Minutes
University Council Meeting
October 7, 1991

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

Present:J. McComas, E.F. Carlisle, R. Smoot, L. Geyer, B. Pendergrass (for T. Goodale), C. Steger, P. Gherman, L. Harris, G. Hooper, J. Nichols, H. Doswald, R. Sorensen, E. Blythe, J. Buffer, J. Marchman (for W.G. Clough), P. Eyre, D. Smith, D. Hewitt, P. Miller, L. Rees, N. Dodl, J. Robertson, F. Thye, R. Heller, G. Bunce, G. Holtzman, J. Ficenec, B. Crittenden, N. Marriott, S. Batie, A. Snoke, L. Barroso, C. Vargo, M. Byrne, K. Mottley, M. Cacheris, B. Rexroad, P. Larkin

Guests: Peter Rony, Chemical Engineering; John Hillison, Faculty Senate; Bill Burleson, Spectrum; Richard Bambach, Geological Sciences

Absent: C. Forbes, S.J. Ritchey

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Dr. McComas opened the first University Council meeting of the 1991-92 academic year by welcoming new and returning members. Each member introduced himself/herself and noted his/her university affiliation.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

3. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF APRIL 25, 1991

The University Council minutes of the meeting of April 25, 1991 were approved as distributed.

4. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON FACULTY AFFAIRS RESOLUTION, 1991-92A, CONCERNING THE PROPOSED REVISION OF THE FACULTY GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES.

Dr. Geyer opened discussion of this item by providing a brief history of the faculty grievance system, which is excluded by law from the state classified staff grievance system. He noted that the principal difference between the two systems is that faculty can file salary grievances, while classified staff cannot. He explained that the new proposed procedures, which differ from the existing procedures in that they are less cumbersome, have been available to faculty as an alternative approach for about a year. Dr. Geyer reported that all faculty have chosen the new procedures. He also noted that the Faculty Senate has twice reviewed and amended the document.

Dr. Barry Crittenden then introduced nine amendments to the proposed grievance procedures. The amendments, he argued, (1) are designed to allow both the aggrieved and the Faculty Review Committee ample opportunity to present all relevant information, and (2) provide for more timeliness throughout the grievance process. He then explained each of the nine amendments. Dr. McComas asked the Commission on Faculty Affairs to examine and respond to

Dr. Crittenden's amendments as appropriate.

Dr. Gherman pointed out that the resolution allows an aggrieved faculty member to call in the Faculty Senate Committee on Reconciliation, but as written does not permit an administrator the same right in order to mediate a grievance with a faculty member. This, he indicated, should be changed.

Dr. Peter Rony, Professor of Chemical Engineering, spoke about his personal experiences with the faculty grievance procedures. He informed Council that his grievance took three full years to resolve. He urged that (1) the resolution be returned to the CFA for further consideration regarding timely review, (2) all university faculty be made party to these deliberations, and (3) the resolution be published in SPECTRUM so that all faculty members will be aware of its content.

Dr. Richard Bambach, who acted as chair of the Faculty Review Committee, noted that the revision of the grievance procedures was designed specifically to eliminate the problems that had occurred in the past. Dr. Bambach stated that the difficulty of coordinating the schedules of the involved individuals made it impractical to set specific time limits. He added his belief that the new procedures would eliminate the possibility of cases being dragged out over a long period.

Dr. Snoke expressed his reservation about further efforts to gain input such as publishing the resolution in SPECTRUM, stating that the CFA and the Faculty Senate provide avenues for two-way communication and feedback. In response, Dr. Rony reiterated his belief that the faculty grievance procedures are sufficiently important to justify broader dissemination.

The resolution was carried forward for second reading.

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

a. Commission on Graduate Studies, April 3, 1991.

b. Commission on Research, April 10 and September 11, 1991.

c. Commission on Student Affairs, March 21, April 18, and September 5, 1991.

d. Commission on Undergraduate Studies, March 25 and April 8, 1991.

6. FOR INFORMATION

a. Minutes of the Committee on Athletics, March 21, April 11, and May 13, 1991.

b. Minutes of the Building Committee, April 12, 1991.

Dr. McComas briefly reported the status of capital projects at Virginia Tech, including the integrated plan to convert upper quad residence halls to academic space. He also noted that the university-wide need for space is estimated at 500,000 square feet. He stated that Virginia Tech will need to continue to make its case to increase capital funds.

c. Minutes of the University Communications Resources Committee, March 27, April 24, and May 29, 1991.

In response to a question from Dr. Snoke about the Committee's ongoing discussions of dial-in access, Dr. Blythe reported that the Committee has been unable to locate appropriate software that would facilitate pricing and cost-recovery for this service. He did not anticipate that charging for dial-in access would occur during this fiscal year because of software limitations.

d. Minutes of the Computer Committee, April 3, and May 1, 1991.

e. Minutes of the University Committee on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action, March 20 and April 17, 1991.

f. Minutes of the University Library Committee, April 3, 1991.

Dr. Gherman reported that the VTLS computer has been upgraded to include a "word-search" feature.

g. Status of Searches

Dr. Carlisle reported that it is unlikely that the Provost's Office will be initiating the search for the Vice President for Information Systems before the spring, due to the work-load constraints involved with the two other searches (Dean for the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and Dean for the School of Forestry). Dr. Carlisle added that Dr. Blythe, interim V.P. for Information Systems, and others will be reevaluating the structure and purpose of Information Systems. On the subject of the search for Dr. Nichols' successor, Dr. Carlisle reported that the search committee will be identifying individuals to bring to campus in the next several weeks. He then stated that the search for the Dean of the School of Forestry is still in its early stages, adding that the anticipated status change to a college necessitated that the position be readvertised as a dean's position.

h. University Council Constitution

Reporting for Dr. Larry Moore, Dr. Harris relayed two corrections to the document, dated July 9, 1991. The first, on page 7, adds the Associate Provost for Research to the Commission on Graduate Studies (for a total of 25 members). The second, in section 13, adds the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies (totaling 27 members). A third correction noted after the meeting adds the Vice President for Alumni Relations to the Commission for University Support. Dr. Harris added that the revised document will be distributed at the next meeting.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. McComas introduced a slide-tape presentation produced by University Relations and narrated by Ms. Karen Cronin, Information Officer for Educational Communications. He informed Council that the slide show will be used by university presidents and members of their staffs as they address the needs of higher education in talks to alumni and friends around the state. The same presentation will also be made to legislators and members of newspaper editorial boards.

8. QUESTION/ANSWER FORUM

Dr. Geyer note that there has been a change in the procedures used by the Educational Foundation to manage funds. He asked for a summary of past and current charges and for an explanation as to why there has been a change in the policy. In response, Dr. McComas described how the university's decentralized development effort has led over time to more restricted giving, especially to specific colleges, rather than to the university at large, thus leaving fewer resources to support the operation of the Foundation itself. He asked that a statement concerning this policy be developed by Mr. Forbes and distributed at an upcoming meeting.

In response to a question from Dr. Heller about a recent increase in VTIP administrative costs charged to inventors, Dr. Hooper noted that it, too,

was related to the associated costs of investing and managing these funds. Mr. Ridenour added that more detailed information would be distributed to Council members about these matters.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

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

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
October 21, 1991

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

Present:J. McComas, C. Forbes, E.F. Carlisle, L. Geyer, T. Goodale, C. Steger, P. Gherman, L. Harris, G. Hooper, G. Jubb (for J. Nichols), H. Doswald, R. Sorensen, S.J. Ritchey, E. Blythe, J. Buffer, J. Osborne (for W.G. Clough), B. Meldrum (for P. Eyre), D. Hewitt, L. Rees, N. Dodl, D. Smith, F. Thye, G. Holtzman, J. Ficenec, B. Crittenden, N. Marriott, J. Hillison (for S. Batie), A. Snoke, L. Barroso, C. Luch, C. Vargo, M. Byrne, M. Cacheris, B. Rexroad, P. Larkin

Guests: Bill Burleson, Spectrum; Cornel N. Morton, EO/AA

Absent: M. Ridenour, R. Smoot, P. Miller, J. Robertson, R. Heller, G. Bunce, K. Mottley

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

2. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF OCTOBER 7, 1991

The University Council minutes of the meeting of October 7, 1991 were approved with corrections to (1) paragraph 3 of Section 4, and (2) Section 6C.

3. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON RESEARCH RESOLUTION 1991-92A, CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH CENTERS.

Dr. Hooper briefly reviewed the history of interdisciplinary research centers at Virginia Tech, noting that they have "been under policy for quite a long time." The proposed resolution, he explained, was developed to (1) reflect previous policy guidelines, and (2) recognize more recent SCHEV requirements for the systematic review of interdisciplinary centers. Dr. Hooper added that he would be clarifying the role of deans and department heads in an amended version of the resolution, to be distributed to Council prior to second reading.

The resolution was carried forward for second reading.

4. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON FACULTY AFFAIRS RESOLUTION, 1991-92A, PROPOSED REVISION OF THE FACULTY GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES. FIRST READING, OCTOBER 7, 1991.

Dr. Geyer requested that the resolution be referred to the Commission on Faculty Affairs so that Dr. Crittenden's proposed amendments to the document could be considered.

The resolution was referred.

_____

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

MEETINGS.

a. Commission on Graduate Studies, April 17 and September 20, 1991.
Dr. Hooper noted a typographical error in Item 3 of the April 17 minutes that should read "April 3rd" instead of April 17.

Dr. Hooper highlighted Item 6 of the September 20 minutes, the revision of the Graduate Honor System Constitution. He noted that the constitution would be presented for Council's approval at an upcoming meeting.

b. Commission on Research, September 25, 1991.

Dr. Hooper noted that the Commission on Research will be examining a graduate research tuition package used at UVa for possible use at Virginia Tech.

6. FOR INFORMATION

a. Minutes of the University Library Committee, May 1, 1991.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. McComas distributed a budget summary that will be used to present the university's priorities and needs to the General Assembly. As background, he also described the three methods through which the university solicits financial support: 1) via the Governor's budget request; 2) through the annual SCHEV budget; and 3) through legislative amendments proffered by state representatives and senators. Dr. McComas then highlighted several strategies that will be followed to seek the support of the parents of the 12,000 in-state students, as well as alumni.

