

Minutes
University Council Meeting
September 4, 1989

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

Present: J. McComas, E.F. Carlisle, P. Scanlon, T. Goodale, P. Gherman, L. Harris, D. McAlister (for J. Johnson), G. Hooper, J. Nichols, C. Steger, H. Doswald, R. Sorensen, J. Crunkilton, J. Osborne (for P. Torgersen), S. Ritchey, P. Eyre, L. Moore, L. Arnold, L. Rees, R. Small, C. Carrig, R. Lovingood, E. Henneke, A. Davis, N. Eiss, L. Eng, D. Kingston, L. Geyer, S. Batie, A. Snoke, N. Marriott, J. Crittenden, P. Winfrey (for J. Riddle), D. Lush, A. Townsend, D. Gilbert, T. Murphy, P. Ratcliffe, B. Tyrrell, M. Miller

Guests: John Ashby, Spectrum; Jacob Perkins, SGA; Patrick Scanlon, Faculty Senate

Absent: C. Forbes, M. Ridenour, R. Smoot, R. Heterick

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. McComas opened the first University Council meeting of the 1989-90 academic year by introducing and welcoming two new members of Virginia Tech's administrative staff, Dr. E. Fred Carlisle, Senior Vice President and Provost; and Dr. Cornel Morton, Assistant to the President and Director of Affirmative Action. Dr. Carlisle, who was formerly Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost at Miami University of Ohio, joined the university in July. Dr. Cornel Morton, who held a similar position at the University of Toledo, assumed his current responsibilities in mid-August.

Dr. McComas then asked Dr. Goodale to update Council on the status of the Virginia Tech Weightlifting Club. Formerly occupying space in War Memorial Gym at no expense, the club was requested to allow free use of the equipment by all students. The club subsequently moved the equipment to University Mall. Jerry Cain, the university's General Counsel, has been asked to provide guidance concerning how the university should respond.

Dr. McComas then updated Council on the acquisition of the Hotel Roanoke as a gift from the Norfolk Southern Corporation. Consultants are being secured to assist the university in deciding how to make the best use of the property. The response from the Roanoke community has been very positive, and the acquisition is expected to strengthen existing ties between Tech and Roanoke.

Dr. Hooper was asked to briefly report on the Roanoke Valley Graduate Center. Several universities are in residence at the new facility on Church Street. A consortium of public institutions and Hollins and Roanoke Colleges are cooperating in offering graduate courses in Roanoke. The newly-opened facility has acquired the latest technology and is now offering classes.

Dr. McComas summarized progress to date on the proposed campus in northern Virginia, Woodrow Wilson College. If approved and funded, the college will offer degrees in the name of its joint founders, Virginia Tech and the University of Virginia. A proposal for the campus (which does not not

specify location, degrees offered, necessary funding, starting date, or number of faculty) was developed at the request of, and has been submitted to, the Commission on Education for the 21st Century.

Dr. McComas described to Council the status of recent relations between Virginia Tech and the Town of Blacksburg. Following receipt of a letter from the President of the Blacksburg Chamber of Commerce expressing concern about a number of issues, including Squires food service facilities, the development of Tech's internal telephone and telecommunications system, and the Blacksburg Transit service, a breakfast meeting with Tech and town officials was held to discuss these issues. Similar meetings are planned to facilitate further dialogue.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Dr. Eng asked that agenda items, CFA Resolutions 1988-89 B, C, D, and E, be removed from the agenda, pending further action by the Commission on Faculty Affairs. A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda as amended. The motion PASSED.

3. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF APRIL 17, 1989

The University Council minutes of the meeting of April 17, 1989 were approved as distributed.

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

- a. Commission on Extension, November 18, 1988; April 28, 1989.
- b. Commission on Faculty Affairs, March 24, April 7, April 21, 1989.
- c. Commission on Graduate Studies, April 19, 1989.
- d. Commission on Student Affairs, April 6, 1989.
- e. Commission on Undergraduate Studies, March 27, 1989.

5. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Dr. Goodale introduced Paula Ratcliffe, the 1990-91 Junior Class President.

Dr. McComas announced the publication of an article in ARCHITECTURE MAGAZINE that features Virginia Tech's College of Architecture and Urban Studies.

Dr. Hooper acknowledged the efficient relocation of the Computing Center.

Dr. McComas recognized the contributions of Drs. Tom Goodale and David Ford and their staff for facilitating the return of Tech students for the 1989-90 academic year.

Dr. McComas also congratulated Dr. Goodale and his staff, the Corps of Cadets, and Dr. Harvey Rosenberg for their help to students made homeless as a result of the recent fire at Foxridge Apartments.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant

to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
October 16, 1989
(corrected 12/4/89)

Dr. Thomas Goodale, who presided until President McComas arrived from the Tech Airport, called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

Present: J. McComas, J. Perry (for E.F. Carlisle), T. Goodale, P.F. Scanlon (for L. Eng), J. Johnson, P. Gherman, L. Harris, G. Hooper, J. Nichols, H. Bonham (for R. Sorensen), J. Crunkilton, S. Ritchey, B. Meldrum (for P. Eyre), L. Moore, L. Arnold, L. Rees, R. Small, R. Lovingood, E. Henneke, L. Geyer, D. Kingston, J. Crittenden, N. Marriott, S. Batie, A. Snoke, J. Riddle, D. Gilbert, P. Murphy, P. Radcliffe, W. Tyrrell, M. Miller, D. Lush, A. Townsend, C. Steger

Guests: John Ashby, Spectrum

Absent: C. Forbes, M. Ridenour, R. Smoot, R. Heterick, H. Doswald, P. Tongersen, A.J. Davis, C. Carrig, N. Eiss.

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 4, 1989

The University Council minutes of the meeting of September 4, 1989 were approved as distributed.

3. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON FACULTY AFFAIRS, RESOLUTION 1988-89 B, SALARY SUPPLEMENTS FOR ADPS (FIRST READING, APRIL 17, 1989).

This resolution establishes an endowment to provide annual salary supplements for each Alumni Distinguished Professor, to be determined annually by the Provost. Dr. Perry verbally amended the last sentence of the resolution to read: "In addition, the university will provide each Alumni Distinguished Professor with an annual account to provide support of appropriate academic activities (e.g., books, travel, journal subscriptions, research expenses, etc.) in addition to that provided by the department." This change clarifies that individual departments and/or colleges are not responsible for these financial supplements; they will be provided by the Office of the Provost.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution as amended. The motion carried.

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

- a. Commission on Faculty Affairs, April 28, September 8, 1989
- b. Commission on Graduate Studies, April 5, May 3, 1989

c. Commission on Research, April 12, April 26, 1989

Dr. Kingston asked that item 6 of the April 12, 1989 minutes from the Commission on Research be excepted by Council.

He then expressed concern about the injustice of off-campus facilities paying for their own utilities, routine maintenance and other services, while being charged the full 49% on-campus indirect costs rate. In essence, Dr. Kingston explained, they are charged twice. Dr. Hooper indicated that discussion of this topic was still ongoing in the Commission on Research and offered to provide more comprehensive information to Council by early December.

It was noted by Dr. Gary Hooper that Dr. Dorothy Richardson, who was mentioned in the minutes of April 12 as the new Director of Sponsored Programs and Research Administration, passed away in late September.

Dr. Hooper also announced that the Director of the Waste Policy Institute will be Dr. Dean Eyman.

With these clarifications the minutes were approved.

d. Commission on Student Affairs, April 13, April 20, September 7, 1989

Dr. Goodale noted that the Commission on Student Affairs is working with student government and other groups on a better mechanism to hear Budget Board appeals.

5. FOR INFORMATION

David Lush, President of the Graduate Student Assembly, described the 1989-90 Graduate Student Assembly Planning Agenda, and highlighted the cooperative efforts GSA shares with various administrative components of this university. He invited Council members to discuss with him any aspect of the agenda.

In response, Dr. Snoke expressed surprise that the Commission on Graduate Studies was not mentioned in Item 10 ("Graduate School Relations") as a possible avenue for interaction. He also noted that Item 15 ("International Concerns") does not adequately reflect the breadth of resources available to foreign students through the Cranwell Center and other university programs.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. McComas updated Council on the status of Woodrow Wilson College as it relates to the announced resignation of President Robert O'Neil. Dr. McComas distributed a copy of a statement issued by Rector Joshua P. Darden, Jr. and Mr. O'Neil that reiterates UVA's continued commitment to the concept (copy attached). Dr. McComas mentioned that ongoing discussions are focusing on ways to distinguish Woodrow Wilson College from other institutions in the area. He also emphasized the growing political importance of this university having a physical presence in Northern Virginia.

