write a Resolution, etc.). There is an existing university policy, overseen by Human Resources, that outlines the closure. The Chair indicated that the Commission would need to talk to

human resources, the budget office, and other groups on campus to build a solid case before drafting a Resolution to modify the policy, as financial and other impacts are often one of the first questions raised at University Council discussions. Jonathan will continue to collect information from other Commissions and administrative units and will plan to bring the topic back at a future meeting.

## **5. New Business**

### **a) Update from the Transportation & Parking Committee on E-Scooters**

Richard Ashley provided an update from the recent discussions at the Transportation and Parking Committee on e-scooters. He provided a handout for review, an email between Phil, Ryan and Rick related to potential actions in response to the recent Committee meeting (Attachment B). He also recommended that the members reference the Committee's minutes from December, and when available, the minutes from their February 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.

When the Committee met in December, Mike Mollenhauer, the Primary Investigator on the research project that has brought e-scooters to campus presented on their project. The research project is a collaboration among VTTI, Ford, & Spin. An ad hoc/working e-scooter committee was launched 6 months prior to launch to help inform policies & operating parameters. The Town of Blacksburg has voted to allow scooters in many areas, but Downtown does have restrictions. The purpose of the study is to evaluate and provide recommendations regarding scooter safety, operating parameters, infrastructure, & parking concerns, as well as whether they are a nuisance. There are 18 fixed cameras at various locations on campus to track use and provide data for the research project, as well as 50 scooters equipped with cameras. Rick indicated that in follow-up to the presentation, he had questions regarding IRB consent related to pedestrians and by-standers of e-scooter users.

At the Committee's February 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, Jeri Baker reported that Dwayne Pinkney has formed a Task Force to assess micro-mobility methods (i.e. personal transportation devices). This working group's considerations encompass more than e-scooters. Jeri will be reporting back to the Committee at their April meeting.

The Transportation and Parking Committee recommends that the Commission 1) have a presentation from Mike Mollenhauer and 2) clarify whether these policy issues belong at the Committee or the Commission level. Rich indicated that he and several other members have concerns that the implementation was treated as a research project rather than as a policy decision that went through governance approvals. They don't recommend terminating the study prematurely, but do have concerns about the precedent that has been set and whether there are lessons to be learned. He indicated that it seems several governance bodies should have been informed even if not part of the decision-making process.

### **b) Feedback on materials from the President's Committee on Governance**

Jonathan Bradley asked the members to provide any feedback from their constituents on the draft documents shared by the President's Committee on Governance. No comments were shared.

## **6. Updates from Reporting Committees**

### **a) Campus Development Committee**

Sarah Myers provided an overview of the Committee's October meeting, where the group received a briefing on the planning & design process, as well as an overview of the Innovation Campus. In November the Committee did not meet. In December, the Committee participated in a tour of the power/steam plant. The Chair expressed interest the Commission participating in a tour of the power/steam plant at a future meeting.

### **b) Energy & Sustainability Committee**

Denny Cochrane shared updates from the Energy & Sustainability Committee. Green RFP proposals were the main topic of discussion. An update was shared on progress of implementing the proposals approved last year, including re-lamping to accommodate LEDs & an HVAC system renovation at the Math Emporium, as well as several other LED lighting renovations. Current year Green RFP projects are almost ready to go forward for review and the Sustainability Office (which helps collect and verify the submissions) anticipates that approximately 20 will be reviewed by the Committee.

President Sands and Dwayne Pinkney have charged a group with reviewing the university's Climate Action Commitment – John Randolph is Chairing and Todd Schneck is Vice Chair. The group has formed 12 subcommittees and involved many, many community members, including faculty (current & former from the Energy and Sustainability Committee), staff, and students from across the university. The group's goal is to present a revision to Dr. Pinkney by close of the semester. The changes will then be presented for governance approval, on an accelerated path, in the fall. The overall goal is to take the revision to the Board of Visitors for approval in November 2020.

### **c) IT Services & Systems Committee**

William Dougherty provided an overview of the recent Infrastructure subcommittee meeting and referred everyone to the minutes that were distributed for further details. The group talked a little about phones, support for the Innovation Campus, cloud services, and broadband radio services.

### **d) Transportation & Parking Committee**

Part of the report for this Committee was provided under New Business (see item 5a. above). Richard Ashley indicated that in the interest of time, he deferred sharing additional information with the Commission until the next meeting.

## **7. Acceptance of Committee Minutes & Approval for Posting**

Due to a lack of quorum, this item was skipped. These minutes will be re-distributed for electronic acceptance.

### **a) Campus Development Committee**

- October 24 and December 5, 2019 Minutes

### **b) Energy & Sustainability Committee**

- October 28 and November 18, 2019 Minutes

## **8. Next Meeting Date**

- Thursday – March 19, 2020 – 2:00 p.m. – 130 Burruss Hall

The Chair shared reminders regarding the topics for the next meeting, including an Update on the Innovation Campus by Brandy Salmon and Election of Chair, Vice Chair, and Representative to the Transportation & Parking Committee for AY2020-21.

## **9. Adjourned** at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kayla Smith