In response to a question from Dr. Marriott, Dr. McComas reviewed the capital needs summary, noting the integrated space plan and plans for a new bookstore and adjacent parking garage.

Dr. Hillison, President of the Faculty Senate, distributed copies of the "Procedures of the Faculty Review Committee," which was recently revised and approved by the Faculty Senate.

Melissa Byrne announced that Secretary of Education, James Dyke, met recently with an all-student audience to discuss 1) the state of higher education in Virginia, 2) sexual assault on college campuses, and 3) substance abuse.

8. QUESTION/ANSWER FORUM

Dr. Geyer inquired when a summary statement concerning the fee structure used by the Education Foundation would be distributed. Dr. McComas reported that recent discussions with the Development Foundation have resulted in some changes, but that Mr. Ridenour or Dr. Smoot would need to report on these. He added that it would be added as an informational item at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
November 4, 1991

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

Present:J. McComas, C. Forbes, M. Ridenour, E.F. Carlisle, R. Smoot, L. Geyer, T. Goodale, C. Steger, Paul Metz (for P. Gherman), L. Harris, G. Hooper, A. Swiger (for J. Nichols), T. Bonham (for R. Sorensen), S.J. Ritchey, E. Blythe, J. Buffer, W.G. Clough, P. Eyre, D. Smith, D. Hewitt, L. Rees, N. Dodl, Marie Wall (for P. Miller), R. Heller, J. Robertson, F. Thye, G. Holtzman, J. Ficenec, D. deWolf (for B. Crittenden), Joseph Falkinham (for N. Marriott), S. Batie, A. Snoke, L. Barroso, C. Vargo, M. Byrne, K. Mottley, M. Cacheris, Laura Tessmer, (for P. Larkin)

Guests: Bill Burleson, Spectrum; Cornel N. Morton, EO/AA; Martha Johnson, Graduate School; Robert Morgan, SGA; Neil Stewart, Graduate Honor System

Absent: H. Doswald, G. Bunce, C. Luch, B. Rexroad

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

2. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF OCTOBER 21, 1991

The University Council minutes of the meeting of October 21, 1991 were approved as written.

3. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON FACULTY AFFAIRS RESOLUTION 1991-92B, CONCERNING THE GEOGRAPHICAL TRANSFER POLICY.

Dr. Geyer reviewed the background of the proposed resolution, which came about as a result of concern for financial considerations involving faculty transfers. He pointed out that when a faculty member is transferred for programmatic reasons, there is general agreement among CFA members that the program should 1) offset moving expenses, and 2) make appropriate salary adjustments as necessary to reflect a higher cost-of-living. In response to the second consideration, Dr. Carlisle suggested that the CFA carefully consider the specific mechanisms for calculating these salary adjustments.

Dr. Eyre then described a hypothetical situation involving a faculty member transferred to a lower-cost of living area. Would that individual, he asked, be paid less to reflect these circumstances? Dr. Eyre suggested that the resolution be amended to reflect this possibility.

The resolution was carried forward for second reading.

4. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON GRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1991-92A, CONCERNING THE CONSTITUTION OF THE VIRGINIA TECH GRADUATE HONOR SYSTEM, DATED APRIL 19, 1991.

As background, Dr. Hooper described how the proposed constitution came to

be rewritten in response to a survey concerning the effectiveness of the original constitution. The proposed draft, he explained, was written by a committee of faculty, students and administrators. It was then reviewed by the Commission on Graduate Studies, the Graduate Student Assembly, and Virginia Tech General Counsel's Office. Dr. Hooper stated that the new Constitution incorporates major revisions, adding "that there is hardly a topic area that has not been modified." Dr. McComas then called on Mr. Neil Stewart, Chief Justice of the Graduate Honor System, who summarized the contents of the new document. Ms. Vargo announced that the GSA fully supports the new constitution.

The resolution was carried forward for second reading.

5. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON RESEARCH RESOLUTION 1991-92B, CONCERNING A POLICY ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTIES.

Dr. Hooper noted that because the definition of "intellectual properties" has broadened considerably over the past five years, the Intellectual Properties Committee (IPC) and the Commission on Research undertook a thorough review of the original 1986 policy. The resulting resolution, he explained, addresses two major areas: 1) the membership, structure and role of the Intellectual Properties Committee, and 2) a working definition of intellectual properties that incorporates both "traditional" and "novel" intellectual properties, such as inventions and software. Dr. Hooper then pointed out that the ratio of income generated from intellectual properties will remain the same, with 50% to the inventor, 10% to the department/college of origin, and 40% to Virginia Tech Intellectual Properties (VTIP).

Dr. Clough inquired whether an intellectual property would be subject to VTIP surcharges if it had been developed over time by a faculty member with a previous university affiliation? Dr. Hooper responded that while the IPC and VTIP would carefully consider each case, they would be more proactive in protecting the interests of this university. Dr. Ficenec inquired why every college was not represented on the Intellectual Properties Committee? Dr. Hooper responded that the IPC's membership was structured so that representatives have the appropriate professional background and expertise to assess the merits of an individual's intellectual property. Several people then noted that the resolution's discussion of possible inventors fails to include undergraduates, graduate students or staff. Dr. Hooper acknowledged this oversight and informed Council that a revised draft would correct these omissions.

The resolution was carried forward for second reading.

6. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON RESEARCH RESOLUTION 1991-92A, CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH CENTERS (AMENDED RESOLUTION). FIRST READING, OCTOBER 21, 1991.

Dr. Hooper reviewed the content of the modified resolution, noting that all changes were underlined.

The resolution PASSED.

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

a. Commission on Extension, April 2, 1991.

b. Commission on Faculty Affairs, October 4, 1991.

c. Commission on Research, October 9, 1991.

Dr. Hooper highlighted item #5, the proposed special research tuition resolution for graduate students, reporting that it has been referred

to the Commission on Graduate Studies.

d. Commission on Student Affairs, September 19 and October 3, 1991.
e. Approval of the Minutes of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies, April 22 and September 23, 1991.

8. FOR INFORMATION

a. Minutes of the University Committee on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action, September 17, 1991.

b. Minutes of the University Library Committee, September 11, 1991.

Dr. Snoke asked if Council could receive a copy of the University Libraries Mission and Goals statement and reorganization charts, noted in the minutes. Dr. Metz responded that this document would be appended to the next set of University Library Committee minutes.

c. Report on the Virginia Tech Development Foundation's fee structure.

Dr. Smoot reported that concerns raised by Council and others about the Virginia Tech Development Foundation's revised fee structure has resulted in the suspension of fees on gifts. Any amounts collected to date will be returned. In consultation with the college deans, the Development Foundation Board will explore other means to raise sufficient funds to support development activities.

Dr. Dodl inquired about fees generated from telephone fundraising efforts. Mr. Forbes responded that those fees will remain in place as administrative costs of running the telethon program.

Dr. McComas spoke at length about the complexity of development efforts. He highlighted the difficulty of apportioning fees on gifts, especially in cases when the donor specifies that the gift not be used for administrative purposes. He then stressed that Development Foundation fees are vital to the operation of the university.

Dr. Hooper distributed to Council a report on the Virginia Tech Intellectual Properties, Inc., which describes more fully VTIP's overhead policy.

9. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Kevin Mottley introduced Mr. Robert Morgan, the newly-elected speaker of the SGA House of Representatives.

Dr. Goodale updated Council on the status of the Andrea Walnes investigation, stating that recent remains discovered in Giles County were positively identified through dental records. A memorial service is scheduled for November 7th. A full criminal investigation has been initiated. Dr. McComas recognized the role of the Dean of Students Office and the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs in this and other matters involving students.

Dr. McComas updated Council on the continuing state-wide efforts to increase the corporate/business community's role in supporting higher education in the Commonwealth.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
December 2, 1991

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

Present:J. McComas, C. Forbes, M. Ridenour, E.F. Carlisle, R. Smoot, J. Hillison (for L. Geyer), T. Goodale, D. McAlister (for C. Steger), J. Eustis (for P. Gherman), L. Harris, G. Hooper, J. Nichols, R. Sorensen, J. Crunkilton (for J. Buffer), W.G. Clough, R. Bates (for H. Doswald), P. Eyre, D. Smith, D. Hewitt, L. Rees, N. Dodl, P. Miller, R. Heller, J. Robertson, G. Holtzman, J. Ficenec, B. Crittenden, N. Marriott, T. Rakes, A. Snoke, L. Barroso, C. Vargo, C. Luch, K. Mottley, M. Cacheris, P. Larkin, B. Rexroad

Guests: Bill Burleson, Spectrum; Cornel N. Morton, EO/AA; Neil Stewart, Graduate Honor System; Russ Cole, CSAC; Laura Tessmer, Residence Hall Federation

Absent: E. Blythe, S.J. Ritchey, F. Thye, G. Bunce, M. Byrne

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

2. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 4, 1991

The University Council minutes of the meeting of November 4, 1991 were approved with corrections.

3. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON RESEARCH RESOLUTION 1991-92C, CONCERNING PROCEDURES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE VIRGINIA STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT.

Dr. Hooper explained that this resolution was developed in response to the July, 1991, revision of the Virginia State and Local Government Conflict of Interest Act. It states that a Virginia Tech employee can hold a personal interest in a business which has a research and development contract with the university if the employee's personal interest is made known to and approved by the University before entering into the contract. He added that by law the appropriate dean and department head must know in advance if a corporation conducts business with the Research Division.

The resolution was carried forward for second reading.

4. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON FACULTY AFFAIRS RESOLUTION 1991-92B, GEOGRAPHICAL TRANSFER POLICY. FIRST READING, NOVEMBER 4, 1991 .

Dr. Hillison stated that the original resolution as distributed was amended according to recommendations that the document be more specific with regard to calculating salary adjustments. Specifically, he noted, the policy states that "a cost of living adjustment will be added to the faculty member's base salary during the period they are employed in a high-cost area as defined for classified employees in the Virginia compensation Plan issued by the State Personnel Director." He informed Council that CFA has approved the amended resolution; it also has the endorsement of the Faculty Senate. He moved approval of the resolution.