Dr. McComas briefly described the process by which Virginia Tech's benchmark institutions are identified. Representatives from SCHEV, the Virginia House and Senate, and the Secretary of Education's Office all participate in the discussions. Some of the comparison criteria we proposed as relevant to the formulation of the list of Tech's peer institutions include: 1) \$50+ million in research activity, 2) doctorates constituting at least 4% of degrees awarded, 3) membership in the Research Library Association, 4) a discipline mix that more closely matches our own, and 5) proven quality of Arts and Sciences programs, as exemplified by the Phi Beta Kappa Chapter at Virginia Tech. Key officials from Virginia Tech are

continuing negotiations with the five-member committee that will likely complete its deliberations on this by mid-November.

Dr. McComas reported on the status of the search for a new Director for the Virginia Cooperative Extension Services. Dean Ritchey has agreed to chair the broad-based, intercollegiate search committee that will identify at least three finalists. Dean Nichols, to whom the new Director of VCES will report, will make a recommendation to the President at that time.

Dr. McComas described the transfer of the Hotel Roanoke to Virginia Tech as a way of building a firmer base in Roanoke.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

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

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
December 4, 1989

Dr. McComas called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m.

Present: J. McComas, M. Ridenour, R. Smoot, F. Carlisle, T. Goodale, L. Eng, J. Johnson, B. Foltin (for Paul Gherman), L. Harris, G. Hooper, R. Heterick, C. Steger, H. Doswald, R. Sorensen, D. Robertshaw (for John Crunkilton), J. Marchman (for Paul Torgersen), S. Ritchey, B. Meldrum (for Peter Eyre), L. Moore, L. Arnold, A.J. Davis, L. Rees, R. Small, R. Lovingood, E. Henneke, N. Eiss, D. Kingston, J. Crittenden, P. Scanlon (for Sandra Batie), J. Webster (for Arthur Snoke), J. Riddle, D. Gilbert, P. Murphy, K. Crawford (for William Tyrrell), M. Miller, D. Lush

Guests: John Ashby, Spectrum; Phyllis Volheim, Classified Staff Affairs Committee; John Perry, Office of the Provost; Cornel N. Morton, President's Office

Absent: C. Forbes, J. Nichols, C. Carrig, L. Geyer, N. Marriott, P. Radcliffe, A. Townsend

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. McComas announced that the peer group review has been completed with positive results. Some changes in the peer list included adding the University of Southern California, the University of Pennsylvania, and Boston University and dropping Oregon State University and Washington State University. A complete list will be sent to members of Council.

Dr. McComas mentioned that the hazing incident at Kenyon College led to demands from black students with regard to change in curriculum and policy. Dr. McComas expects to respond to these demands before Christmas and added that it is his goal to make this campus a more supportive place for minority students and faculty. Dr. Cornel Morton added that it is important for faculty to take a personal interest in the progress of all students, especially those who may be facing adjustment problems.

Dr. McComas informed Council that as a result of uncertainty about state revenue projections, Virginia Tech might have to reduce expenditures by nearly \$2 million from the 1989-90 annual budget. These reductions could then be extended to the next budget year, resulting in keen competition for available funds. A plan for these reductions must be submitted to the Governor's Office by December 18.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Dr. Eng requested that CFA minutes dated 20 October 1989 be added to the list of minutes for approval.

Dr. Goodale asked that CSA minutes dated 19 October 1989 be removed from the list of minutes for approval.

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

3. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF OCTOBER 16, 1989

Dr. Kingston noted that the minutes incorrectly reported the approval of the minutes from the Commission on Research, dated April 12, 1989. The minutes were corrected as follows: "Dr. Kingston asked that item 6 of the April 12, 1989 minutes from the Commission on Research be excepted by Council."

The University Council minutes of the meeting of October 16, 1989 were approved as amended.

4. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON FACULTY AFFAIRS, RESOLUTION 1988-89 C, TENURE PROCESS FOR LECTURERS AND INSTRUCTORS (FIRST READING, APRIL 17, 1989).

As set forth in the minutes of April 17, this resolution enables present Virginia Tech instructors and lecturers to eliminate service at that rank from the tenure probationary period.

It was moved and seconded to approve the resolution.

The motion CARRIED.

5. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON FACULTY AFFAIRS, RESOLUTION 1988-89 F, RECONCILIATION COMMITTEE (FIRST READING, APRIL 17, 1989).

As described in Item 8 of the Minutes of Council of April 17, 1989, this resolution permits individuals to voluntarily share confidential information with the Committee on Reconciliation when appropriate.

It was moved and seconded to approve the resolution.

The motion CARRIED.

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

a. Commission on Extension, September 8, 1989

b. Commission on Faculty Affairs, September 15, October 6, October 20, and November 3, 1989

c. Commission on Graduate Studies, September 20, October 4 and November 1, 1989

d. Commission on Research, September 13, 1989

Dr. Hooper added that discussion is ongoing about the issue of payment for custodial services from overhead charges for outlying buildings.

e. Commission on Student Affairs, September 21, 1989

f. Commission on Undergraduate Studies, April 24, September 11, and September 25, 1989

Dr. Carlisle clarified that CUS minutes dated April 24, 1989 should reflect a change in the College of Business graduation requirements. Instead of "Department of Accounting (Info Sys. Options)," that checklist item should read "Department of Management Sciences."

The subject of religious holidays was also raised in reference to the September 11 & 25, 1989 CUS minutes. A list of those holidays will be developed and provided to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies. Dr. Harris noted that major religious holidays will be included on the

Virginia Tech calendar.

7. For Information

o Mr. Minnis Ridenour updated Council on the search for a VP for Public Service/Outreach (please see attached announcement). He indicated that the search committee would be comprised primarily of University Council members and added that he would soon be contacting prospective members about serving. Dr. Linda Arnold expressed the concern that the position description does not indicate an international focus or component. Dr. Carlisle responded that it is not clear at this time whether this or another position will have primarily responsibility for extending the university's global outreach. Dr. McComas added that, based on a recently submitted report from the International Task Force Committee, he saw the need for an office of international affairs, perhaps in the Provost's Office, with a qualified director at its head.

o Discussion then turned to the subject of the library and persistent problems of funding and space. Dr. Carlisle mentioned that \$600,000 will be added to the operating budget this year. He is also recommending an overall budget increase of \$1,500,000 for the 1990-91 academic year. He added that most state funding will go toward acquisitions, while \$250,000 will be provided through the Provost's Office for equipment. On the subject of student and shelving space, Dr. Carlisle said some central space for student seating is sought, while the possibility of acquiring off-campus high density storage facilities is also being investigated.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

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

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
January 15, 1990

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

Present: J. McComas, R. Smoot, E.F. Carlisle, T. Goodale, L. Eng, W. Flowers (for J. Johnson), P. Gherman, L. Harris, G. Hooper, P. Galliher (for R. Heterick), W. Allen (for J. Nichols), C. Steger, H. Doswald, R. Sorensen, J. Buffer, J. Osborne (for P. Torgersen), S. Ritchey, R.L. Pyle (for P. Eyre), L. Moore, L. Arnold, L. Rees, R. Small C. Carrig, R. Purdy (for R. Lovingood), E. Henneke, N. Eiss, D. Kingston, J. Crittenden, N. Marriott, S. Batie, A. Snoke, J. Riddle, D. Gilbert, P. Murphy, P. Radcliffe, W. Tyrrell, M. Miller, A. Townsend

Guests: John Ashby, Spectrum; Phyllis Volheim, CSAC; Cornel Morton, Office of the President; Patrick Scanlon, Faculty Senate; Gregg LoCascio, SGA; Mike Maxwell, Honor System; Janine Hiller, Honor System

Absent: C. Forbes, M. Ridenour, A.J. Davis, L. Geyer, D. Lush

Dr. McComas introduced Dr. James J. Buffer, Jr., the new Dean of the College of Education.

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Dr. Kingston mentioned that he had a question for Dr. Goodale and suggested that a question/answer period be built into future University Council agendas, as is done in the British Parliamentary system. Dr. McComas requested that he hold his question until the new and old business had been covered.

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

2. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF DECEMBER 4, 1989

Dr. Eng pointed out that the minutes did not reflect the approval of the minutes from the Commission on Faculty Affairs, dated October 20, 1989, and requested that they do so.

Mr. Gilbert noted that the minutes mention the search for the Vice President for Public Service; he questioned whether a roster of members had been prepared. Dr. McComas responded that it was available and would be forwarded to him.

The University Council minutes of the meeting of December 4, 1989 were approved as amended.

3. FIRST READING, CSA RESOLUTION 1989-90 A, CONCERNING INCLUSION OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE VIRGINIA TECH HONOR SYSTEM TO THE COMMISSION ON STUDENT AFFAIRS.