The resolution PASSED.

5. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON GRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1991-92A, CONCERNING THE CONSTITUTION OF THE VIRGINIA TECH GRADUATE HONOR SYSTEM, DATED APRIL 19, 1991.

Dr. Hooper moved approval of the resolution.

The resolution PASSED.

6. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON RESEARCH RESOLUTION 1991-92B, CONCERNING A POLICY ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTIES.

Dr. Hooper highlighted the textual changes (underlined in the amended resolution) made as a result of previous discussion of the document (e.g., including student and staff representatives on the Intellectual Properties Committee). He also clarified that VTIP (Virginia Tech Intellectual Properties) policies are separate and distinct from the policies contained in this document. In response to a question about the number of patents awarded at Virginia Tech, Dr. Hooper reported that a record number (over fifty) have been generated at this university since the beginning of the academic year. This translates, he noted, to a national ranking of 18 or 19 in the total number of patents awarded to a university.

Dr. Heller asked that VTIP's policies be made available to Council. Dr. Hooper invited anyone who is interested in receiving a copy of these guidelines to contact him directly.

Ms. Vargo pointed out that the resolution approved earlier (Item #5) incorrectly lists the GSA as "Graduate Student Association," while it should read "Graduate Student Assembly." Dr. Hooper stated that the final draft will correct that misprint. He then moved approval of the resolution.

The resolution PASSED.

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

a. Commission on Extension, October 1, 1991.

b. Commission on Graduate Studies, October 2, 1991.

c. Commission on Undergraduate Studies, October 14, 1991.

8. FOR INFORMATION

a. Minutes of the University Communications Resources Committee, September 25, 1991.

In the absence of a UCR committee representative, Dr. McComas asked that any questions regarding these minutes be held until the next University Council meeting.

b. Minutes of the Virginia Tech Athletic Committee, September 26 and October 16, 1991.

Mr. Ridenour spoke about the "Second Century Campaign," which will raise funds for Athletic Association facilities and scholarships. He explained that because state funds cannot be used to support the Athletic program, their budget becomes a "very tight one to manage."

Dr. Crittenden stated his belief that the distribution of tickets for the UVA game (held in Charlottesville) was unfair to students, whose athletic fee should have enabled them to at least purchase tickets for this game. Rather, he noted, season ticket holders bought most of the

available seats. Mr. Ridenour explained that the smaller stadium in Charlottesville translates to fewer tickets for both season ticket

holders and students. Dr. McComas agreed that the current system should be reviewed so that students have a greater opportunity to purchase tickets for games held at UVa. He asked Mr. Ridenour to discuss this issue with David Braine.

Dr. Heller observed that some of the weight-lifting equipment in the gym is in poor condition. Dr. Goodale responded that because this equipment is maintained through the recreational sports department (not the Athletic Dpartment), it becomes an issue for his office. He agreed to further investigate this situation.

9. QUESTION/ANSWER FORUM

Dr. Hillison requested an update on the latest round of budget reductions. In response, Dr. McComas informed Council that a contingency plan for a 3% reduction would be completed later that afternoon. While it is "very general" in nature so that adjustments can be made as necessary, it does not call for furloughs or layoffs through the remainder of this academic year. Dr. McComas addressed the need for a "coordinated response" among all state universities. He also spoke to the need to avoid raising student tuition levels -- particularly for out-of-state students.

Mr. Ridenour then described how a 5% reduction during the 1992-93 academic year might be managed, if this becomes necessary, through salary savings on unfilled positions and reduced equipment purchases and operating budgets.

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
January 20, 1992

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

Present:J. McComas, R. Smoot, E.F. Carlisle, J. Falkinham, T. Goodale, D. McAlister (for C. Steger), P. Gherman, L. Harris, G. Hooper, E. Blythe, L.A. Swiger, R. Sorensen, M.A. Lewis (for J. Buffer), W.G. Clough, S. J. Ritchey, P. Eyre, D. Smith, D. Hewitt, P. Miller, L. Rees, N. Dodl, J. Robertson, F. Thye, R. Heller, G. Holtzman, J. Ficenec, B. Crittenden, N. Marriott, T. Rakes, A. Snoke, L. Barroso, C. Luch, C. Vargo, M. Byrne, T. Snead (for K. Mottley), B. Rexroad, P. Larkin,

Guests: Bill Burleson, Spectrum; Cornel N. Morton, EO/AA; Vince Cilimberg, University Athletic Committee;

Absent: C. Forbes, M. Ridenour, H. Doswald, G. Bunce, M. Cacheris

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

2. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF DECEMBER 2, 1991

The University Council minutes of the meeting of December 2, 1991 were approved with corrections.

3. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON RESEARCH RESOLUTION 1991-92C, CONCERNING PROCEDURES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE VIRGINIA STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT.

Dr. Hooper moved approval of the resolution.

The resolution PASSED.

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

a. Commission on Faculty Affairs, October 25, November 8, November 22, and December 13, 1991.

b. Commission on Graduate Studies, November 8, 1991.

c. Commission on Research, October 23, 1991.

d. Commission on Student Affairs, October 17, November 7, and November 21, 1991.

Expanding on the minutes of October 17, Dr. Goodale informed Council that SCHEV has completed its Survey on Sexual Assault and forwarded its recommendations to Virginia colleges and universities. He added that CSA is now reviewing those recommendations. Dr. Goodale then acknowledged the efforts of the Student Government Association and the Graduate Student Assembly for their well-organized response to additional budget reductions.

Mr. Larkin noted that the minutes of October 17 contain a one-sentence

reference to "ecological and environmental concerns about CRC moving closer to campus" (Item #2 under "Reports of Subcommittees"). He explained that this refers to his concern about the ongoing development of land surrounding the Corporate Research Center. He questioned the need to develop further sites when several plots of land are already vacant and await construction. Dr. McComas asked Dr. Harris to follow up on this issue and share his findings with Mr. Larkin.

e. Commission on Undergraduate Studies, October 28 and November 11, 1991.

Dr. Crittenden asked Dr. Carlisle to explain the rationale for proposed "Review of Admissions Policy" (October 28 minutes, Item #6). In response, Dr. Carlisle detailed his recommendation for an eight-member committee (five faculty, one dean, one associate dean, and one undergraduate student) to review the university's admissions policy. In addition to noting that five years has elapsed since the last review, Dr. Carlisle also observed that at least two proposals for modification of the admissions policy await review, as well as resolution of several questions regarding the Admissions Advisory Committee. Dr. Crittenden then voiced his concern about what he perceived as a downgrading of admissions standards. Dr. Carlisle responded that the committee, if assembled, will "consult widely" as it reviews Virginia Tech's admissions policy and encouraged Dr. Crittenden to express his views to the committee at that time.

5. FOR INFORMATION

a. Minutes of the Virginia Tech Athletic Committee, November 13, 1991.

b. Minutes of the University Communications Resources Committee, October 30, 1991.

c. Minutes of the University Committee on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action, October 15, and November 19, 1991.

Dr. McComas expressed his appreciation to Dr. Cornel Morton and the staff of the Equal Opportunity Office and Personnel Services for their work in connection with the recent successful OFCCP (Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs) review.

d. University Libraries Mission and Goals Statement and Organizational Charts.

Dr. Gherman explained some of the libraries' reorganization and personnel changes that are the result of budget cuts.

Drs. Harris and Gherman then described the manner in which commission and committee minutes and support materials will be kept on reserve in the library for review by members of Council and others who are interested.

e. Resolution of Appreciation from the Staff Senate.

Dr. McComas acknowledged on behalf of the University and the Staff Senate the work of Dr. Larry Moore and the Task Force for their contributions to the formation of the Staff Senate.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS

o Dr. McComas asked Dr. Blythe to update Council on the joint feasibility study, to be conducted by C&P Telephone, Virginia Tech, and the town of Blacksburg, for the development of an "electronic village." Dr. Blythe explained that the proposal involves a significant town-wide upgrade in basic communications capability, including the installation of fiber optics cable throughout the area. The Blacksburg electronic village

project, if funded, would serve as a pilot project for the entire Commonwealth. Dr. McComas then described some positive implications of the project for education, especially in the public schools, adding that it would also provide valuable exposure for Virginia Tech and Blacksburg. He stressed, however, that the project is only at the feasibility stage.

o Regarding the implementation of the new governance structure, approved last May by University Council, Dr. Harris informed members that letters soliciting commission and council representatives will be mailed to organizations this week. He reminded Council of the Task Force's recommendation that the new structure be in place by the spring. To that end, Dr. Harris has requested the names of the appointees by late March. On the subject of committee membership, Dr. Harris asked that Council consider the possibility of extending the current terms of members (including those individuals who will be rotating off at the end of this academic year). He explained that the task of constituting the eight new commissions, three new councils, while at the same time replacing as many as 85 committee members this spring, may prove to be too confusing. Thus, in consultation with Dr. Moore and the President, Dr. Harris recommends that new committee appointments be delayed until the upcoming academic year. This item will be placed on a future Council agenda for discussion.