Dr. McComas asked Dr. Goodale to briefly describe the resolution, then

invited Council discussion. Confusion was expressed as to what constituted a "recognized student organization," as opposed to a "registered student organization." Mr. Gilbert responded that the registered status applies to all of the over 400 organizations at Virginia Tech, while the 14 recognized student organizations are representative in nature (for definition of a "registered student organization," see Policy Memo 96). Dr. Cross added that a recognized student organization is one that has membership on CFA and on the Honor System. Mr. Townsend questioned whether this resolution would apply to the graduate student honor system as well. When informed that it would not, Mr. Townsend advised that the word "undergraduate" be added to the text of the resolution to avoid confusion. Dr. Small then offered an objection to the wording of the resolution which states that the "Honor System ought to be represented in all deliberations that affect student life." He felt it was too broad a statement to be viable and should be eliminated. Dr. Arnold added that the statement concerning "educating the entire student body on policies governing academic conduct" should be broadened to include the entire university -- faculty and staff. With an understanding that the necessary changes in wording would be incorporated into a revised version, the resolution was carried forward for second reading.

4. FIRST READING, CSA RESOLUTION 1989-90 B, CONCERNING THE DELETION OF THE GRADE STAR OPTION AND THE CHANGE IN UNIVERSITY SERVICE HOURS FOR HONOR CODE VIOLATIONS.

Dr. Janine Hiller and Mr. Mike Maxwell, Chief Justice of the Honor System, provided some background on the two proposed amendments to the Honor System Constitution. The first change involves the deletion of the grade * sanction (given for Class III violations of the Honor System). The * grade is administered similarly to an incomplete grade designation in that it is a temporary grade and is calculated as an "F" into the student's QCA. It differs from an "I" in that an actual grade is assigned but is suspended until the grade * is removed (a year and a half after the violation occurs). The sanction is being deleted because of difficulties it creates, especially when it is given to graduating seniors who then are unable to obtain transcripts. The second change involves the revision in the number of university service hours given to a student who violates the Honor Code. With the deletion of the grade star, it was felt that further distinction between the classification of offenses was required. Thus, the 25, 50, and 75 hours will be revised to 20, 40, and 80 hours, respectively

Dr. Rita Purdy questioned what would happen in the event that a senior committed a Class III violation, i.e., would the transcript be frozen until the 80 service hours are completed? Dr. Hiller responded that a transcript and diploma would not be issued until the service hours were completed. Drs. Purdy and Arnold expressed concern that the Honor System was becoming increasingly weak. Conversely, Mr. Gilbert felt that the university service hours properly provide the educational component of a sanction as a complement to the punitive function. Dr. Crittenden voiced his belief that most of the changes to the Honor System in the past twenty years had only weakened its impact, and that to try to "educate" seniors with the deletion of the grade star sanction was unrealistic. Dr. Hiller responded that the Honor System Review Board fully supports the philosophy of the grade star, but believes it is unworkable for the senior who is seeking employment. Mr. Maxwell added that other punitive sanctions for Class III violations exist, such as the double-weighted zero on a final exam (which effectively means that the student fails that class).

Dr. McComas suggested that a hearing be held before the next meeting so that this topic could be discussed in further detail. He added his own concern regarding the the time delay between when an alleged violated occurs and when action is finally taken. He feels a way should be sought to streamline that process.

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 3 & November 7, 1989.
- b. Commission on Graduate Studies, November 15, 1989.
- c. Commission on Student Affairs, October 19 & November 2, 1989.

6. FOR INFORMATION

a. INITIAL DISCUSSION OF THE REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL, STANDING UNIVERSITY COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES: RECOMMENDED CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS REVISIONS, JANUARY 5, 1990.

Dr. Larry D. Moore, Chairman of the Task Force, opened the discussion by requesting that University Council informally discuss the report over the next several meetings. A formal resolution (including the complete revision of the current standing constitution of the university) will be submitted to Council at the March 19 meeting, with final action expected during the May 7 meeting. Copies of the report have also been sent to Faculty Senate members. An approved resolution concerning the composition of University Council, university committees and university standing committees will be presented to the President and Board of Visitors after July 1. The Task Force recommends a transition year during 1990-91, with full implementation of the resolution effective July 1, 1991.

Dr. Moore then briefly summarized the contents of the report and informed Council that the Task Force, by a majority vote, recommends the adoption of the Cabinet Model of governance, involving a smaller University Council structure. Some of the major points of the Report include the following:

- o The number of commissions would be increased to seven, adding a Commission on Academic and Institutional Support and a Commission on Public Service (replacing the Commission on Extension)
- o With the exception of three committees -- Athletics, Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action and Classified Staff -- all committee would report to University Council through one of the seven commissions. A member of each of those three free-standing committees would serve on University Council.
- o A representative of the Classified Staff Affairs Committee would serve on each of the commissions.
- o It would be the responsibility of the commissions, not the standing committees, to act on policy issues.
- o University Standing Committee chairs would be appointed by the President from among members other than the principal administrative officer (applies to both the Congressional and Cabinet models).

Dr. McComas then invited questions and comments concerning the Report. Dr. Snoke mentioned that a representative from the Learning Resources Center is absent from the recommended Communications Network Committee membership. He also asked what the difference was between the "Information Systems Commission" proposed last year and the Commission on Academic and Institutional Support. Dr. Arnold replied that the new commission was designed to address broader policy matters.

Dr. Kingston expressed his concern that graduate students are still under-represented, specifically on the Commission on Student Affairs and on the Intellectual Property Committee. Dr. Paul Gherman then asked how the University Operational Committees were defined and identified. Dr. Moore responded that they are defined in the constitution, but because they are

not permanent committees, they are not listed in the report. Dr. Gherman also requested that the stated charge of the Library Committee include the phrase "to disseminate knowledge."

Dr. Kingston asked why commission chairs are appointed in different ways for the congressional and cabinet models. In the former model, the chair would be the senior administrator and on the cabinet model the chair would be a faculty member. Dr. Arnold replied that the two models represent two different philosophies. The congressional model is based on a principle of broad communication and thus necessitates the active involvement of a senior administrator. On the other hand, the cabinet model is based on the premise that Council should provide active leadership on the university governance system. Thus, an individual who is not required to spend an excessive amount of time on administrative matters should be appointed to serve on Council. Dr. Sorensen added that the congressional model permits the various interest groups to have full representation on Council, and since it does not differ significantly from the structure that currently exists, the appointment procedures on commissions would remain the same. The cabinet model, where representation would tend to take place in the commissions themselves rather than on University Council, justifies a smaller Council structure. Thus, the Task Force thought it inappropriate to have an exclusively administrative representation on Council. Dr. Snoke added his suggestion that the report specify that the senior administrator serve as secretary to the commission (on the cabinet model). Dr. Moore replied that it would be included.

Mr. Townsend mentioned that, given the unique experience of minorities on this campus, he thought it appropriate to include a representative from the Black Organizations Council or the Black Student Alliance on the Commission on Undergraduate Studies. On this same topic, Dr. Kingston commented that minority representation should involve more than just the black student population. Looking ahead, he continued, Hispanics, Asians and other minorities will require representation and that it would be wise to anticipate this in the constitution now so that it need not be revised later.

At the close of this discussion, Dr. Moore invited Council members to send to him their suggestions and comments about the report.

b. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. McComas invited Dr. Kingston to pose his question to Dr. Goodale at this time. Dr. Kingston asked Dr. Goodale to update Council on the status of the Virginia Tech Weightlifting Club. Dr. Goodale responded that recommendations for action have been prepared and will be submitted to Dr. Carlisle for consideration. Resolution of this matter should be forthcoming shortly.

Dr. McComas invited Council members to the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial celebration at 7:00 p.m. in Owens Banquet Room.

Dr. Carlisle spoke briefly about the budget reductions called for by the Governor for the current year. He explained that he and Mr. Ridenour had consulted widely on campus about ways to generate the required 2% cash return. The funds are largely being gathered from central accounts. Salary savings will be another source of funds, as well as monies generated through position freezes. The more difficult issue will be the anticipated 5% budget reduction for the 1990-91 academic year (approximately \$8.5 million). Dr. McComas added that there is no assurance that Governor Wilder will implement former Gov. Baliles' recommendations. Accordingly, reductions may be even more severe than what has been proposed thus far. Dr. McComas mentioned that he is reluctant to see out-of-state tuition fees increase to the full cost. Many do not understand that, rather than being a drag on the state, this group of students makes an economic contribution to the state's economy, he said. The presidents of Virginia's universities will have an opportunity to respond to the governor's budget recommen-

dations on January 22nd when they appear before the General Assembly.

On the subject of faculty salary increases, Dr. McComas mentioned that the newly-revised peer group list has aided Virginia Tech in securing a recommended 5.2% increase for faculty, as compared to 4.7% for UVA and 4.2% for Radford University, for example. He then expressed concern for classified staff, who would experience more difficult economic conditions, and who are already underpaid by state and national levels. He thought that the best option over time would be to remove support personnel from the state classification into the higher education system. Dr. McComas asked that public attention be directed to the conditions of this underpaid constituency.

Dr. McComas brought up the issue of the space deficits at Virginia Tech. He reported that Engineering has a 320,000 sq. foot space shortage (translating to approximately \$75-100 million). By the same token, the College of Arts and Sciences is reported to have a 16% space deficit. Campus-wide, space deficits at this university could translate to an approximate \$1 billion shortage. In addition to space problems, there are also problems of stagnant departmental operating budgets, overcrowding, and increasing undergraduate class sizes. If Tech's staffing requirements were fully met, 370 additional faculty and staff would be needed. Thus, before any large increase of students can be considered, increases in both space and personnel would be mandatory. Dr. McComas provided this information to explain his public response to individuals advocating the increase of undergraduates on this campus.

Dr. McComas then raised the issue of "Hethwood II" and the request by the town to dedicate a roadway from that general area to U.S. 460 and a possible link to U.S. 314, which runs by the dairy farm. With the proposed increase in campus facilities in that area, Dr. McComas expressed reluctance to facilitate the access of non-student traffic to this campus. The university must seek ways of balancing the need to protect the campus from unwarranted traffic, while remaining good "citizens" of this community.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

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

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
January 29, 1990

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

Present: J. McComas, M. Ridenour, F. Carlisle, L. Cross (for T. Goodale), L. Eng, J. Johnson, P. Gherman, L. Harris, G. Hooper, W. Allen (for J. Nichols), C. Steger, M. Ogliaruso (for H. Doswald), T. Bonham (for R. Sorensen), D. Robertshaw (for J. Buffer), J. Marchman (for P. Torgersen), S. Ritchey, P. Eyre, L. Moore, P. Scanlon (for L. Arnold), A.J. Davis, L. Rees, R. Small, C. Carrig, E. Henneke, L. Geyer, N. Eiss, D. Kingston, J. Crittenden, N. Marriott, S. Batie, A. Snoke, D. Gilbert, P. Murphy, P. Radcliffe, W. Tyrrell, M. Miller, A. Townsend

Guests: Cornel N. Morton, Office of the President; Janine S. Hiller, Honor System; Nancy Hooker, Honor System; John Ashby, Spectrum

Absent: R. Smoot, C. Forbes, R. Heterick, R. Lovingood, R. Riddle, D. Lush

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 15, 1990

Dr. Kingston noted that his comments regarding increasing graduate school representation on commissions/committees mentions the Commission for Undergraduate Studies, while it should reference the Commission on Student Affairs. Ms. Hooker requested that the two references to the "Honor Society" in the attendance section be replaced by the correct term, "Honor System." Both Drs. Kingston and Snoke raised a question about the accuracy of the square foot shortages and corresponding dollar deficits cited in the minutes. Dr. McComas responded that those figures would be verified and corrected.

The University Council minutes of the meeting of January 15, 1990 were approved as amended.

3. SECOND READING, CSA RESOLUTION 1989-90 A, CONCERNING CHANGE IN MEMBERSHIP FOR THE COMMISSION ON STUDENT AFFAIRS. FIRST READING: JANUARY 15, 1990.

Dr. Cross distributed the revised document and informed Council that the changes provide additional rationale for the resolution. He noted that the revised text does not state the official name of the Honor System, namely the "Virginia Tech Honor System," but offered to preface each mention of the Honor System with "Virginia Tech." Dr. Scanlon questioned whether it was appropriate to add "Virginia Tech" to the resolution, as this is not the "official" name of the university. Dr. Cross responded that the name "Virginia Tech Honor System" is used in its constitution, thus a change of that nature would entail much more than simply revising this one resol-

ution. Committee members concurred that the present name should be retained. Dr. Cross also mentioned that the resolution in its present form does not distinguish between the undergraduate and graduate honor systems. In response, Mr. Townsend requested that the word "undergraduate" be inserted prior to each reference to "student(s)" to make that distinction. A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution with the insertion of the word "undergraduate" where appropriate. The motion CARRIED.

4. SECOND READING, CSA RESOLUTION 1989-90 B, CONCERNING THE VIRGINIA TECH HONOR SYSTEM CONSTITUTION AND THE DELETION OF THE GRADE "*" SANCTION.
FIRST READING: JANUARY 15, 1990.

Dr. Cross requested that this resolution be referred back to the Commission on Student Affairs for further discussion. A motion was made and seconded to refer the resolution. The motion CARRIED.

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

a. Commission on Undergraduate Studies, October 9, and November 6, 1989.

6. FOR INFORMATION

a. In reference to the Computer Committee minutes of October 4, Dr. Kingston questioned the high cost (\$500,000) of delivering output from the Computer Center. Since Dr. Heterick was not present, Dr. McComas asked Dr. Harris to pursue this issue with Dr. Heterick and provide his findings at the next meeting. Also in reference to the October 4 minutes, Dr. Snoke asked if Learning Resources was now a sub-group of CNS, as indicated by the stated four-group composition of CNS under Agenda Item #3. In response, Dr. Carlisle offered to explore this and provide clarification for Council.

b. Dr. Snoke then referenced the University Library Committee Minutes of November 1, 1989 and questioned whether Item I under "Old Business" should come before University Council. It was noted that a resolution concerning the approval of policy on branch libraries should have been submitted to Council for approval. Rather than act on it at the present time and in its present form as an item within the minutes, Dr. McComas recommended that a resolution be drafted and be presented to Council at a subsequent meeting.

c. ONGOING DISCUSSION OF THE REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL, STANDING UNIVERSITY COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES: RECOMMENDED CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS REVISIONS, JANUARY 5, 1990.

Dr. Moore thanked Council members for their input and welcomed further comments. He then referenced pages 24-29 of the Task Force Report summarizing the changes to the commissions and committees. He reminded members that some of the changes are in name only, because they only reflect new academic or administrative titles. He then invited discussion of any portion of the document. Dr. McComas inquired whether there had been any substantive feedback to the proposed changes. Dr. Moore indicated that several good suggestions had been received but none that relate to changes in commission/committee composition. Mr. Townsend reported that the Graduate Student Assembly recently passed a resolution requesting certain changes to the Report and would forward it to Dr. Moore as soon as possible. Dr. Moore requested comments by the 15th of February -- particularly those involving the composition of committees and commissions -- and reminded members that the revised Report would come before Council at the March 19 meeting. Dr. Snoke inquired whether the Task Force was preparing an updated version of the Report incorporating the suggested changes so that Council members would have a fresh draft with which to work. Dr.

Moore replied that he is waiting on further input prior to doing so, but would be able to provide a revised report shortly thereafter.

Dr. Snoke referenced Attachment I from the University Library Committee meeting minutes of November 1, 1989, RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE TO THE TASK FORCE ON UNIVERSITY COMMISSIONS, COMMITTEES AND UNIVERSITY COUNCIL COMPOSITION. He mentioned that one of the recommendations therein reinforces his previous comment regarding the inadequate reporting structure for the ULC. Dr. Moore responded that the Task Force had been contacted directly by the ULC and also by the Library Faculty Association, who, as he stated, "unfortunately agreed to disagree among themselves." Thus, the Task Force attempted to meet the needs of both groups. He added that this could be an item for the upcoming meeting of the Task Force and the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Rees raised the issue of staff concerns, which from his own informal college survey seem to be state policy-related issues rather than university-level ones. However, he referenced page 10 of the Task Force Report under "Functions and Duties" of the Commission on Faculty Affairs and said that with a few exceptions (topics of tenure, academic freedom, sabbatical leaves), these issues do not significantly differ from the concerns he heard expressed through his survey. Dr. Moore replied that although these concerns may apply to both constituencies, they are not addressed through the same channels. Thus, the Task Force does not recommend the formation of a Commission on Staff Affairs at this time. Dr. Moore added that classified staff are represented through the Classified Staff Affairs Committee, which reports directly to Council.

Dr. Kingston observed that research associates, who are neither faculty nor classified staff, do not serve on university committees and commissions. Dr. Hooper added that this constituency represents several hundred individuals. Dr. Moore noted that many departments include their research associates in faculty meetings, thus there are channels through which research associates CAN voice their concerns. However, because their total numbers are relatively small, the Task Force did not consider it appropriate to add research associates to committees and commissions.