Dr. Snoke expressed concern about the end of March deadline for submitting the names of nominees and appointees, especially for the Faculty Senate. Ms. Byrne voiced similar concerns for the Student Government Association; however, both indicated their willingness to advance the nominating process if feasible. Dr. Harris acknowledged that the March deadline might prove to be problematic for many organizations, but stressed the urgency of completing the process as soon as possible.

o Dr. McComas asked Ms. Byrne to describe the response the Student Government Association and the Graduate Student Assembly had made to the budget crisis. She detailed the various strategies that have been developed as a non-confrontive response to the latest cuts. She highlighted a planned trip to Richmond on January 28th, as well as a state-wide informational budget rally on January 29th. Dr. McComas stressed to Council the need to present a "non-adversarial" response to the state legislature by writing to one's own local representative and senator. Ms. Luch pointed out the relative "powerlessness" of out-of-state students, many of whom are graduate students, who have no local state representative. Dr. McComas acknowledged this fact and suggested that these individuals work instead with university staff to stress the importance of out-of-state students to the life and diversity of the university. He also spoke about the economic importance of this large constituency, pointing out that out-of-state students are significant contributors to the state and local economies.

o Dr. McComas briefed Council on several recent NCAA reforms that will become mandatory in four years: (1) that student-athletes must complete 13 required courses during high school to be eligible to engage in college athletics, and (2) that all student-athletes will need a minimum high school GPA of 2.5 or 900 SAT to be eligible to participate as college freshmen. He also said that athletic residence halls are being phased out. All of these reforms, he concluded, would enhance the graduation rate of these students. Dr. McComas then discussed the need to place coaches' salaries under complete control of the university.

o Regarding the budget, Drs. McComas and Carlisle described in detail the 29% reduction to the Extension Service operating budget proposed by the Governor. They stressed that Virginia Tech will be working diligently to restore a major portion of that large reduction through an amendment to the state budget. An upcoming article in SPECTRUM will discuss the

nine-block configuration of the Cooperative Extension Service and how the cuts will affect the services it provides.

Dr. McComas then addressed the urgent need to provide salary increases for faculty and staff, adding that SCHEV has submitted a collective amendment to the budget calling for salary increases.

Dr. Carlisle briefly reviewed the background and current status of this biennium's budget cycle, including a description of Virginia Tech's three separate budgets (instruction, research and extension). When asked by Dr. Snoke if the three budgets could be collapsed into one, Dr. Carlisle responded that it would be unfair to use tuition dollars to fund Virginia's extension services and agricultural research. Dr. Carlisle also described the proposed reduction in funding for the Commonwealth Centers.

Dr. McComas announced that Virginia has slipped to 40th in the nation in the amount of per-student state funding for higher education (this figure includes community colleges and universities). He also informed Council that "well over a half a billion dollars has been cut from higher education" since the onset of the reductions. Dr. McComas closed the meeting with the observation that while funding for education has historically been viewed as contributing to the common good, it now is being treated as a service that should be paid for with user's fees.

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 10, 1992

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

Present:J. McComas, C. Forbes, M. Ridenour, E.F. Carlisle, J. Falkinham, T. Goodale, D. McAlister (for C. Steger), P. Gherman, L. Harris, G. Hooper, E. Blythe, L.A. Swiger, H. Doswald, R. Sorensen, J. Buffer, J. Osborne (for G.W. Clough), S. J. Ritchey, P. Eyre, D. Smith, D. Hewitt, P. Miller, L. Rees, N. Dodl, J. Robertson, R. Heller, G. Holtzman, J. Ficenec, B. Crittenden, T. Rakes, A. Snoke, Lisa Jansen (for L. Barroso), C. Luch, C. Vargo, M. Byrne, T. Snead (for K. Mottley), T. Stoll, B. Rexroad, P. Larkin,

Guests: Bill Burleson, Spectrum; Cornel N. Morton, EO/AA; Nancy Simmons, Faculty Senate

Absent: R. Smoot, F. Thye, G. Bunce, N. Marriott

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 20, 1992

The University Council minutes of the meeting of January 20, 1992 were approved as submitted.

3. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON RESEARCH RESOLUTION 1991-92D, CONCERNING SPECIAL RESEARCH FACULTY APPOINTMENTS.

Dr. Hooper explained that the growth in research and related activities at Virginia Tech has necessitated modification of the FACULTY HANDBOOK as it relates to special research faculty appointments. The proposed resolution would add the classifications of Senior Research Associate and Postdoctoral Associate to the FACULTY HANDBOOK and clarify matters relating to the fringe benefits for these individuals. The other two classifications of Research Scientist and Senior Research Scientist will remain as they are at present. This resolution, he stated, is fully endorsed by the Commission on Faculty Affairs.

Dr. Heller suggested that the statement, "The processes of advertising, interviewing and selection as appropriate to the position should be followed," was vague and does not address the special situation of Virginia Tech graduates who become post-doctoral students. He asked if these individuals would have to apply for these positions, even though they might already be performing the work? Dr. Hooper responded that these positions would be subject to state guidelines for advertising and hiring, but added that he would further explore this issue and modify the resolution if needed.

Dr. Hewitt noted that the qualifications for appointment to Research Scientist seem to be consistent with those for Assistant Professor, and those for Senior Research Scientist are equivalent to those for Professor. Consequently, he inquired, is there a research appointment that equates to the level of Associate Professor? Dr. Hooper indicated that he would edit the resolution to reflect these concerns.

The resolution carried forward for second reading.

4. FIRST READING, UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION 1991-92A, CONCERNING THE PROPOSED POLICY ON LIBRARY DEPOSIT COPIES OF UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS.

Dr. Dodl explained that the University Libraries receive numerous requests for publications produced at this university, but are often unable to provide them. This resolution, he stated, is intended to make available in the University Libraries all technical reports, working papers, conference proceedings and other types of publications produced within the university. Toward that end, colleges, departments and centers will be asked to send two copies of each publication to the Head of the Acquisitions Department.

The resolution carried forward for second reading.

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

a. Commission on Extension, November 5, 1991.
b. Commission on Faculty Affairs, January 24, 1992.

Dr. Falkinham moved approval of the minutes with the following changes: (1) the correction of two typographical errors in paragraph 8; (2) Carl McDaniels will replace Marge Murray on the Alumni Distinguished Professor Selection Committee, as noted in paragraph 2; and (3) the phrase in paragraph 8, item (8), "Procedures for Approved Faculty Search," should be removed.

Dr. Harris asked when CFA would have the revised draft of the faculty grievance procedures ready for University Council. Dr. Falkinham replied that the policy was still undergoing revisions, but that he expected it to be completed soon.

c. Commission on Graduate Studies, November 20, 1991.

d. Commission on Research, December 11, 1991.

Dr. Hooper discussed item 4 of these minutes, "Ownership of Data," at length, noting that a committee has been formed to develop a comprehensive policy governing these often complicated situations.

e. Commission on Student Affairs, December 5, 1991.

Dr. Goodale identified the changes to the CSA minutes of November 7 and November 21, 1991. He also announced the upcoming Hate Crimes Forum on February 19th, in Squires Student Center.

f. Commission on Undergraduate Studies, December 9, 1991.

6. FOR INFORMATION

a. Minutes of the Computer Committee, September 4, October 2, and December 4, 1991.

b. Minutes of the University Committee on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action, December 17, 1991.

c. Minutes of the University Library Committee, November 13, 1991.

d. Recommendation to Extend University Governance Committee Memberships.

In connection with implementation of the new University Governance System, Dr. McComas recommended to Council that it consider extending

the terms of existing committee members through the 1992-93 academic year. Dr. Harris reviewed the timing of the process by which the memberships of the eight new commissions and three new councils will be established, effective July 1, 1992. Given the effort needed to accomplish this task, Dr. Harris stated that it would be advantageous to defer action on committee memberships until the new memberships on commissions and councils have been resolved.

Dr. Hooper moved that Council extend the membership of the committees for up to one year (with the exception of those individuals who would have to step down due to graduation or retirement). The motion carried.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS

o Dr. McComas spoke about the university's very positive response to the United Way Campaign, highlighting the organizational efforts of Thomas O. Williams, overall Campaign Chairperson, and Ann Spencer, Director of Personnel Services, who chaired the Virginia Tech effort. He commended the generous contributions of faculty and staff in the face of dispiriting economic conditions.

o Dr. McComas called on Mr. Ridenour to report on the two bills now before the General Assembly regarding general obligation bonds. Mr. Ridenour described the two proposed packages: (1) the Governor's bond package that will provide $401 million dollars for higher education in 1992-94, and (2) a more comprehensive bond package introduced by Delegate Cranwell (which includes the Governor's proposal) for about $1.2 billion dollars. He then highlighted the specific projects that will be funded if the bonds are passed, noting that $46 million dollars will be made available to Virginia Tech if the Governor's budget bill is approved. He also described the sole Virginia Tech amendment which would restore $9.2 million dollars for the Cooperative Extension Service.

Ms. Byrne described the state-wide effort of students to present their concerns about budget cuts to the state legislature, as well as their support for a general obligation bond. Dr. McComas added that he felt the students had represented themselves and their concerns in a very positive manner. Ms. Vargo then asked how general budgetary information was being conveyed to the parents of students. Dr. McComas replied that a newsletter for parents has been launched by the Student Affairs Office. The budget situation is being addressed via this newsletter.

o When asked by Dr. Hewitt if the early retirement program would again be available and whether the positions freed by early retirement this year have now been returned to the university, Dr. McComas responded that nothing has been said by Richmond to suggest the program will be repeated. Mr. Ridenour noted that the university has been given authorization to fill positions that were created by early retirement. Dr. Carlisle explained that these positions will be reallocated along with new positions the university received last year.

o Mr. Gherman announced that he would be assuming the new position of Special Assistant to the Vice President to work on matters related to the electronic village project. Ms. Joann Eustis will be interim director of University Libraries, effective March 1, 1992.

Dr. Heller inquired about the employee drug and alcohol policy. He noted that there are places on campus, such as the Donaldson Brown Center, which routinely serve alcohol at social functions. Dr. McComas responded that the policy applies to alcohol served during working hours at the work site.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
February 24, 1992

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

Present:C. Forbes, M. Ridenour, E.F. Carlisle, J. Falkinham, T. Goodale, L. Harris, G. Hooper, W. Allen (for L.A. Swiger), H. Doswald, R. Sorensen, S. Crumwell (for J. Buffer), G.W. Clough, S. J. Ritchey, D. Smith, D. Hewitt, P. Miller, N. Dodl, J. Robertson, F. Thye, R. Heller, G. Holtzman, J. Ficenec, B. Crittenden, L. Geyer (for N. Marriott), T. Rakes, A. Snoke, Lisa Jansen (for L. Barroso), C. Luch, C. Vargo, M. Byrne, T. Stoll, B. Rexroad, P. Larkin,

Guests: Bill Burleson, Spectrum; Cornel N. Morton, EO/AA; Paul Knox, University Forum on Liberal Education (U.F.L.E.); Patricia Kelly, U.F.L.E.; Guy Hammond, U.F.L.E.; Susan Brooker-Gross, U.F.L.E.; Carol Burch-Brown, U.F.L.E.; Jon Shepard, U.F.L.E.; C. Gene Haugh, U.F.L.E.

Absent: J. McComas, R. Smoot, C. Steger, P. Gherman, E. Blythe, P. Eyre, L. Rees, G. Bunce, K. Mottley

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 10, 1992

The University Council minutes of the meeting of February 10, 1992 were approved with corrections.

3. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION, 1991-92A, CONCERNING THE REVISED UNIVERSITY CORE CURRICULUM.

Dr. Carlisle, chair of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies, described the history of the resolution and accompanying REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY FORUM ON LIBERAL EDUCATION, noting that in Spring of 1990, a special committee was established to review and propose revisions of the university's core curriculum. He recognized the thorough and time-consuming efforts of the members of the University Forum on Liberal Education (UFLE), comprised of Prof. Carol Burch-Brown, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Programs; Dr. Susan Brooker-Gross, Dept. Head of Geography; Dr. James Craig, Dept. Head of Geological Sciences; Dr. Leon Geyer, President of the Faculty Senate; Dr. Guy Hammond, Professor of Religion; Dr. C. Gene Haugh, Professor of Agricultural Engineering; Dr. Russell Jones, Associate Professor of Psychology; Dr. Patricia Kelly, Associate Professor of Curriculum and Instruction; Dr. Paul Knox, Professor of Urban Affairs and Planning; Dr. Rebecca Lovingood, Professor of Housing, Interior Design and Resource Management; Dr. Barbara Pendergrass, Assistant to the Vice President of Student Affairs; Dr. Bevery Sgro, Director of the Division of Student Affairs; Dr. Jon Shepard, Dept. Head of Management; Dr. Bruce Wallace, University Distinguished Professor of Biology; and Mr. William Kuster, representative of the Student Government Association. The committee's 36-page report, he announced, details all of the proposed changes. Dr. Carlisle then asked Prof. Carol Burch-Brown, chair of the UFLE, to summarize the major points of the core curriculum resolution.

Prof. Burch-Brown described the lengthy process required to draft the

report, including a comprehensive review of the existing core curriculum, a campus-wide survey of the strengths and weaknesses of current requirements, an analysis of writing skills in undergraduate classes and programs, a look at enrollment patterns, and a review of related documentation, such as the university's Self-Study. She highlighted the importance of campus-wide consultations involving faculty, students and administrators. The final report was approved by CUS in February, 1991. She summarized the following major aspects of the proposal:

o The structure of the core curriculum will be based on the following Areas of Study (as opposed to departmental divisions): (1) Writing and Discourse, (2) Ideas, Cultural Traditions and Values, (3) Society and Human Behavior, (4) Scientific Reasoning and Discovery, (5) Quantitative and Symbolic Reasoning, (6) Creativity and Aesthetic Experience (a minimum one-credit hour in the arts), and (7) Critical Issues in a Global Context;

o A university writing program will be established to support the development of writing-intensive courses and the enhancement of writing throughout the curriculum;

o A standing university-level committee will be formed to give leadership to the core curriculum and to make final curricular recommendations to CUS concerning the inclusion of courses in the core curriculum;

o A comprehensive handbook on liberal education and the core curriculum will be published this summer for all students, faculty and advisors.

Dr. Clough commended the UFLE for their excellent work, then expressed his belief that the arts requirement should be designed so that it becomes a sound, intellectual exercise. He also stressed that technological studies should be included in the core curriculum and recommended that a follow-up assessment process be developed and implemented once the new structure is in place. Prof. Burch-Brown agreed with his concerns regarding the validity of the arts requirement. She also replied that technological studies would be included in Area 7, "Critical Issues in a Global Context." With regard to assessment, Prof. Burch-Brown pointed out that the proposal allows for a course-by-course assessment, but concurred that the "broad picture" should be reviewed at a later time. Dr. Carlisle added that the State Council for Higher Education mandates an assessment of liberal education programs; thus, he added, the new core would be evaluated through this process. Dr. Geyer pointed out that the Core Curriculum Committee would also be responsible for assessing the new core curriculum.

Ms. Rexroad expressed concern for how the changed requirements might impact students already enrolled at Virginia Tech, e.g., will current students be required to take additional credits to accommodate the new system? Prof. Burch-Brown responded that the staged implementation will not affect currently-enrolled students, as the first substantive changes in credit hour requirements do not occur until the Fall of 1994. She also stressed that all aspects of the core curriculum will be fully communicated through the core curriculum handbook and the undergraduate catalog.

In response to a question from Dr. Crittenden, Prof. Burch-Brown detailed steps for implementation of the resolution, beginning with the establishment of the University Core Curriculum Committee and the drafting and approval of the student handbook. Dr. Crittenden expressed concern about the effective date of the resolution, "for students graduating 1996 or thereafter." He advised that the implementation date of the new core curriculum be delayed so that (1) detailed requirements can be worked out and published in the handbook, and (2) all currently-enrolled students will not be subject to any after-the-fact credit hour increases. Prof. Burch-Brown acknowledged his concerns but stressed that there are no substantive requirement changes for either currently-enrolled students or for freshmen entering Fall, 1992 or 1993. She explained that changes over the next two

years will only relate to the university's manner of governing the core curriculum. The substantive changes, she reiterated, will take place over

a period of two to eight years, with the writing program being the last to be fully implemented.

Several students addressed the issue of the perceived reduction in course selection flexibility. Dr. Brooker-Gross responded that this was a topic of great concern to the UFLE, but stressed that the "Areas of Study" configuration in fact provides greater flexibility in course selection.

Dr. Crittenden asked if the advanced placement process will continue in its present form or will changes result in an additional semester of English? Prof. Burch-Brown explained that the Department of English could not at this time increase the number of courses available; thus, the advanced placement policy will remain as is. She noted, however, that the university is increasing its writing requirements. Dr. Crittenden also expressed concern about the arts requirement, asking if the responsibility of providing appropriate courses will rest exclusively within the Division of Performing Arts. Prof. Burch-Brown responded that this requirement can be accomplished through a variety of options in several colleges.

Several council members questioned whether students are governed by the requirements stated in their freshman catalog, or by the requirements in effect at the time of their graduation. After some discussion, Dr. Carlisle stated that it was unrealistic to expect requirements to remain frozen over a four or five year period, but added that a representative of the Registrar's Office would be available at the next meeting to respond to these concerns.

Dr. Haugh raised the issue of overlapping courses, particularly within Area 7, "Critical Issues in a Global Context," stating that it might result in restricting the number of courses available to students. Prof. Burch-Brown concurred that this was a concern of the UFLE, but stressed that this requirement is designed to encourage more departments to modify courses for inclusion in this general area prerequisite.

Dr. Carlisle reminded members that there will be additional opportunity to discuss this resolution at the next meeting, at which time a vote will occur. He asked that any amendments to the resolution be made in writing prior to Thursday, February 27th.

The resolution carried forward for second reading.

4. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON RESEARCH RESOLUTION 1991-92D, CONCERNING SPECIAL RESEARCH FACULTY APPOINTMENTS. FIRST READING, FEBRUARY 10, 1992.

Dr. Hooper explained that the resolution was amended to clarify several issues raised at the last meeting: (1) appropriate procedures for advertising, interviewing and hiring; and (2) the necessary qualifications for appointment to the rank of Research Scientist. He moved approval of the resolution.

The motion PASSED.

5. SECOND READING, UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION 1991-92A, CONCERNING THE PROPOSED POLICY ON LIBRARY DEPOSIT COPIES OF UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS. FIRST READING, FEBRUARY 10, 1992.

Dr. Dodl moved approval of the resolution.

The motion PASSED.

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

a. Commission on Graduate Studies, January 15, 1992.

b. Commission on Student Affairs, January 16, 1992.
c. Commission on Undergraduate Studies, January 27, 1992.

7. FOR INFORMATION

a. Minutes of the Computer Committee, January 8, 1992.

b. Minutes of the University Communications Resources Committee, November 20, 1991.

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS

In connection with the two proposed legislative bond packages, Ms. Byrne announced that a voter registration drive has been organized for the week of March 16th in Newman Library and at Blacksburg High School. Full-page ads announcing the campaign will appear in the COLLEGIATE TIMES and the PRESTON JOURNAL.

Speaking for the Faculty Senate, Dr. Geyer acknowledged the efforts students have made in connection with "Faculty Appreciation Day" on February 25th.

9. QUESTION/ANSWER FORUM

Dr. Snoke requested clarification of the possibility of a salary increase for faculty and staff. Mr. Ridenour responded that although no definite information will be available until the close of the legislative session on March 7th, he stated that the proposed 2% increase could not be considered a merit increase, but rather the restoration of funds lost as a result of the 1990 salary reduction. He added that, if approved, it will likely apply to all state employees who were on the payroll when that 2% reduction was made.

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
March 2, 1992

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

Present:J. McComas, M. Ridenour, R. Smoot, E.F. Carlisle, T. Goodale, C. Steger, G. Hooper, E. Blythe, A. Swiger, H. Doswald, R. Sorensen, J. Buffer, G.W. Clough, S. J. Ritchey, P. Eyre, D. Smith, D. Hewitt, L. Rees, N. Dodl, F. Thye, R. Heller, G. Holtzman, J. Ficenec, J. Marchman (for B. Crittenden), L. Geyer (for N. Marriott), T. Rakes, A. Snoke, Lisa Jansen (for L. Barroso), C. Luch, C. Vargo, M. Byrne, T. Snead (for K. Mottley), B. Rexroad, P. Larkin,

Guests: Bill Burleson, Spectrum; Cornel N. Morton, EO/AA; Wanda Hankins Dean, University Registrar; Timothy Reed, U.U.S.A.; Guy Hammond, University Forum on Liberal Education (U.F.L.E.); Susan Brooker-Gross, U.F.L.E.; Carol Burch-Brown, U.F.L.E.; Jon Shepard, U.F.L.E.; C. Gene Haugh, U.F.L.E.; John Aughenbaugh, G.S.A.