Dr. Gherman inquired how the Task Force had determined which individuals would serve at the various reporting levels. Using the example of the University Library Committee, he described how the Provost and the Vice President for Information Services serve on that committee, on the commission to which the ULC reports, and on University Council. He wondered aloud whether overlapping membership was the best use of people's time? Dr. Moore replied that committee membership was designed to include individuals who could provide the best input. Thus, the Task Force asked senior administrators to suggest individuals who could maximize communication and interaction within these committees. Dr. Moore added that the Task Force has received recent suggestions that could change this structure. Dr. Gherman also posed a procedural question: How would Council be voting on the document; in its entirety or section-by-section? Dr. McComas responded that the latter approach, although more time consuming, would be more practical. No decision was reached on this matter, but will need to be resolved soon.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. McComas recapped the gist of the testimony given by state university presidents to the House Appropriations Committee with regard to budget cuts. He said that the presidents made clear their concern that higher education was to be asked to carry a disproportionate share of the budget reductions as compared with other state agencies. Dr. McComas and other representatives at the hearings also emphasized the damage that would be done to programs by increasing out-of-state tuition costs, especially at the graduate level. Following the formal meeting, some college and university representatives had an opportunity to discuss this situation with

several key legislators. In sum, they sought the restoration of \$70 million to higher education over the biennium through various means, including the following:

- o Supporting the community college request for faculty positions to full-time status, as opposed to part-time or adjunct status
- o Returning to the Baliles budget for salary increases (Governor Wilder recommended a faculty salary cap of 4.5%)
- o Restoring funds to the budget for unavoidable and fixed costs (utilities, telephones, and insurance, for example)
- o Changing the language that would return growth in overhead research dollars to the state.

Several key legislators agreed that higher education had been hard hit and Dr. McComas voiced his optimism that these individuals would make every effort to minimize the damage. He also mentioned the possibility of an amendment being passed that would give institutions the option of levying a temporary 2-year fee surcharge on students. Several other sources are also being considered as a way of providing additional revenue.

Mr. Ridenour then described in detail the base budgetary cuts of the estimated \$9.2 million Tech would lose for each year of the next biennium

(see attached document). Several adjustments were recommended by former Governor Baliles, all of which are detailed on page 1 of the budget report.

Mr. Ridenour also explained that a new lottery bill has been introduced that would move certain items from the general fund to the lottery. If passed, this bill would directly affect our operating budget in a negative way.

Mr. Ridenour then briefly discussed the current budget proposal that: 1) mandates graduate students would pay substantially more in fees than would undergraduates, and 2) requires that out-of-state students pay 100% of the cost of their instruction. He informed Council that the university has requested that this language be amended so that greater flexibility is granted in addressing these issues. Dr. McComas added that the proposed legislation fails to recognize that graduate and out-of-state students make a positive contribution to the local and state economies. Dr. Kingston asked if there was anything faculty members could do to help the situation. Dr. McComas suggested that representatives of the faculty senate visit with local delegates to enlist their support. Dr. McComas closed the meeting by stressing that the political climate for continued funding of higher education is quite favorable, if funds can be located.

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 19, 1990

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

Present: J. McComas, F. Carlisle, T. Goodale, L. Eng, J. Johnson, P. Gherman, L. Harris, G. Hooper, J. Nichols, C. Steger, H. Crawford (for H. Doswald), R. Sorensen, S. Crumwell (for J. Buffer), J. Marchman (for P. Torgersen), S. Ritchey, L. Moore, L. Arnold, A.J. Davis, L. Rees, R. Small, C. Carrig, R. Purdy (for R. Lovingood), E. Henneke, L. Geyer, N. Eiss, D. Kingston, J. Crittenden, N. Marriott, P.F. Scanlon (for S. Batie), A. Snoke, D. Gilbert, W. Kuster (for P. Murphy), P. Radcliffe, D. Wood (for W. Tyrrell), M. Miller, D. Lush, A. Townsend

Guests: Norman Dodl, Library Committee; John Ashby, Spectrum; Cornel Morton (Office of the President)

Absent: C. Forbes, M. Ridenour, R. Smoot, P. Eyre, R. Heterick, 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 JANUARY 29, 1990.

The University Council minutes of the meeting of January 29, 1990 were approved as distributed.

3. FIRST READING, UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION 1989-90 A, CONCERNING THE CREATION OF NEW BRANCH LIBRARIES.

Dr. Dodl noted that increasing budgetary constraints confront the library system at Virginia Tech. The establishment of library facilities at distant learning centers would stretch existing resources beyond reasonable limits. Thus, an operational policy was drafted to make clear that any additional branch libraries should not be created from within the existing library budget. The resolution states that "no new branch libraries be created without specific additional funding being made available for that purpose."

Dr. Arnold questioned whether this resolution implied that no new "dead book facilities" would be created. Dr. Gherman replied that the two are unrelated. Dr. Arnold also observed that this is the first resolution coming before University Council that deals with matters of resource allocation. Dr. Gherman noted that this resolution addresses the internal use of funding, rather than the allocation of resources from the university at large. In response, Dr. Arnold expressed some concern regarding the nature of policy coming before Council, e.g., should Council routinely deal with matters relating to the internal use of funds? What precedent does this set?

Mr. Townsend noted that the Graduate Student Assembly is trying to increase the number of book drop-off locations. He questioned whether this resol-

ution would affect these efforts. Dr. Gherman responded that it would not.

The resolution was carried forward for second reading.

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

a. Commission on Faculty Affairs, January 5, 1990.

b. Commission on Research, November 8, 1989.

Dr. Hooper called attention to Item #4, concerning the Public Health Service Final Rule on Misconduct in Science. He noted that an interim institutional response has been submitted to the Public Health Service.

c. Commission on Student Affairs, December 7, 1989.

Dr. Goodale called attention to the Delta Kappa Epsilon incident and added that a future CSA meeting would be devoted to a discussion of the racial climate on campus.

5. FOR INFORMATION

Dr. McComas asked Dr. Snoke to respond to any questions concerning the minutes of the University Communications Network Committee, dated November 29, 1989. Dr. Arnold referenced the Policy Regarding Campus Networks and asked if there was a body of documentation that addresses policy issues within the information services area to which this document would be "attached." Dr. Snoke replied that he is not aware of any written body of such documentation. He added that the term "policy" is used loosely in this situation and actually refers more to "a way of doing things." Dr. Carlisle noted that if such a set of codified policies exist, it would be identified and made known to Council.

In the University Library Committee minutes dated December 6, 1989, Dr. Gherman called attention to the discussion of the issue of access vs. ownership.

Dr. Gherman was asked to speak to the issue of the organizational structure of CNS. Prior to doing so, he distributed the attached CNS organizational chart. He then referenced the question from the previous Council meeting dealing with the organizational fit of the Learning Resources Center and Media Services. While they were once a single unit, they now assume separate and distinct roles. Media Services includes photography, graphic arts, printing and copying; the Learning Resources Center deals with matters of video production, audio-visual services and educational technology. Dr. Gherman also identified the directors of these five sub-divisions as follows: Media Production Services, Tom Head; Network Services, Judy Lilly; Research and Development, Theta Bowden; Scholarly Communications Project, Lon Savage; and Learning Resources Center, John Moore.

Dr. Moore then invited further discussion of the Report of the Task Force on the University Council, Standing University Commissions and Committees: Recommended Constitution and Bylaws Revisions, January 5, 1990. Dr. Moore noted that the Faculty Senate met to address the report and asked Dr. Eng to summarize those discussions. Dr. Eng mentioned that any of the proposed recommendations would entail some modification of the existing constitution. He added that the present system of governance was adopted some time ago when the university was a very different institution than it is today. He added that this might be an opportune time to critically rethink not only structural changes but also needed modifications to the underlying system. Dr. Eng noted that the Faculty Senate is considering the formation of its own "task force" to examine some of these underlying assumptions and structure. For example, what is the proper role of faculty, students and staff in matters of resource allocation? How can faculty, student and

staff participation be increased in the formulation of university-wide policy? Dr. Arnold added that some faculty members perceive the university governance and planning structure as too hierarchical.

Dr. Moore asked Dr. Eng if he was proposing that the Faculty Senate and Task Force work together to address these issues (and thus delay the submission of a final resolution)? Dr. Eng agreed that this might be preferable, although Dr. Arnold noted that the Faculty Senate must first come to agreement on some of these issues.

Dr. McComas observed that there seems to be some fundamental questions that have not been worked out by faculty members themselves. Specifically, what faculty university-wide perceive the role of the Faculty Senate and the role of University Council to be? Lack of faculty involvement in the planning process was cited as an example of something that contributes to their sense of disaffection with the present governance system. Dr. Carlisle noted that the planning process is a relatively long and complicated one -- one that has offered and will continue to offer faculty meaningful participation at all stages. In fact, he noted, the planning committee is comprised mainly of faculty and has consciously attempted to involve other faculty members in its work.