Absent: C. Forbes, J. Falkinham, J. Eustis, L. Harris, P. Miller, J. Robertson, G. Bunce, T. Stoll

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

2. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON GRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1991-92B, CONCERNING GRADUATE PROGRAM STANDARDS AND POLICIES.

Dr. Hooper provided the background for this resolution which revises and is intended to replace POLICY MEMORANDUM N. 14 (dated May 7, 1979). He explained that the Commission on Graduate Studies amended the policy in response to recurring problems related to: 1) graduate admissions procedures and requirements, 2) the advisement of graduate students, and 3) faculty participation on graduate advisory committees. In addition to requiring departments to provide more specific graduate program guidelines, this resolution also mandates periodic evaluation and assessment by CGS and the Graduate School of a department's program standards and procedures.

The resolution carried forward for second reading.

3. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON STUDENT AFFAIRS RESOLUTION 1991-92A, CONCERNING A CHANGE IN CLASSIFICATION AND FUNDING OF STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS.

Dr. Goodale asked Mr. Tim Reed, Assistant Director of Student Activities and co-author of the proposal, to explain the eight-year history of the resolution. In response, Mr. Reed noted that much of the work needed to "hammer out" the relationships between the various student organizations and the university has been ongoing since 1988. Following a brief overview of the resolution's background, Mr. Reed identified and described the three classifications of student organizations detailed in the resolution: 1) University Student Life Programs (USLP), 2) University Chartered Student Organizations (UCSO), and 3) Registered Student Organizations (RSO). USLP's are organizations, comprised primarily or exclusively of students, which are directly linked to an administrative or academic department of the university. A second type, University Chartered Student Organizations,

is one having a special, direct relationship with the university, typically involving university staff who are hired to work directly with such organizations. A third type, the Registered Student Organization, is a voluntary association of Virginia Tech students with no direct tie to the university except that members of RSO's are entitled to operate, meet, advertise and participate in activities at Virginia Tech.

Mr. Reed then described the underlying funding model including 1) its applicability to the Virginia Public Procurement Act, 2) the source of funding and location of accounts, and 3) the tax status of the various organizations. He added that the university's General Counsel's Office worked closely with CSA to ensure that the funding model was in compliance with university policy. He then addressed each aspect of the funding model as it applies to the three types of organizations.

Following Mr. Reed's overview, Dr. Goodale introduced Mr. John Aughenbaugh, delegate from the Graduate Student Assembly and co-author of the proposal, to explain how existing policies governing student organizations will be affected by the proposed change, particularly with regard to funding. Mr. Aughenbaugh highlighted the creation and functions of the Regranting Budget Boards (one each for the Student Government Association and the Graduate Student Assembly) from which the RSO's must solicit their annual funding.

When asked by Dr. Heller how religious organizations will be classified, Mr. Aughenbaugh replied that they will be considered Registered Student Organizations.

The resolution carried forward for second reading.

4. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1991-92A, CONCERNING THE REVISED UNIVERSITY CORE CURRICULUM. FIRST READING, FEBRUARY 24, 1992.

Dr. Carlisle moved approval of the resolution, then reminded Council of the two main issues raised during first reading of the document: 1) the implementation of the resolution as it affects credit-hour requirement changes, and 2) how and when changes in requirements will affect currently-enrolled students. He called on Prof. Burch-Brown to address the issue of implementation.

The Report of the University Forum on Liberal Education (UFLE), she explained, is a broadly-based statement about the philosophy, pedagogy, and structure of liberal education at Virginia Tech. The standing university policy on effective dates of graduation affects all academic programs, including the new core curriculum. To graphically illustrate the core's implementation, she distributed a one-page chart, "Time-Line for Implementation of Core Curriculum Requirements." The chart, although it does not appear in the resolution or UFLE report, illustrates how and when each of the area requirements will be implemented. Dr. Jon Shepard, member of the UFLE, explained that Areas 2-5 are comprised of those courses that are already included in the core curriculum under departmental designations with no changes in credit-hour requirements for the graduating class of 1996 or 1997. Actual credit-hour changes do not occur until the fall of 1994 with the implementation of the one credit-hour requirement for Area 6, "Creativity and Aesthetic Experience, and the three-credit hour requirement for Area 7, "Critical Issues in a Global Context." Dr. Shepard pointed out that the evaluation of new and existing courses for inclusion in the new core curriculum will begin in 1995. The first writing-intensive courses, he noted, will begin in the fall of 1995, with the second to be added in the fall of 1999. He stressed that the chart is consistent with the way the resolution is written -- it simply clarifies the proposed changes. Dr. Heller observed that the chart alleviates many of the implementation concerns about the resolution, and asked that it be attached to the resolution. The chart was appended to the resolution by common consensus.

Dr. Hammond, member of the UFLE, pointed out that the implementation timetable could be revised if the need arose, although he added that the

UFLE believes its guidelines provide a realistic framework for implementation.

In response to several questions about the writing-intensive courses, Prof. Burch-Brown noted that this requirement can be accomplished within existing classes, rather than by adding writing-specific courses. She also stated that smaller, upper-level courses are the logical environment for promoting writing skills.

Dr. McComas then recognized Ms. Hankins-Dean, University Registrar, who described the university's graduation requirements: i.e., students are subject to the requirements stated at the time of graduation, not those in effect at the time of admission. She then summarized the contents of Policy Memo #109, effective May, 1990, which requires a two-year window for any curricular changes. She pointed out that the new core curriculum meets these guidelines.

Following the discussion of policies surrounding graduation requirements, Prof. Burch-Brown reiterated that these changes are only one aspect of the Report of the University Forum on Liberal Education. The larger picture, she stressed, is an articulated view concerning the substance and goals of liberal education including the formation of a university-level Core Curriculum Committee to govern all aspects of the new Core.

Dr. McComas recognized Dr. Snoke who moved approval of an amendment to the resolution that would modify the effective date of the resolution. The motion died for want of a second.

Dr. McComas recognized Dr. Marchman who moved approval of an amendment by Dr. Crittenden that would delay the effective date of the resolution. The motion died for want of a second. Dr. Marchman then commented on several positive aspects of the new core curriculum, particularly the increase in course-selection flexibility.

In response to a question from Dr. Hewitt about the feasibility of producing and distributing the core curriculum handbook by the summer, Prof. Burch-Brown responded that the handbook is already largely written; a more pressing issue, she noted, is the speedy identification of the new Core Curriculum Committee.

The motion passed.

———————

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

a. Commission on Extension, January 7, 1992.

b. Commission on Graduate Studies, February 5, 1992.

c. Commission on Undergraduate Studies, February 11, 1992.

Dr. Carlisle highlighted discussions of the state policy on transfer students and academic eligibility.

6. FOR INFORMATION

a. Minutes of the Virginia Tech Athletic Committee, December 4, 1991.

Mr. Ridenour clarified the notation on page 2 that the scholarship budget is $434,590 in arrears. He explained that this figure does not reflect the total sum of contributions received by the Athletic Department, so it is

actually lower. He also pointed out that it is unlikely that an operating deficit will occur at the stated level of $500,000, adding that the Athletic Department will work within a budget, even if services must be reduced.

When Mr. Larkin inquired about the total percentage of student fees applied to the Athletic Department, Mr. Ridenour estimated it to be about $110 per student. He pointed out that this amount is significantly lower than the amount charged at many other universities

b. Minutes of the Computer Committee, November 6, 1991.

c. Minutes of the University Committee on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action, January 21, 1992.

Dr. Morton addressed the issue of the proposed Afrocentric Theme Hall, noting that, if implemented, this would probably occur sometime after 1993. Mr. Larkin added that this proposal first must be approved by the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and the Vice President for Student Affairs. Dr. McComas stated that the creation of an Afrocentic residence hall would ultimately require the approval of the Board of Visitors. Dr. Morton also described the videotape, "Learning Disabilities: A University Challenge," funded through a grant from the Affirmative Action Incentive Grants Program. The video will be shown to faculty members conjointly with the presentation of a series of workshops on working with learning disabled students.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. McComas acknowledged the efforts of Ms. Rexroad and Ms. Byrne, as well as several faculty members, during a recent trip to Northern Virginia to recruit national merit scholars. He described the difficulty of promoting the strengths of Virginia Tech to potential students while at the same time trying to describe the negative effects of the budget cuts.

With the legislative session almost complete, Dr. McComas observed that public response has been very positive to our request for restoring funds to the 1992-94 budget for the Cooperative Extension Service. He informed Council that much of the support had come from urban areas rather than from rural areas, as might be expected. He also announced that the smaller of the two bond issues has passed both legislative houses and is likely to be approved by the governor. Now the work begins, he explained, to garner voter support for the bond issue. Dr. Geyer then inquired whether any thought had been given to promoting the passage of the bond as a way to create jobs, particularly in the construction sector. Dr. McComas agreed that the bond issue should be promoted in terms of the statewide benefits it would provide.

On the subject of tuition, Dr. McComas informed members that there will likely be a tuition increase next year for both graduate students and undergraduates amounting to less than the authorized level of 12% for out-of-state students and 9% for in-state students; he pointed out that the precise figures will not be known until the Board of Visitors approves the budget at a special meeting in early April. Dr. McComas then stressed that any tuition increases must be viewed as a way of maintaining the integrity of academic programs at Virginia Tech.

Dr. McComas also described how higher education in Virginia benefits the common good and, as such, merits the support of the entire population. He added that if we are unable to increase funding for higher education the quality of education will decrease, resulting in a devaluation of diplomas earned at Virginia's state institutions.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris
Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
April 20, 1992

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

Present:J. McComas, R. Smoot, J. Wolfe (for E.F. Carlisle), J. Falkinham, T. Goodale, N. Lester (for C. Steger), J. Eustis, L. Harris, G. Hooper, E. Blythe, W. Allen (for A. Swiger), H. Bonham (for R. Sorensen), J. Buffer, J. Marchman (for G.W. Clough), S. J. Ritchey, J. Hess (for D. Smith), D. Hewitt, N. Dodl, J. Robertson, F. Thye, R. Heller, P. Feret (for G. Bunce), G. Holtzman, J. Ficenec, B. Crittenden, N. Marriott, T. Rakes, A. Snoke, L. Barroso, J. Aughenbaugh, C. Vargo, K. Mottley, T. Stoll, B. Rexroad, P. Larkin

Guests: Bill Burleson, Spectrum; Cornel N. Morton, EO/AA; Timothy Reed, U.U.S.A.; Pat Hyer, Provost's Office; Regina Smick-Attisano, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences; Michael Hurd, Residence Hall Federation; Sharon Yeagle, Recreational Sports; Chris Wise, Recreational Sports; Pamela Orcutt, Staff Senate; Russ Cole, CSAC; Clara Cox, Staff Senate; Carole Nickerson, President's Office; Anthony Townsend, GSA; Leo Smith, Recreational Sports

Absent: C. Forbes, M. Ridenour, H. Doswald, P. Eyre, P. Miller, L. Rees, T. Snead

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda with one procedural change. The motion PASSED.

2. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 24, 1992

The University Council minutes of the meeting of February 24, 1992 were approved as submitted.

3. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF MARCH 2, 1992

The University Council minutes of the meeting of March 2, 1992 were approved as submitted.

4. SECOND READING, PROPOSAL FROM THE JOINT TASK FORCE ON COUNCILS, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES TO CHANGE THE COMPOSITION ON THE COMMISSION ON STUDENT AFFAIRS. FIRST READING, APRIL 3, 1991.

Dr. Harris informed Council that the officers of the Graduate Student Assembly (GSA) have expressed concern about the number of graduate student representatives on the Commission on Student Affairs, believing that the recommendation of the Joint Task Force had not been followed. He then called on Dr. Larry D. Moore, former chair of the Joint Task Force, to provide background. Dr. Moore stated that the Task Force's Report, sent to Council for approval on April 3, 1991, recommended four graduate student members on CSA. However, in response to concerns that four GSA representatives might be disproportionate representation on CSA, Dr. Moore reduced that number from four to three but, through an oversight, neglected to bring this change to Council for its consideration and vote during the final meeting. Thus, he explained, the resolution before Council at this

time is to stipulate that three graduate students will represent the Commission on Student Affairs. If the motion fails, he added, Council will thereby accept the original recommendation of the Task Force that provides four CSA graduate student representatives: Speaker of the GSA, Vice Speaker of the GSA, and two elected representatives of the GSA -- a representative of Master's programs and a representative of doctoral programs.

As a member of both the Joint Task Force and the graduate student community, Mr. Tony Townsend spoke in favor of the Task Force's original recommendation that four students sit on CSA, stating that (1) it would allow this constituency more meaningful participation, and (2) four representatives would not over-balance the eleven undergraduate student representatives on CSA. Several other members concurred with this evaluation, including Dr. Hooper and Mr. Aughenbaugh.

Dr. Moore reminded members that if the motion fails, four GSA members will represent the Commission on Student Affairs.

The motion FAILED. (Thus, CSA will have four GSA representatives.)

5. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON FACULTY AFFAIRS RESOLUTION 1991-92B, PROPOSED POLICY ON INSTRUCTORS AND LECTURERS.

Dr. Falkinham explained the genesis and key rationale for this resolution, which is designed to address what the CFA believes is an inequity in the treatment of instructors at Virginia Tech. Current university policy does not permit full-time employment of instructors beyond the seven-year probationary period. The effect of this policy has been to discontinue the full-time employment of instructors after six years of service (unless they are granted tenure as assistant professors). While many of these instructors are subsequently employed in part-time positions, carrying as much as an 80% load, they are denied university fringe benefits, such as health insurance and retirement benefits. In redressing these inequities, this resolution redefines the rank titles of instructor and lecturer and adds an additional title, EXTRA-COLLEGIATE INSTRUCTOR, which will be used for designated library and extension appointments on continued appointment track. Moreover, the proposed policy will allow reappointment of full-time instructors in non-tenure-track positions without limiting the number of years for such full-time service, thus making instructors eligible for university benefits. Furthermore, the section of the FACULTY HANDBOOK on promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor will be deleted. Dr. Falkinham also stated that a new section is included to address the appointment and employment of full- and part-time non-tenure-track instructors. He then summarized several ramifications of these changes, especially the increased responsibility for deans and department heads to "keep up with these appointments."

When Dr. McComas asked for an estimate of the number of individuals who would be positively affected by approval of this resolution, Dr. Wolfe responded that approximately 20-30 instructors would again be eligible for full-time employment, particularly in the Mathematics and English departments.

The resolution carried forward for second reading.

6. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON GRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1991-92B, DEFINITIONS OF GRADUATE ASSISTANTSHIPS.

Dr. Hooper explained that the increasingly complex and varied responsibilities of graduate assistants necessitates the proposed modifications to the FACULTY HANDBOOK. He defined the normal workload of a graduate student as 20 hours work, then explained the five categories of graduate assistantships: Graduate Teaching Assistant, Senior Graduate Teaching Assistant, Graduate Assistant, Graduate Research Assistant, and Senior Graduate Research Assistant (formerly Graduate Program Assistant). In

particular, Dr. Hooper highlighted the responsibilities of the relatively small number of individuals who will meet the criteria of a Senior Graduate Teaching Assistant. Several questions were raised about funding this new category. In response, Dr. Hooper estimated that the 20 or so individuals who will meet these more rigorous job specifications will merit a higher stipend, resulting in an additional total annual expense of approximately $60,000.

When Dr. Heller requested clarification of the role of the Graduate Assistant, Dr. Hooper responded that although they will have more general responsibilities than the GRA or GTA, all three are at the same stipend level.

The resolution carried forward for second reading.

7. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON STUDENT AFFAIRS RESOLUTION 1991-92C, RE-ALLOCATION OF ATHLETIC FEES TO SUPPORT RECREATIONAL SPORTS.

As background, Dr. Goodale pointed out that the Fall, 1991, decision to withdraw the proposal for a new physical fitness building forced a re-examination of alternative methods for improving existing Recreation Sports facilities and programs. In that context, the Facilities Subcommittee of CSA, currently chaired by Patrick Larkin, proposed that one dollar per student, per semester, be re-allocated from the athletic fee to the Department of Recreational Sports, beginning 1992-93. Furthermore, the subcommittee recommended the permanent implementation of a recreation fee as part of the comprehensive fee, beginning 1993-94. Mr. Larkin pointed out, however, that the first proposal is moot because the Board of Visitors has already set tuition and fees for 1992-93. Dr. Goodale then detailed a feasibility study that has been proposed to examine alternative methods for improving recreational sports, as well as to measure the potential benefit of the proposed recreational fee implementation.

Saying he had discussed this matter with Mr. Ridenour, Mr. Smoot requested that this resolution be referred back to CSA for further study.

The resolution was referred to the Commission on Student Affairs.

8. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1991-92B, ACADEMIC ELIGIBILITY POLICY FOR AGRICULTURE TECHNOLOGY.

Dr. Wolfe explained that this resolution is designed to (1) bring agriculture technology students under the provisions of the university's academic eligibility schedule, and (2) respond to students' requests to define university expectations of their performance. In response to a question from Dr. Crittenden about the entrance requirements for these students, Regina Smick-Attisano, Acting Assistant Director of Resident Instruction, noted that students must have a minimum 2.0 high school or community college GPA for entrance into the program.

The resolution carried forward for second reading.

9. FIRST READING, STAFF SENATE CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS, FEBRUARY 14, 1992.

Ms. Lisa Barroso described the three-year Classified Staff Affairs Committee effort to put into place the structure that is detailed in the Staff Senate Constitution. Ms. Pam Orcutt, vice-president of the Staff Senate, then described the process followed to prepare and finalize the constitution.

The resolution carried forward for second reading.

10. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON GRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1991-92A, CONCERNING GRADUATE PROGRAM STANDARDS AND POLICIES.

Dr. Hooper moved approval of the resolution.

The motion PASSED.

11. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON STUDENT AFFAIRS RESOLUTION 1991-92A, CONCERNING A CHANGE IN CLASSIFICATION AND FUNDING OF STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS.

Dr. Cross reviewed some of the major points raised during Council's previous discussion of the document. He then distributed copies of corrected pages 11 and 12 of the full proposal. He reminded Council that the resolution is intended to clarify the role of the student organizations and their relationship to the university, especially in terms of the university's liability for these groups.

When asked by Dr. Smoot whether Council would be voting on the resolution or the proposal, Dr. Cross responded that the resolution, a summary of the items contained in the proposal, will be voted upon. Dr. Smoot then advised that approval of the resolution be contingent on the removal of all notations in the actual proposal as to how specific student organizations should be categorized. He added that the Commission on Student Affairs should be responsible for internally assessing how student organizations are classified, independent of University Council approval.

Dr. Cross moved approval of the resolution.

The motion PASSED.

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

a. Commission on Extension, February 4, 1992.

b. Commission on Graduate Studies, February 19, March 4, and March 18, 1992.

With regard to the March 4 minutes, Dr. Snoke pointed out that the Commission on Graduate Students approves Ph.D. programs based on the academic merit of the program, rather than on the basis of resource

availability. He noted that the two do not necessarily go hand-in-hand, which often is problematic for CGS.

Dr. Hooper discussed the attachment regarding Ph.D. residency requirements in the March 18 minutes.

c. Commission on Research, January 22, 1992.

d. Commission on Student Affairs, February 6, February 20, March 5, March 19, and March 26, 1992.

Dr. Heller recommended that the recording secretaries of commissions and committees clarify the meaning of acronyms, used consistently in minutes but often without explanation. Dr. McComas concurred and asked that his concern be noted in Council's minutes.

e. Commission on Undergraduate Studies, February 25 and March 23, 1992.