Dr. Snoke asked when an updated version of the Task Force Report would be available? Dr. Moore replied that he is waiting for several promised revisions before he generates a new draft. Dr. Snoke also raised the issue of policy submission from committees. There currently seems to be no clear-cut mechanism whereby policy resolutions from the six committees that report directly to University Council can be submitted, as not every committee has a representative sitting on Council. In addition, because the minutes from these committees do not require formal Council approval, several committee members are concerned that the minutes do not receive Council's full attention.

Dr. McComas asked that the Task Force give further thought to the many issues raised during this discussion.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS

In relation to current budgetary constraints, Dr. McComas announced that an Ad Hoc Committee on Budget Reductions would be formed to participate in discussions of budget cuts. Dr. Scanlon has been asked to submit at least five nominations from the Faculty Senate. In addition, a University Distinguished Professor will be asked to serve on the committee, and each college will be represented on the committee. An undergraduate and graduate student representative will also be added to the committee's membership.

Dr. McComas updated Council on the status of the budget reductions. He noted that the House and Senate have made preliminary reports. The House has recommended the addition of \$1 million in unavoidable costs for Virginia Tech, while the Senate has not. Dr. Carlisle added that faculty salary increases are included on the agendas of both the House and the Senate, with the former recommending 4.5% and the latter 5.1%. The most potentially damaging result of the reductions would be the increase in out-of-state fees, especially for graduate students. Dr. McComas mentioned that ways are being sought to avoid this possibility. He added that there have been conflicting reports about the magnitude of the cuts, varying from 5% to 6%, but it is not currently known which figure (if either) is correct. Dr. McComas also noted that he sent a letter (attached) to H.B. Andrews, Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and Robert Ball, Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, requesting that funding alternatives be developed to share more fully the serious impact of these reductions across all state agencies. In addition, Dr. McComas expressed concern that very little public outcry, particularly in the way of newspaper editorials, has been expressed. Public leadership needs to emerge to call attention to the severity of the cuts for higher education.

Dr. Marriott asked about the viability of using lottery funds to supplement the budget. Dr. McComas responded that state officials have proposed borrowing \$100 million from the retirement fund in order to put the lottery schedule back on target. These funds would be used for capital construction only. In closing this discussion, Dr. McComas emphasized the need for the university to work together in formulating a viable solution to the imposed reductions.

Dr. McComas announced that Dr. Steger has agreed to serve as Acting Vice President for Public Service, in addition to serving in his current capacity as Dean of the College of Architecture and Urban Affairs.

Dr. Harris mentioned that he is attempting to locate an alternate location for future University Council meetings, as current membership exceeds the Boardroom's capacity. He asked members to contact him with their suggestions for appropriate space.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
March 5, 1990

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

Present: J. McComas, M. Ridenour, R. Smoot, E.F. Carlisle, L. Eng, C.C. Jones (for J. Johnson), P. Gherman, L. Harris, G. Hooper, J. Nichols, D. Hanna (for C. Steger), H. Doswald, R. Sorensen, J. Buffer, J. Osborne (for P. Torgersen), S. Ritchey, P. Eyre, L. Moore, L. Arnold, A.J. Davis, L. Rees, R. Small, C. Carrig, R. Purdy (for R. Lovingood), E. Henneke, L. Geyer, N. Eiss, D. Kingston, J. Crittenden, N. Marriott, P.F. Scanlon (for A. Snoke), J. Riddle, D. Gilbert, P. Murphy, P. Radcliffe, W. Tyrrell, M. Miller, A. Townsend

Guests: Wanda Dean, University Registrar; Phyllis Volhein, Classified Staff Affairs Committee; John Ashby, Spectrum

Absent: C. Forbes, T. Goodale, R. Heterick, S. Batie, D. Lush

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 19, 1990

The University Council minutes of the meeting of February 19, 1990 were approved as distributed.

3. FIRST READING, COMMISSION OF FACULTY AFFAIRS RESOLUTION 1989-90 A, CONCERNING LENGTH OF ADMINISTRATIVE TERMS IN OFFICE.

Dr. Eng provided background on the resolution, which appeared before Council last spring as CFA Resolution 1988-89 D, but was referred back to CFA for possible language revision and for review by the provost (who had not yet been named at that time). This resolution provides language for the faculty handbook that would stipulate "department or division chairs, heads and directors to serve for fixed length terms, specified by the department or division. The length of term to be served and procedures for renewal are to be decided by the departmental or divisional faculty in consultation with the college dean."

Dr. Carlisle noted that the resolution is consistent with conversations he has had on this subject with college deans and with members of the CFA. Dr. Carlisle added that he will be sending a memo to academic administrators and faculty regarding all aspects of department leadership, including the role and responsibilities of department heads/chairs, appointment procedures, terms of appointment (not longer than five years without formal evaluation), and evaluation procedures (annually by the dean and at least every five years by the department). Dr. Carlisle will circulate this memorandum to Council members prior to the next meeting of Council. In response to several questions about the CFA's definition of "fixed term," Dr. Eng noted that the CFA did not want to legislate term length within the resolution itself. Dr. Gherman asked if this resolution would apply only to academic colleges or would include other academic administrators as

well? Dr. Carlisle responded that while it was drafted with the former constituency in mind, he saw no reason why it could not pertain to academic administrators as well.

The resolution was carried forward for second reading.

4. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1989-90A, CONCERNING MIDTERM GRADES FOR FRESHMEN.

Dr. Carlisle explained that this resolution was drafted collaboratively by CUS and the Faculty Senate to make the advising process more effective. The resolution would produce a mid-term "grade" (i.e., satisfactory or unsatisfactory) for freshmen and transfer students during the fall semester only. It is intended as an early indication of the student's progress. While copies of the grade report would go to advisors and academic deans, no permanent record of the grade would be maintained. Dr. McComas indicated that students had told him some professors were not giving tests prior to the "midterm" (clarified during subsequent discussions to mean "prior to the drop deadline and before spring registration"). As a consequence, there would be little data available for making that assessment. He inquired whether the resolution implied an obligation on the part of teaching faculty to assign some qualitative assignment prior to the issuance of the grade? Dr. Carlisle responded that he felt it would. Mr. Townsend wondered whether if, in fact, this evaluation provided any meaningful feedback for the student, as little substantive work may be done before the drop deadline. He felt that a letter grade should be assigned that would be calculated into their final grade. Dr. Arnold responded that, based on the differing nature of course requirements, it would be difficult to uniformly mandate or regulate assignments that would provide a letter grade. Dr. McComas agreed that a student should be given a meaningful assessment of how she/he is performing in any given class, so that the "drop" option could be judiciously considered, and that teaching personnel at all levels should be encouraged to provide such assessment. A question was raised by Mike Miller as to why this resolution is directed only at freshmen during their fall term; he thought it would be helpful for all students during both spring and fall semesters. Ms. Dean responded that first-term freshmen experience significant adjustment during this time and would benefit most from the midterm report and subsequent interaction with an advisor. Ms. Dean added that follow-up evaluations are planned to measure possible correlations between an "unsatisfactory" grade and an advisor's intervention. Dr. Purdy added that it is hoped the resolution will encourage greater student-faculty contact. Mr. Townsend noted that this resolution would be helpful for first-year graduate students as well, and asked if this resolution should be broadened to include this student group. Dr. Hooper replied that this was an issue that should be discussed with the Commission on Graduate Studies.

The resolution was carried forward for second reading.

5. SECOND READING, UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION 1989-90 A, CONCERNING THE CREATION OF NEW BRANCH LIBRARIES: FIRST READING: FEBRUARY 19, 1990.

Dr. Gherman initiated discussion of this resolution with some background information. He mentioned that the library continues to receive requests from off-campus sites requesting the establishment of library facilities. He added that the resolution intends to reaffirm the fact that Virginia Tech should have a centralized library structure, as opposed to a more distributed system. Dr. Carlisle asked if the resolution was being proposed as simply a funding recommendation or as a programmatic matter, i.e., if the funds could be provided, would the library establish additional branches? Dr. Gherman responded that the intent is to discourage the establishment of library branches, regardless of the availability of funds. Dr. Scanlon inquired what constituted "additional funding"? Dr.

Eng and Mr. Ridenour both expressed their concern that the resolution suggests that a lack of funds prevents the establishment of branch libraries, rather than conveying a deliberate programmatic effort to discourage a distributed library system. If the latter is the intent, it should be so stated, they thought.

Dr. Sorensen moved that the resolution be referred back to the Library Committee for further consideration. The motion was seconded and passed without dissent.

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

a. Commission on Extension, December 12, 1989.

b. Commission on Faculty Affairs, November 17, 1989 and January 19, 1990.

Dr. Eng noted Item IV of the 1/19/90 minutes. As stated in those minutes, "The Commission [on Faculty Affairs] does not recommend that a limit be placed on the number of publications which can be submitted for consideration during a promotion or tenure review." He explained the Commission felt it would be extremely difficult to establish such a university-wide policy, and that it might also be unfair to some individuals.

c. Commission on Graduate Studies, December 6, 1989.