13. FOR INFORMATION

a. Minutes of the Virginia Tech Athletic Committee, February 12, 1992.

b. Minutes of the University Communications Resources Committee, January 29

and February 26, 1992.

c. Minutes of the Computer Committee, February 5 and March 4, 1992.

Ms. Vargo expressed concern about the notation in the March 4 minutes that a charge for off-campus dial-in service is being contemplated, stating that most graduate students can little afford this additional charge. Mr. Blythe explained that on-campus students have been paying a semester fee for voice-data-video services, which has also been used to support the off-campus modem pool. He said this practice is probably indefensible in any case, but that expenses have grown to such an extent that it was becoming increasingly bothersome to charge on-campus students for the expansion and development of off-campus access.

Mr. Townsend pointed out that graduate assistants must often work at home due to the lack of campus office space and telephone-data lines. He questioned why these students should have to pay for dial-in access while performing job-related activities. Mr. Blythe stated that departments have a responsibility to pay for work-related costs.

Dr. McComas asked Dr. Hooper, in consultation with the Office of the Provost, to further investigate the feasibility of billing departments for job-related computer access.

d. Minutes of the University Committee on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action, February 18, 1992.

e. Minutes of the University Library Committee, January 15, and February 12, 1992.

Dr. Dodl noted that a policy statement concerning the Library fine structure would be attached to the next set of minutes.

f. Classified Staff Affairs Committee Final Report, April, 1991.

Ms. Barroso called on Ms. Ann Spencer, who provided a brief chronology of the genesis of the Classified Staff Affairs Committee (CSAC), beginning in Fall, 1989. Russ Cole, Chair of CSAC, then highlighted the organization's most notable accomplishments, namely the establishment of the Commission on Classified Staff Affairs and the Staff Senate of Virginia Tech. He thanked the many faculty members and administrators who contributed to CSAC's efforts.

14. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. McComas responded at length about the varied and important contributions of classified staff, stating that their work is often under-noticed and under-appreciated.

Dr. McComas then addressed concerns about the implementation of the new KEY ADVANTAGE health care plan, particularly those of out-of-state employees, employees with serious illnesses, and those requiring mental health services. As a result of these problems, Ms. Spencer informed Council that there will be a three-month grace period for state employees before the plan is fully implemented on October 1st.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Harris

Executive Assistant
to the President

LAH:lg

Minutes
University Council Meeting
May 4, 1992

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

Present:J. McComas, M. Ridenour, E.F. Carlisle, J. Falkinham, T. Goodale, D. McAlister (for C. Steger), J. Eustis, L. Harris, G. Hooper, E. Blythe, A. Swiger, H. Doswald, R. Sorensen, S. Crumwell (for J. Buffer), G.W. Clough, S. J. Ritchey, D. Smith, D. Hewitt, L. Rees, N. Dodl, J. Robertson, F. Thye, G. Bunce, G. Holtzman, J. Ficenec, J. Hardell (for B. Crittenden), N. Marriott, A. Snoke, L. Barroso, C. Vargo, M. Hurd (for P. Larkin)

Guests: Bill Burleson, Spectrum; Cornel N. Morton, EO/AA; Robin Ball, Personnel Services; Pam Orcutt, Staff Senate

Absent: C. Forbes, R. Smoot, P. Eyre, P. Miller, R. Heller, T. Rakes, C. Luch, K. Mottley, T. Stoll, B. Rexroad

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

2. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF APRIL 20, 1992

The University Council minutes of the meeting of April 20, 1992 were approved with one correction.

3. FIRST READING, COMMISSION ON FACULTY AFFAIRS RESOLUTION 1991-92C, PROPOSED FAMILY LEAVE POLICY.

Before explaining the resolution, Dr. Falkinham requested that University Council waive second reading and vote to adopt the policy during this final meeting. As rationale for his request, he stated that (1) approval of this resolution would follow the recent (July, 1991) institution of a parental leave policy for salaried classified staff, and (2) the proposed policy requires approval of the Board of Visitors before becoming effective. Dr. Falkinham then briefly reviewed each section of the policy, stating that the proposed revisions are intended to offer faculty members more flexibility to deal with childbirth, adoption, serious family illness, or other extenuating non-professional circumstances. He highlighted the new recommendation that up to ten days of paid family leave could be used by parents upon the birth or adoption of a child. Additionally, annual leave can be used by calendar year faculty to extend the leave period beyond the usual 6 weeks certified by a physician. Much of the remaining proposal, he added, is either existing policy or slightly modifies the current language, such as redefining the term "family" to include stepchildren or "any individual residing in the same household."

Prior to further discussion of the resolution, Dr. McComas sought a motion to waive second reading. Although voicing approval of the general intent of the resolution, Dr. Clough expressed concern about passing it with so little time to consider the ramifications of the proposal, such as the implications for department heads who deal with the absence of faculty. To respond, Dr. Falkinham quoted from the policy that deans, department heads and supervisory personnel must be consulted before family leave is granted, and "it may not be possible to meet every requested accommodation if it imposes serious hardship on students, other staff, or a funded project."

The motion to waive second reading passed.

Ms. Barroso questioned whether the policy applied to individuals categorized as special research faculty appointments? Dr. Falkinham replied that it did not; only faculty members on regular, salaried, non-restricted appointment could access these proposed benefits. A corollary question was raised about compensating eligible faculty members who are partially funded through research contracts. Who would be responsible for reimbursing the sponsoring project for the days of paid leave? Dr. Hooper voiced his concern about the financial ramifications of this resolution for these special-appointment people. Dr. Snoke suggested that the proposal be amended to clarify who will be affected by this policy; Dr. Falkinham agreed to do so.

Several Council members noted that if this policy is passed, it would result in different benefits for faculty and classified staff. Ms. Ball agreed and explained that effective July 1, 1991, classified staff are allowed up to 30 days of unpaid leave for the birth or adoption of a child, but are not allowed paid-leave. Dr. Morton noted that the University Committee on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action discussed this issue at length, but agreed that the proposed faculty family leave policy would not violate any equity issues, as the university cannot dictate compensatory policy for classified staff. Dr. Sorensen added that he hoped that Council would not feel constrained by the state polcicy for classified staff, but instead would provide leadership in improving benefits for Virginia Tech employees that might lead to a change for classified staff as well. He voiced his approval of the resolution.

The resolution passed.

———————

4. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON FACULTY AFFAIRS RESOLUTION 1991-92B, PROPOSED POLICY ON INSTRUCTORS AND LECTURERS.

Dr. Falkinham moved approval of the resolution.

The motion passed.

———————

5. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON GRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1991-92B, DEFINITIONS OF GRADUATE ASSISTANTSHIPS.

Dr. Hooper summarized the intent of the policy, then moved approval of the resolution.

The motion passed.

———————

6. SECOND READING, COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES RESOLUTION 1991-92B, ACADEMIC ELIGIBILITY POLICY FOR AGRICULTURE TECHNOLOGY.

Dr. Carlisle moved approval of the resolution.

The motion passed.

———————

7. SECOND READING, STAFF SENATE CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS, FEBRUARY 14, 1992.

Ms. Barroso moved approval of the resolution.

The motion passed.

———————

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

a. Commission on Extension, March 3, 1992.

Dr. McAlister noted a correction in the date for the Public Service Forum in Tidewater, from May 5th (as stated in the minutes) to May 21st.

b. Commission on Faculty Affairs, February 7, March 20 and April 10, 1992.
c. Commission on Graduate Studies, April 1, 1992.

Dr. Hooper noted Item #6, a description of the Graduate Research Symposium help in early April, adding that it was well attended and received. Dr. Falkinham pointed out a typographical error in that paragraph.

9. FOR INFORMATION

a. Minutes of the Virginia Tech Athletic Committee, March 18, 1992.

b. Minutes of the University Committee on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action, March 17, 1992.

10. ANNOUNCEMENTS

o Dr. McComas recognized the exceptional achievements of Dr. Gary Hooper, Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School, who is leaving Virginia Tech at the end of this academic year.

o Dr. Goodale described several activities that occurred on- and off-campus in response to the riots in Los Angeles, such as the noontime gathering on the drillfield. He and Dr. McComas stressed the university's commitment to hearing and responding to the concerns raised as a result of the events in California.

o Dr. McComas updated Council about the implementation of the KEY ADVANTAGE health plan. He and Mr. Ridenour described the genesis of the plan, which was developed by the state in response to escalating health care costs and passed by the General Assembly. It is due to be implemented on July 1, but Governor Wilder has granted a three-month delay to enable more physicians to enroll. Mr. Ridenour, chair of a statewide committee to examine the plan, described the many concerns raised by both health care providers and state employees, including the lack of participating primary care physicians, the referral system, accommodations for out-of-state employees, the mental health care referral process, and the fact that many designated physicians are not accepting new patients. After lengthy discussion, Mr. Ridenour noted that Virginia Tech, as a state employer, has no choice and must implement the plan. He added, however, that the university will attempt to influence decisions to remove or modify as many of the major objections to the proposal as possible.

Dr. Falkinham inquired whether Virginia Tech could independently contract for health care insurance. Dr. McComas responded that while it was possible, it would probably be a very costly alternative. Dr. Falkinham also criticized the lack of a wellness component to the plan.

Dr. Bunce pointed out that the university was not even given the option of maintaining current coverage with possibly higher premiums, but rather was told about the change after the fact.

Dr. McComas acknowledged these concerns, adding that the university is doing all that it can to positively influence what the state provides in health care benefits.

11. QUESTION/ANSWER SESSION

Dr. Falkinham requested an update on the status of the bond issue. Dr. McComas responded that the governor has called a meeting of state university presidents on May 15 to discuss this and several other issues. He envisions the formation of a state-wide committee of university representatives to promote passage of the bond. He then described the constituency groups who will be targeted, including current students and their families, alumni, and the local population. A looming problem, Dr. McComas explained, is that such lobbying is relatively ineffective during the summer months. Therefore, an intensive effort to publicize the bond must be initiated in the fall. Both Dr. McComas and Mr. Ridenour indicated that the success of this bond will influence the vote on future bonds. Thus, they concluded, this vote will be "critical."

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

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

LAH:lg