Dr. Kingston referenced Item 4, the proposed CGS resolution on Redefinition of Assistantship, and asked when that document would be coming before Council as a policy resolution. Dr. Hooper responded that it should have done so already; he added that he would look into the status of the document. Drs. Kingston and Arnold asked that the relevant item in the minutes, Item 4, be excepted from approval and Dr. Hooper concurred.

Mr. Gilbert inquired about the status of Item 3, the proposed graduate student commuter shuttle to Roanoke. Mr. Townsend indicated that at present there seemed to be only minimal support for the shuttle, and thus he was unable to provide any substantive information about the project.

7. FOR INFORMATION

a. Minutes of the Library Committee, January 10, 1990

Mr. Gilbert noted that the Student Government Association is quite concerned about the possible removal of study space from Newman Library.

b. Ongoing discussion of the Report of the Task Force on the University Council, Standing University Commissions and Committees: Recommended Constitution and Bylaws Revisions, January 5, 1990.

Dr. Moore distributed a list of the recommended changes in the Task Force recommendations, dated March 5, 1990, primarily addressing suggested additions and/or deletions to the various commissions and committees. One of the other suggested changes would require University Council to approve all minutes from the University Standing Committees and the University Operational Committees, as suggested in a previous Council meeting. Dr. Moore reminded members that these changes do not necessarily reflect the Task Force's endorsement; they only represent suggestions received by the Task Force. Mr. Tyrrell asked Dr. Moore if there was an undergraduate student representative serving on the Task Force? Dr. Moore responded there was, but that this individual had not been regularly participating since the summer. He also mentioned that there has been no regular graduate student representation on the Task Force, either. Mr. Townsend inquired if another student could represent the assigned individual. Dr. McComas invited Mr. Townsend and Mr. Gilbert to forward to him the names of individuals willing to serve on the Task Force. Dr. Moore noted that the

Report is scheduled to come before Council as a resolution for first reading on March 19th. He added, however, that first reading could be delayed until the first meeting in April. Dr. McComas requested that Dr. Carlisle meet on this topic with both the Task Force and representatives of the Faculty Senate in order to reach common agreement, even if it delays the formal approval of the Report.

Dr. Rees noted that the SAT exams are being given on same day as Commencement, May 5th. He added that it might create problems of noise and parking. Dr. Harris was asked to follow up on this matter. (Note: It was later learned that all exams will be in rooms removed as far as possible from the center of campus. These rooms are closed to outside noise.)

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
April 16, 1990

Dr. McComas called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m.

Present: J. McComas, M. Ridenour, E.F. Carlisle, L. Eng, J. Johnson, P. Gherman, L. Harris, G. Hooper, J. Nichols, E. Egger (for C. Steger), H. Doswald, H. Bonham (for R. Sorensen), J.F. Marchman (for P. Torgersen), R. Purdy (for S. Ritchey), M.A. Lewis (for J. Buffer), R.L. Pyle (for P. Eyre), L. Moore, L. Arnold, A.J. Davis, L. Rees, R. Small, R. Lovingood, E. Henneke, L. Geyer, D. Kingston, J. Crittenden, N. Marriott, P.F. Scanlon (for S. Batie), A. Snoke, P. Volhein (for J. Riddle), J. Budd (for D. Gilbert), G. LoCascio (for P. Murphy), P. Radcliffe, W. Tyrrell, M. Miller, A. Townsend

Guests: John Ashby, Spectrum

Absent: C. Forbes, R. Smoot, T. Goodale, R. Heterick, C. Carrig, N. Eiss, D. Lush

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Following the distribution of a memo from Dennis Hinkle concerning the proposed new B.S. degree program in Industrial Design within the College of Architecture and Urban Studies, Dr. Arnold requested that it be added to the agenda as an item for discussion. The item was added as #5d under "For Information."

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

2. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF MARCH 5, 1990

Mr. Miller noted that the minutes should reflect that under item #4, First Reading of CUS Resolution 1989-90 A, it was Mike Miller (not Bill Tyrrell) who raised the question of the resolution's proposed target group.

The University Council minutes of the meeting of March 5, 1990 were approved as amended.

3. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1989-90 B, CONCERNING GUIDELINES FOR UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE REQUIREMENT CHANGES.

Dr. Lewis noted that this resolution is intended to replace Policy Memorandum 41.1 and would go into effect for the 1992 graduating class. In describing the changes this resolution would make, Dr. Lewis, representing the Course Criteria Committee of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies, highlighted three provisions: 1) that CUS direct its secretary to maintain a file of all the degree requirement checklists, which would in particular include the issue of options; 2) that the university adopt a series of procedures to assist departments and colleges in the revision and implementation of curricula changes and graduation checklists; and 3) that a department/division must follow a formal approval process if it wishes an option to appear on the transcript itself; this request should accompany the request for approval of the option or concentration.

The resolution was carried forward for second reading.

4. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON FACULTY AFFAIRS RESOLUTION 1989-90 A, CONCERNING LENGTH OF ADMINISTRATIVE TERMS IN OFFICE. FIRST READING: MARCH 5, 1990.

Dr. Eng recapped the content of the resolution which provides language for the faculty handbook that would stipulate department or division chairs, heads and directors will serve for fixed length terms specified by the department or division. The length of term to be served and procedures for renewal will be decided by the departmental or divisional faculty in consultation with the college dean.

Dr. Carlisle distributed a revised memo (dated April 10, 1990) concerning policy guidelines about the role, responsibilities, appointment, and evaluation of department heads, chairs, and division directors. Dr. Carlisle explained that the content of this memo is a policy interpretation of CFA Resolution 1989-90 A, supported by the CFA and the college deans. Dr. Marriott asked if the resolution would be retroactive; i.e., would it apply to individuals currently in leadership positions? Dr. Carlisle responded that it would, with some start-up flexibility. With regard to item #2 of the memorandum that describes appointment procedures of department/division administrators, Mr. Townsend asked if a student representative could be added to the list of possible search committee members. Dr. Carlisle responded that his memorandum does not purposefully exclude student representation on search committees, and added that he would include such a statement. Dr. Gherman observed that while the memorandum specifies appointment terms of no longer than five years, the resolution does not. He asked if new appointees would be assigned a specific length term. Drs. Carlisle and McComas responded that terms lengths would be made known at the time of their appointment. Dr. Henneke inquired about the first item of the memorandum, the role and responsibilities of department/division heads, chairs, and directors. He noted that the description does not mention scholarly activities, e.g., research and teaching, and suggested that it should. Dr. Carlisle responded that his memo addresses what the resolution addresses -- that is, the situation of an individual as head, director, or chair, rather than that individual's work as faculty member. Dr. McComas noted that the purpose of both the memorandum and the resolution is to address term length and assessment procedures, rather than administrative roles. Dr. Eng added that Council is not being asked to vote on the content of Dr. Carlisle's memorandum, but on the resolution itself, which addresses only the issue of administrative term length.

The motion carried.

5. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1989-90 A, CONCERNING MIDTERM GRADES FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS. FIRST READING: MARCH 5, 1990.

Dr. Carlisle referred to the minutes of March 5, 1990 for a discussion of the content of the resolution.

The motion carried.

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

a. Commission on Extension, February 6, 1990.

b. Commission on Faculty Affairs, February 2, 1990.

c. Commission on Graduate Studies, February 7, February 21, March 7, and March 21, 1990.

Dr. Hooper noted the ongoing discussion of Commencement, with particular reference to the approval of a separate doctoral commencement ceremony. Mr. Townsend thanked Dr. Hooper and those on the Commencement Committee on behalf of GSA for their efforts.

d. Commission on Research, January 24, 1990.

e. Commission on Student Affairs, January 18 and February 15, 1990.

f. Commission on Undergraduate Studies, January 8, January 22 and February 12, 1990.

Dr. Carlisle referenced the ongoing discussion of the work of the Core Curriculum Committee, chaired by Carol Burch-Brown. The committee is focusing primarily on two areas: 1) the short-term problem of insufficient seating for some of the core curriculum courses, and 2) the longer-term question of revising the core curriculum. Dr. Arnold asked if there were other issues the committee is addressing. Dr. Carlisle responded that their charge is fairly long and includes issues such as gender, race, international perspectives, technological questions, and the purpose of the core curriculum.

7. FOR INFORMATION

a. Minutes of the University Committee for Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action, January 18 and February 21, 1990.

b. Minutes of the University Communications Network Committee, January 31 and February 28, 1990.

Dr. Snoke referenced the final item from the minutes of February 28, 1990, the proposed name change for the committee, suggesting that the name of the UCNC be changed to University Communications Resources Committee. Dr. Snoke inquired whether the Committee could change their own name, or needed Council approval to do so. Dr. Snoke also reiterated his concern about resolution submission procedures for committees that report directly to Council, but do not have a member sitting on that body. Dr. Harris responded that during this interim period prior to the completion of the Task Force Report, it would probably be the president's place to accept the name change. Dr. McComas did so and asked that minutes reflect this approval. In reference to the second issue, Dr. Harris responded that he he has sent a memo clarifying the procedures for resolution submission and approval to all the chairs of the committees who do not report to a commission.

c. Minutes of the University Library Committee, February 7, 1990.

With reference to item #2, Dr. Gherman noted the cancellation of 16 international newspapers, explaining that the volume of subscriptions necessary to serve the many international constituencies on campus had become very costly. Student Affairs will be sponsoring subscriptions to several of these papers from student fees; eventually they will be housed in Squires Student Center.

d. Discussion of the new B.S. degree program in Industrial Design, submitted by the College of Architecture and Urban Studies.

Dr. Egger stated that this issue was being brought before Council at this time because the program had only just been approved by CUS (on April 9th) and thus may not be included in CUS minutes submitted for approval at the final Council meeting of the year. (Although Council approval of new degree programs is not required as a part of the approval process, it is routinely noted and approved in the commission minutes.) In presenting this proposal before Council, Dr. Egger and his colleagues wanted assurance that they could proceed with the

submission of the document to the Board of Visitors in August and to the State Council on Higher Education in September. If approved, the program will be initiated in Fall, 1992.

Dr. McComas suggested that Council could indicate approval of the program proposal by approving the April 9, 1990 CUS minutes, which will include a detailed description of the proposal, at the next meeting.

Dr. Snoke inquired about the appropriate level of involvement of University Council in the approval process for new courses and degree programs. Dr. Kingston added that because such issues involve the commitment of resources, University Council should be included in the formal approval process for new courses and programs. Dr. McComas added that this would be a timely issue for Council to address, and that just because Council has not been formally involved in the past does not suggest that it should not be in the future. Dr. Carlisle added that unless a college or department can demonstrate persuasively that library, financial, and human resources are satisfactory, new programs will not be approved or advanced to SCHEV; however, he added that more specificity about the nature of the approval process at all stages is needed.

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS

o Dr. McComas announced that Council's final meeting of the 1989-90 academic year would need to be rescheduled. After some discussion, members agreed to meet on Thursday, May 3rd, from 8:15 to 9:30 a.m. The location will be announced.

o Dr. Nichols announced that James F. Johnson has been named director of Virginia Cooperative Extension.

o Dr. McComas thanked the members of the Faculty Senate, and in particular Drs. Scanlon, Goss, and Eng, for their efforts during the past year.

o Dr. McComas then addressed the status of Black students at Virginia Tech. He noted that although we have made significant progress in recruiting greater numbers of minority students (a 58% increase in the number of applications), the university has not been as successful in promoting a nurturing campus climate. Dr. McComas indicated that he has had several opportunities to meet with Black students and reported that there is a sense of alienation among this group. He is planning a fall meeting with leaders of the Faculty Senate, department heads, and deans to increase the awareness of the problems black students continue to face at Virginia Tech. Dr. McComas added that, at the request of the Governor's Office, this university is now in the process of preparing an affirmative action plan that addresses women and minorities -- both faculty and students.

o Dr. McComas thanked Mr. Ridenour, Dr. Carlisle, the Faculty Senate and the Ad Hoc Budget Committee for their recent work concerning the university's budget.

o Mr. Tyrrell introduced James Budd, President of the Student Government Association, and Gregg LoCascio, Vice President of the SGA. Following those introductions, Dr. McComas took the opportunity to publicly thank David Gilbert and David Lush for their efforts during the past year.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
May 3, 1990

Dr. McComas called the meeting to order at 8:15 a.m.

Present: J. McComas, M. Ridenour, L. Cross (for T. Goodale), L. Eng, L. Leffel (for J. Johnson), B. Foltin (for P. Gherman), L. Harris, E. Stout (for G. Hooper), R. Heterick, J. White (for J. Nichols), D. Hanna (for C. Steger), H. Bonham (for R. Sorensen), J. Crunkilton (for J. Buffer), J. Marchman (for P. Torgersen), R. Pyle (for P. Eyre), L. Moore, L. Arnold, A.J. Davis, L. Rees, D. Fleming (for R. Small), C. Carrig, E. Henneke, L. Geyer, P.F. Scanlon (for N. Eiss), D. Kingston, J. Crittenden, N. Marriott, S. Batie, A. Snoke, J. Budd (for D. Gilbert), J. Earley (for P. Murphy), P. Radcliffe, D. Lush

Absent: C. Forbes, R. Smoot, F. Carlisle, H. Doswald, S. Ritchey, R. Lovingood, J. Riddle, W. Tyrrell, M. Miller, A. Townsend

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 16, 1990

The University Council minutes of the meeting of April 16, 1990 were approved as distributed.

3. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1989-90 B, CONCERNING GUIDELINES FOR UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE REQUIREMENT CHANGES. FIRST READING: APRIL 16, 1990.

The motion CARRIED.

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

- a. Commission on Extension, March 6, 1990.
- b. Commission on Faculty Affairs, March 2 and April 6, 1990.
- c. Commission on Graduate Studies, April 4, 1990.

5. FOR INFORMATION

- a. Minutes of the University Committee on Athletics: October 5, November 9, December 13, 1989; January 25, February 22, March 22, 1990.

Dr. Crittenden described a recent Faculty Senate meeting during which Mr. Braine indicated that Virginia Tech would need to lower its admissions standards for student-athletes if the university was to be more competitive on the playing field. He inquired whether the university had any immediate plans to do so. Dr. McComas responded that although the Athletic Department might like lower admissions standards for its student-athletes, he did not anticipate any change in admissions practices. He added that Dr. Carlisle would head any discussions on this matter if and when such discussions were held. Mr. Ridenour noted that two meetings have been held recently with members of the Athletic

Department, adding that there has been no move to lower admissions requirements for student-athletes. Dr. McComas noted that several alumni have complained in letters to him that Virginia Tech's admissions standards for student-athletes are higher than other institutions, e.g., the University of Virginia, but noted that any change in admissions practices would need to be widely discussed among faculty. Dr. McComas also stated that the Virginia Tech football team had done remarkably well considering that it had been working with 11 fewer athletic scholarships than normal. Dr. Arnold requested that the first meeting of University Council in the fall include a discussion of special admissions practices at Virginia Tech. Dr. Harris added that the process by which special admissions are granted has been approved by the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and involves a committee that has representation from the student's desired department.

b. Minutes of the University Committee on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action, March 21, 1990.

6. QUESTION/ANSWER FORUM

Dr. Crittenden voiced his concern that the Black Studies Concentration was being brought directly before CUS for approval rather than going through the normal approval process. Dr. Crittenden stated that while he favors inauguration of the program, he disapproves of bypassing the regular approval channels. He asked that this decision be reevaluated before going any further. Dr. McComas responded that a volatile racial climate is becoming more prevalent on college campuses all across the country and cited several examples of racial unrest. Dr. Arnold agreed with his evaluation, but added that it provided further impetus for paying heed to the proper approval channels. In response to a question, Dr. John White verified that the Black Studies Program did not go through either the normal 30-day curriculum review or the CUS course criteria review process, but rather came directly before CUS. Dr. Marchman described some troublesome elements of this situation, namely that 1) CUS did not unanimously approve the program, and 2) CUS included the special studies course in the core curriculum when in the past it had not included such courses in the core. Dr. Arnold added that calling special meetings of committees/commissions involved with such issues is an appropriate means of accomplishing business when time pressures exist. Dr. McComas requested that the minutes reflect this discussion and indicated that he would discuss this matter with Dr. Carlisle.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. McComas welcomed to University Council James Budd, the new SGA President, and David Lush, returning as representative of the Graduate Student Assembly.

Dr. McComas expressed his appreciation for the campus-wide support shown during the budget cutbacks. He described the necessity of demonstrating to the Legislature how these cuts will affect the quality of higher education in the Commonwealth. In particular, Virginia Tech and other institutions will develop a standard format for reporting in a consolidated way the impact of these budget reductions on higher education. Particular areas of focus will include reductions in staffing patterns, lack of course selection flexibility, delays in graduation, and reductions in research expenditures. Dr. McComas also mentioned that community colleges in Virginia may have to cut back their admissions by 2,000-3,000 students. Dr. McComas noted the outstanding work done by David Bousquet and his colleagues in the Admissions Office. He informed Council that Virginia Tech has experienced a 2% increase in applications while other Virginia universities are showing declines.

Dr. Eng announced that the Faculty Senate was successful in getting more than half of the eligible faculty to cast ballots in the recent constitu-

tional referendum which approved the revisions of the Faculty Senate constitution.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg