

University Council Minutes, September 16, 1996

Present: B. Bates, E. Blythe, G. Brown, L. Cross, P. Edwards, D Kenney (for E. Hitchingham), E. Holford, J. Johnson, P. Meszaros, C. Nickerson, L. Peters, M. Ridenour, J. Eversole (for R. Smoot), C. Steger, J. Tront (for F. W. Stephenson), L. Swiger, P. Torgersen, J. Aughenbaugh, B. Ley, J. McKenna, V. Myers, J. Seiler, M. Smith, N. Spencer, T. Swecker, R. Dyck, C. Goodsell, K. Pelzer, T. Sherman, L. Shumsky, B. Benoit, R. Daniel, D. De Wolf, R. Goss, F. Gwazdauskas, P. Scanlon, G. Johns, T. Head, K. McNinney, M. Norstedt, N. Phillips, C. Couples, P. Dolezel, C. Forstner, L. Furjanic, J. Hulings.

Guests: J. Randolph, Department Head, Urban Affairs & Planning; P. Metz, Library and President of Faculty Senate.

1. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion passed.

2. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of May 6, 1996.

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the May 6, 1996 University Council meeting had been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System of the GOPHER.

3. Opening remarks from Dr. Paul E. Torgersen and Dr. Peggy Meszaros.

Dr. Torgersen convened the first meeting of University Council for the 96-97 academic year by welcoming everyone and introducing present members.

Dr. Peggy Meszaros followed by introducing each commission chairperson and identifying that commission's issues/interests for the upcoming year:

Dr. Norrine Bailey Spencer, chairperson of Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs, introduced the following issues/interests: 1) understanding the delayed pay check; 2) communicating with constituents; and 3) five-year review of administrators.

Ms. Valerie L. Myers, chairperson of Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, introduced the following issues/interests: 1) understanding the delayed paycheck; 2) smoking policy; 3) inclement weather policy; and 4) emergency personnel policy.

Dr. Jim McKenna, chairperson of Commission on Faculty Affairs, introduced the following issues/interests: 1) post tenure review; 2) administrative review; and 3) faculty climate.

Dr. William B. Ley, chairperson of Commission on Graduate Studies & Policies, introduced the following issues/interests: 1) university review of graduate programs; 2) policy on discontinuation of graduate programs; 3) graduate student health insurance; 4) guidelines for good practices in graduate education; 5) review of policy on auditing graduate courses; 6) review of the graduate assistantship agreement; 7) the revenue sharing initiative; 8) review of tuition scholarships; 9) expansion of state support for graduate tuition; and 10) expansion of graduate student input and participation on the commission

Dr. Bill Swecker, chairperson of Commission on Public Service & Extension, introduced the following issues/interests: 1) commission name change; and 2) implementing task force recommendations.

Dr. Mark Smith, chairperson of Commission on Research, introduced the following issues/interests: 1) ongoing review of university research centers; 2) review of proposals for new university research centers; 3) involvement with conflict of commitment task force; and 4) consider an adoption policy for animals used in research.

Mr. John Aughenbaugh, chairperson of Commission on Student Affairs, introduced the following issues/interests: 1) fan behavior at football games; 2) enrollment, space and housing issues; and 3) student media relationship to university.

Dr. John Seiler, chairperson of Commission on Undergraduate Studies & Policies, introduced the following issues/interests: 1) review of restricted majors; and 2) academic eligibility policy implementation.

Commission on University Support has not identified a chairperson or issues/interests to date.

Dr. Torgersen thanked the commission chairs for their ambitious undertakings of meaningful issues and initiatives and hopes that they can be addressed as positive recommendations to better the whole university.

Dr. Torgersen announced that with the cooperation of Dr. Paul Metz, president of Faculty Senate, he will appoint a small committee made up of University Council members to review and possibly suggest improvements in the governance system processes and communications. Dr. Metz noted that the concept of this subcommittee developed from an initiative of the Faculty and Staff Senates last year. Dr. Torgersen further explained that the charge to the subcommittee will ask if we need to modify our procedures so that we operate and communicate more efficiently. Dr. Metz assured Council members that all constituencies would be represented on the subcommittee.

Dr. Torgersen extended to Council a suggestion that had been placed before him. He proposed that members of Council put aside at least an hour for each Council meeting at which time the formal agenda business would be accomplished as well as an "exchange of information" session. In order to facilitate this "exchange of information" session, Ms. Carole Nickerson, executive assistant to the president, will collect discussion topics. Members can present these topics to Carole through e-mail (CNICKERS@VT.EDU) or bring them to Council meetings. Dr. Torgersen pointed out that this is a particularly good group for this type of discussion and exchange since all constituencies of the University are represented.

Dr. Metz suggested that a discussion among Council members regarding their perception of university governance, i.e., what is good, what could be better, what needs to be fixed, would be invaluable as the subcommittee begins to study the current governance system. Therefore, he suggested that this be the first topic of discussion under this new format.

Several other possible discussion topics were suggested: tailgating at football games, parking, and the current athletic situation. At this point, Dr. Torgersen elected to address the recent altercation allegedly involving athletes. Dr. Torgersen gave a brief description of the altercation, how it began outside Squires, and progressed into the town of Blacksburg. The Blacksburg police are proceeding with an investigation.

4. First Reading, Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1995-96D, Policy on Transfer of Virginia Community College (Amendment to Presidential Policy No. 68).

Dr. John Seiler presented Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1995-96D, Policy on Transfer of Virginia Community College. Dr. Seiler explained that this resolution is an amendment to Presidential Policy No. 68 and its primary function is to insure full compliance with State Council guidelines by standardizing clear and consistent policy concerning a student's ability to transfer to Virginia Tech.

5. First Reading, Commission on Public Service and Extension Resolution 1996-97A, Name Change for the Commission.

Dr. Terry Swecker presented Commission on Public Service and Extension Resolution 1996-97A, Name Change for the Commission. Dr. Swecker explained that relative to the Task Force on Outreach, the Commission would like to change its name from Commission on Public Service and Extension to the Commission on Outreach.

6. First Reading, Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1996-97A, Proposed Restructuring of Undergraduate Degree Programs in Urban Affairs and Planning.

Dr. John Seiler presented Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1996-97A, Proposed Restructuring of Undergraduate Degree Programs in Urban Affairs and Planning. Dr. Seiler explained that this resolution addresses the restructuring of two undergraduate degrees, the B.S. in Environmental Policy and Planning and the B.A. in Public and Urban Affairs.

7. Council approved a packet of Commission minutes comprised of:

- \* Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, May 8, June 12, and July 10, 1996.
- \* Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, April 17, 1996.
- \* Commission on Research, March 27, 1996.
- \* Commission on Student Affairs, April 18, 1996.
- \* Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, April 22, 1996.

8. For Information

Ms. Carole Nickerson read into the minutes editorial changes reflecting administrative title changes. These changes will be reflected on the governance rosters (located on the Gopher) and consist of: 1) adding Interim Vice Provost for Outreach, ex officio, Dixon Hanna to the Commission on Public Service and Extension; 2) add back Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, ex officio, John Fulton to the Advisory Council on Strategic Budget & Planning; 3) add back Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, ex officio, John Fulton to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies & Policies; and 4) change the Director of Public Safety, Health and Transportation to that of Associate Vice President for Personnel and Administrative Systems or Designee on the Transportation and Parking Committee.

Ms. Nickerson announced that a Governance Workshop will be held on October 7, immediately following the University Council meeting. This will be a workshop designed particularly for new committee and commission chairs and other representatives who may be new to council or new to their role in governance. The workshop will be addressing practical aspects of how to function within the governance system.

Announcements

Dr. Torgersen will present his annual address to the faculty and staff Thursday, September 26, at the Donaldson Brown Continuing Education Center.

Responding to Dr. Robert Benoit's query, Dr. Torgersen stated that he thought the Council on Higher Education would get more involved with university business. Dr. Torgersen explained that he would be addressing this issue as well as other interesting changes going on across the state at his address on Thursday.

Dr. Torgersen responded to Dr. Tom Sherman's query regarding critical issues facing the university this year as well as what types of goals have been established for the university to accomplish over the next academic year, by stating that he, the Provost, and the Executive Vice President will begin to implement some of the goals set forth in "the Plan for 1996-2001." Dr. Torgersen said that instruction technology and communications information technology can be done well at this institution. He would like Virginia Tech to define this as an area of expertise so that people across the Commonwealth can look to Virginia Tech as an institution that is taking a leadership role in this field.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson  
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, October 7, 1996

Present: B. Bates, M. Williams (for E. Blythe), L. Cross, P. Edwards, P. Eyre, E. Hitchingham, E. Holford, J. Johnson, P. Meszaros, C. Nickerson, L. Peters, M. Ridenour, R. Smoot, R. Sorensen, C. Steger, F. W. Stephenson, L. Swiger, T. Tillar, P. Torgersen, J. Aughenbaugh, B. Ley, J. McKenna, V. Myers, J. Seiler, M. Smith, M. O'Neill (for N. Spencer), T. Swecker, R. Dyck, C. Goodsell, N. Marriott, K. Pelzer, T. Sherman, B. Benoit, D. de Wolf, R. Goss, F. Gwazdauskas, R. Lalik, P. Scanlon, J. Yardley, K. Burke, T. Head, K. McNinney, M. Norstedt, N. Phillips, T. Lawrence, J. Aughenbaugh, C. Couples, P. Dolezel, L. Furjanic, J. Hulings.

Guests: G. McLaughlin, Institutional Research; P. Hyer, Provost Office, A. Spencer, Personnel and Administrative Services; J. Randolph, Urban Affairs & Planning; J. Fulton, Provost Office; P. Metz, Faculty Senate; J. Muffo, Academic Assessment Programs; D. Conn, Provost Office; D. Hanna, Provost Office; A. McNabb, Biology; M. Harrington, Institutional Research.

1. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion passed.

2. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of September 16, 1996.

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the September 16, 1996 University Council meeting had been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System of the GOPHER.

First Reading, Commission on Research Resolution 96-97A: Policies and Procedures for Releasing Plant Germplasm.

Dr. Mark Smith presented First Reading, Commission on Research Resolution 96-97A: Policies and Procedures for Releasing Plant Germplasm. Dr. Smith explained that the resolution is designed to: 1) insure the continuation of the funds needed by the Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station to support the development of new plant germplasm; 2) to recognize and reward the inventors of new plant germplasm; and 3) to bring the sharing of the revenues generated in the sale of new plant germplasm more in line with University policy.

Dr. Smith introduced Dr. Bob Cannell, director of Virginia Agriculture Experiment Station, and asked him to provide background leading to the proposed resolution. Dr. Cannell explained that historically land-grant universities throughout the country have had a tradition of breeding new varieties of plants, and providing them to a large state clientele. Since breeding new plant varieties is a very expensive procedure, we were able persuade our clientele to accept the idea that we should charge a royalty on the release of these new plant varieties. Dr. Cannell pointed out that a difference from the normal split of royalties in the existing university intellectual property policy was introduced in 1991. He stated that even though the 1991 policy did provide for exceptions to the rule, it was felt that a separate policy should be formulated to assist in "releasing plant germplasm." Hence, the proposed resolution was developed and after heavy discussion with relevant faculty, the policy has been unanimously approved by the Committee on Intellectual Properties and the Commission on Research. Dr. Cannell stated that the proposed resolution appears to be a fair balance between meeting the expectations of our traditional clientele and having sufficient money to sustain these programs.

Dr. Len Peters, vice provost for Research and dean of the Graduate School, stated that typically this is one of the heavily discussed segments of the intellectual property policy at all land-grant universities, and he believes this new resolution will be adopted by other universities as the most equitable way of handling the situation.

Second Reading, Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1995-96D, Policy on Transfer of Virginia Community College (Amendment to Presidential Policy No. 68).

Dr. John Seiler presented the second reading of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1995-96D, Policy on Transfer of Virginia Community College. Dr. Seiler explained that this resolution is basically designed to insure that Virginia Tech is in compliance with the policies established by the State Council of Higher Education. The resolution was voted upon and passed.

Second Reading, Commission on Public Service and Extension Resolution 1996-97A, Name Change for the

Commission.

Dr. Terry Swecker presented the second reading of the Commission on Public Service and Extension Resolution 1996-97A, Name Ch

University Council Minutes, October 21, 1996

Present: D. Stetler (for B. Bates), A. Moore (for E. Blythe), S. Yeagle (for L. Cross), P. Edwards, D. Kenney (for E. Hitchingham), E. Holford P. Meszaros, C. Nickerson, J. Eaton (for L. Peters), L. Martinson (for M. Ridenour), J. Eversole (for R. Smoot), N. Spencer (for R. Sorensen), C. Steger, H. Griffin (for F. W. Stephenson), L. Swiger, J. Aughenbaugh, B. Ley, P. Metz (for J. McKenna), V. Myers, J. Seiler, M. Smith, N. Spencer, T. Swecker, R. Dyck, C. Goodsell, N. Marriott, K. Pelzer, T. Sherman, B. Benoit, F. Thye (for R. Goss), F. Gwazdauskas, R. Lalik, L. Shumsky, K. Burke, T. Head, K. McNinney, P. Metz (for M. Norstedt), N. Phillips, T. Lawrence, J. Aughenbaugh, C. Couples, P. Dolezel, J. Hulings, G. Johns, R. Watkins.

Guests: P. Hyer, Provost Office; D. Eavey, Personnel Services; J. Fulton, Provost Office.

In Dr. Torgersen's absence, Provost Peggy Meszaros presided over the meeting.

1. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion passed.

2. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of October 7, 1996.

Dr. Meszaros noted that the minutes from the October 7, 1996 University Council meeting had been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System of the GOPHER.

3. First Reading, Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, Resolution 96-97A: Revisions to Policy on Authorized Closings (Policy No. 4305).

Ms. Valerie Myers presented First Reading, Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, Resolution 96-97A: Revisions to Policy on Authorized Closings (Policy No. 4305). Ms. Myers explained that due to last year's unique weather situation, the Commission on Classified Staff Affairs decided to revisit Policy No. 4305, the Policy on Authorized Closings. The newly revised policy is designed to: 1) apprise new-hires of their emergency personnel designation; 2) explain the procedures when emergency personnel do not report to work as scheduled; 3) provide for conditions that create transportation difficulties; and 4) define a communication plan that all departments should adopt regarding authorized closing for inclement weather.

Questions arose as to how 'nonemergency' personnel who became 'emergency' personnel due to restructuring or internal job changes would be handled. Mr. Dennis Eavey, Personnel Services, pointed out that the new resolution requires Personnel Services to distribute a mailing each fall to deans, directors, and department heads instructing them to inform their emergency employees of their departmental communications plan and what is expected of them in an authorized closing situation.

Dr. Meszaros described the procedure used in making inclement weather decisions. The police department advises the president, provost, and executive vice president about the weather outlook and road conditions. If Dr. Torgersen is in town, he prefers to make the decision himself, but if he is unavailable, Dr. Meszaros and Mr. Ridenour make a joint decision, typically by 6:00 a.m..

4. Second Reading, Commission on Research Resolution 96-97A: Policies and Procedures for Releasing Plant Germplasm.

Dr. Mark Smith presented First Reading, Commission on Research Resolution 96-97A: Policies and Procedures for Releasing Plant Germplasm. Dr. Smith explained that the resolution is designed to: 1) insure the continuation of the funds needed by the Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station to support the development of new plant germplasm; 2) to recognize and reward the inventors of new plant germplasm; and 3) to bring the sharing of the revenues generated in the sale of new plant germplasm more in line with University policy. Dr. Smith pointed out that this resolution basically speaks to the need for a different revenue split where the unique development of plant germplasm is concerned.

The resolution was voted upon and passed.

5. Council approved a packet of Commission minutes comprised of:

\* Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, September 11, 1996.

∑ Commission on Faculty Affairs, April 25, 1996.

Questions arose regarding administrative appointment reviews and the length of their appointments. Dr. Paul Metz, representing Dr. Jim McKenna, Chairperson of the Commission on Faculty Affairs, explained that although the Commission on Faculty Affairs is very interested in this issue, the Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs is studying it at this time while CFA focuses on post tenure review. Dr. Metz assured members of Council that CFA does plan to visit this issue before the academic year ends.

Regarding a question about a possible resolution dealing with administrative appointments and review, Dr. Pat Hyer pointed out that there is no need for such a resolution because the policy already exists. Dr. Norrine Bailey Spencer explained that the Commission on Administrative Professional Faculty Affairs is currently writing the procedures for implementing administrative reviews.

A question arose regarding whether or not the Faculty Senate was reviewing the severe sanctions policy. Dr. Metz pointed out that after CFA has finished studying the policy, it will most likely be referred to the Faculty Senate.

\* Commission on Public Service and Extension, September 9, 1996.

\* Commission on Research, September 25, 1996.

A question arose regarding the research animal adoption policy and where it now stands. Dr. Mark Smith, chair of the Commission on Research (COR), explained that Dr. Len Peters, Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School, has appointed an ad hoc committee, composed of members of the animal care committee, to consider an "adoption of research and teaching animals" policy at the university. In addition, Dr. Peters has asked COR for input concerning the status of the current policy. Dr. Smith said that at this time, there is no policy, but the Commission on Research believes that even though this is an emotional issue, it is important for the university to put a policy into place.

\* Commission on Student Affairs, September 19, 1996.

\* Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, September 23, 1996.

6. For Information

Dr. Meszaros invited all council members to read the University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning minutes from April 16, May 1, May 22, June 26, August 14, September 10, and September 27. These minutes have been provided for information only.

7. Announcements

Ms. Carole Nickerson noted that Dr. Torgersen's absence is due to his being one of a handful of presidents in the Commonwealth who were invited to testify at a joint hearing of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance Committees.

Dr. Meszaros moved to Discussion segment of the meeting, noting University Council agreed to set aside time during each meeting for in-depth discussion on topics of community interest and to accomplish this in a systematic way. She mentioned that all Council members were invited to suggest topics of discussion as well as to prioritize the chosen topics. The selection for this meeting was Post-tenure Review.

Dr. Meszaros pointed out that through the good efforts of many people, a resolution for the post tenure review process was written and adopted by the University Council and the Board of Visitors. In order to refresh everyone's memory of the resolution, Dr. Meszaros quoted the last paragraph of the resolution: "Therefore be it resolved that the following additions be made to section 2.9 of the Faculty Handbook which 1) establish an Unsatisfactory rating for faculty who fail to meet departmental minimum standards; b) provide guidance to departments for the



development of such standards; and c) provide a process for post-tenure review of faculty members who have received two successive Unsatisfactory performance reviews.”

Dr. Meszaros then outlined the sequence of events leading up to where we are now: 1) the policy was approved in the Spring of 1996 and over the summer small incentive grants were provided to departments that would volunteer to begin working on the minimum standards (so that as all departments began working on defining their minimal standards this fall, there would be a point of reference; 2) subsequently, six departments completed drafts over the summer -- Mathematics, Statistics, College of Engineering, College of Forestry, Crop & Soil, Environmental Sciences, and Management Science; 3) these minimum standard drafts were then compiled, discussed by the Provost's staff, Dean's Council, and the Commission on Faculty Affairs; 4) after that the deans were requested to move forward in developing the remaining documents after a packet of drafts, cover sheets with comments, and a checklist of requirements were provided.

Dr. Meszaros passed out a “calendar of events” reflecting this sequence of events, pointing out that currently all departments are developing their draft documents for review and approval by faculty. The “calendar” indicates that by February 1, 1997, all departments will submit their drafts to their college Promotion & Tenure Committee for review regarding consistency and appropriateness. Revisions must then be made by March 1 when the college P&T Committee forwards them to the deans for their review and approval, and then on April 1 all deans will submit their documents to the Provost's Office. By May 1, approved standards will be distributed to all faculty in each of the departments, and during the summer of 1997, minimal standards and unsatisfactory ratings will go into effect for 1997-98 year.

Discussion followed with positive comments about the policy and its development, and questions about its originality and relation to policies developed elsewhere. Florida and Kentucky were noted as having more far-reaching policies than Virginia Tech's, which limits the focus to unsatisfactory performance. Consensus from several speakers was that ours is an excellent policy, largely original to Virginia Tech, a product of cooperation between faculty and administration in response to a mandate from Richmond, and one that might allow us to promote faculty successes without unduly publicizing failures.

Several speakers made the point that the next key to successful and equitable implementation lies in the departmental policies currently under development. It was noted that individual faculty members should have access to the university policy, since the deans have made it widely available through their department heads. Copies may also be obtained by contacting Pat Hyer, who also has copies of the pilot drafts.

It was noted that the administration in Richmond and at SCHEV has responded positively to the Virginia Tech policy, witness our receipt of faculty salary increases, which were contingent this year at all Virginia institutions of higher education upon the successful development of such a policy. The university was also required to include the policy and implementation plans in the annual restructuring report to SCHEV and the Secretary of Education, which was submitted October 1, 1996.

Turning to the policy itself, speakers noted the focus on minimum rather than lofty standards, and questioned how faculty and the institution might encourage aiming for excellence. Paul Metz's op-ed piece was mentioned as an example of how to place the issue of tenure and post tenure review before the faculty and the public in a persuasively positive light. It was nevertheless noted that the current Virginia Tech policy does not speak to those who do well, but is chiefly a response to political and social conditions and demands.

Discussion next centered on how the implementation of the policy would be monitored. The point was made that the potential severity of outcomes requires some checks and balances to ensure fairness and equity. Provost Meszaros recognized the depth of the question, and said she is taking steps to monitor for differential applications. She was requested to establish a monitoring system as rapidly as possible. The Commission on Faculty Affairs also intends to follow this issue.

The point was made that despite wide publicity in publications both on and off campus, there remains the misperception on the part of some that the impetus for the policy came from Burruss Hall rather than Richmond, and that it will be used as a tool to weed out the unpopular and to weaken tenure. Several speakers responded by pointing out the national activity around this issue, that it is not limited to Virginia or Virginia Tech, and that Promotion and Tenure

Review policies are in fact attempts to strengthen tenure and build respect for the professoriate in the face of growing public skepticism. Others noted that the state mandate is in fact an attack on tenure, but that does not negate the academy's need to monitor and manage itself. Additional comment supported the view that while faculty ought not to protect ill-doers, faculty must also recognize the attack represented by the state mandate and by national focus on the issue.

One speaker noted that the approach in his college to drafting their internal document was positive in every way, with the chief aim being to develop an intervention that would help to get a member back on a successful track. Another observed the close and necessary relationship between the PTR policy and the faculty development issue, pointing out that faculty development is implied throughout the PTR policy. Several members commented on the note of fear that has threaded through the discussion. The point was made that after the long siege of external budget threats and numerous broadsides against the academy, people may have reached the point where fear has become generalized, with our members no longer able to distinguish between another attack and a genuine attempt to bring about improvement.

Final comments centered on the point that higher education has been called into a public conversation about its own accountability as a profession, that the intention from SCHEV was positive, and that we have to remain alert to how this public conversation plays out.

Dr. Meszaros thanked everyone for participating in an excellent discussion and helping to build a climate of trust and openness. The next topic on the prioritized list is actually a related collection of concerns that may take two meetings to cover, beginning November 4: rankings of the university, image and perceptions of the university, and the idea of this university. Ms. Nickerson noted that she has asked Dr. Charles Steger, Mr. Ralph Byers, and Mr. Larry Hincker to be present for the next two meetings to assist with discussion of these very complex topics.

Dr. Meszaros recognized and thanked all members for reading the minutes as this enabled a good discussion, and it indicates that everyone is willing to bring relevant items up for further discussion.

In closing, Dr. Meszaros urged each member to ensure that all faculty in their departments play a significant role in the development of their the minimum standards. She pointed out that this is the single most important step in the whole post tenure review process -- to make sure that the voices of the faculty in each department are heard and that as the document is prepared everyone is informed and has a voice in the preparation. She reiterated that in order to ensure trust in the system it is essential that everyone participates. Dr. Meszaros's charge to members is to inform departmental faculty that UCOUNCIL had this discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson  
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, November 4, 1996

Present: B. Bates, M. Williams (for E. Blythe), G. Brown, S. Yeagle (for L. Cross), P. Eyre, E. Hitchingham, E. Holford P. Meszaros, C. Nickerson, L. Peters, M. Ridenour, R. Smoot, Jr., R. Sorensen, C. Steger, F. W. Stephenson, L. Swiger, T. Tillar, P. Torgersen, B. Ley, P. Metz (for J. McKenna), V. Myers, J. Seiler, T. Swecker, R. Schubert (for M. Smith), R. Dyck, N. Marriott, T. Sherman, B. Benoit, R. Daniel, D. deWolf, R. Goss, N. Spencer, F. Gwazdauskas, P. Scanlon, K. Burke, T. Head, K. McNinney, T. Lawrence, M. Norstedt, C. Couples, P. Dolezel, J. Hulings.

Guests: P. Hyer, Provost Office; D. Eavey, Personnel Services; J. Fulton, Provost Office; A. Spencer, Personnel and Administrative Services; L. Martinson, Executive Vice President's Office; A. Moore, Information Technology Initiatives; S. Allen, Staff Senate.

1. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion passed.

2. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of October 21, 1996.

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the October 21, 1996 University Council meeting had been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System of the GOPHER.

3. Second First Reading, Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, Resolution 96-97A: Revisions to Policy on Authorized Closings (Policy No. 4305). Ms. Valerie Myers presented Second Reading, Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, Resolution 96-97A: Revisions to Policy on Authorized Closings (Policy No. 4305). Ms. Myers explained that the newly revised policy is designed to: 1) apprise new-hires of their emergency personnel designation; 2) explain the procedures when emergency personnel do not report to work as scheduled; 3) provide for conditions that create transportation difficulties; and 4) define a communication plan that all departments should adopt regarding authorized closing for inclement weather. She explained that once adopted, the resolution requires Personnel Services to distribute a mailing each fall to deans, directors, and department heads instructing them to inform their emergency employees of their departmental communications plan and what is expected of them in an authorized closing situation.

The resolution was voted upon and passed.

4. Council approved a packet of Commission minutes comprised of:

\* Commission on Administrative Professional and Faculty Affairs, September 17, 1996.

The minutes were approved with one minor correction: change Staff Association to Staff Senate.

• Commission on Faculty Affairs, September 27 and October 11, 1996.

Dr. Pat Hyer, representing Dr. Jim McKenna, chairperson of Commission on Faculty Affairs, clarified that the Commission on Faculty Affairs has not completed its suggestions to the current Committee on Ethics. The new charge, once determined, will be broader, in line with the AAUP

guidelines, and will outline a more general level of ethical faculty behavior.

Dr. Hyer also provided a brief update on CFA's reaction to the post-tenure review drafts they had been provided for study. She assured members that CFA had no deep concerns regarding the drafts, and that they would continue to follow along and provide whatever advice they could.

\* Commission on Graduate Studies & Policies, October 2, 1996.

Regarding an inquiry as to where the Commission on Graduate Studies & Policies stands on the electronic thesis and dissertation situation, Dr. Bill Ley explained that an advisory committee, under the leadership of Dr. John Eaton, has been appointed to work out the details of the implementation.

Responding to a question about the Library's budget situation, Dr. Eileen Hitchingham, dean of the Library, explained that the shortfall discussed in the minutes does not refer to a current situation, but refers to a potential shortfall in the upcoming year. Dr. Hitchingham pointed out that if the university wishes the Library to offer the same services it now does, the operating budget for 1997-98 will have to be adjusted or a shortfall will occur.

\* Commission on Outreach, October 14, 1996.

\* Commission on Research, October 9, 1996.

After Dr. Bob Schubert, substituting for Dr. Mark Smith, chairperson of the Commission on Research, presented the minutes, a discussion about the animal adoption policy came up. Dr. Patrick Scanlon expressed his disappointment at the way the minutes reflected the Animal Care Committee's efforts to address the adoption policy issue, and pointed out the committee is federally mandated and must grapple with a complex set of issues with potentially grave consequences for the university. Dr. Scanlon reiterated that the committee consists of responsible people, and that the Commission's minutes misrepresented their approach to very difficult questions.

Dr. Len Peters reiterated that at this time the university does not have an animal Adoption Policy. He pointed out that this is a very controversial and emotional issue and has caused a wide difference of opinion amongst committee and commission members. Dr. Peters said the university is in the very early stages of trying to develop a policy and that the Commission on Research has encouraged the Animal Care Committee to propose a policy which the Commission on Research could endorse and subsequently present to University Council. Towards this goal, Dr. Peters, Kay Heidbreder, and the Animal Care Committee will soon meet.

Dr. Metz and Dean Eyre reminded Council that the adoption policy issue must remain separate from the integrity of the minutes, which are designed to accurately reflect the actual events of a meeting and must therefore be approved as written.

A question arose regarding the 1996-97 Athletic Committee's agenda. Several members who are on this committee acquainted Council with the following agenda items: concern about facilities, behavioral issues, the implementation and recommendation for support services to athletes, and NCAA joint audit with SACS accreditation.

\* Commission on Student Affairs, October 3, 1996.

· Commission on Undergraduate Studies & Policies, October 14, 1996.

Discussion arose concerning the possibility of changing class schedules on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday from the existing ten minutes between classes to fifteen minutes. Dr. Peggy Meszaros pointed out that a recommended change in the current schedules came about as a ground swell of faculty concerns. She suggested that any and all concerns regarding how this might impact the university population should be shared with Dr. John Seiler so that the Commission on Undergraduate Studies & Policies can make an informed decision. Mr. Jay Hulings, president of the Student Government Association, mentioned that the Commission on Student Affairs will also be studying the proposed changing of class schedules and the related implications.

#### 5. For Information

Minutes of University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning, October 8, 1996.

#### 6. Announcements

Introducing the discussion topics Rankings of the university, image and perceptions of the university, and the idea of this university, Dr. Charles Steger, Mr. Ralph Byers, and Mr. Larry Hincker set the stage by explaining that the communication, positioning, and image of the university is a very complex challenge. Dr. Steger began by explaining the ways in which we try to communicate Virginia Tech's image to many different constituencies, both external and internal. He used handouts to illustrate our 17 external constituencies and the resulting challenge of crafting messages to shape their perceptions of Virginia Tech. He also stated that our internal constituencies are comprised of 1500 faculty members, 25,000 students, 2900 staff, and research for about 400+ companies.

Mr. Ralph Byers, Director of Government Relations, commented that he specializes in a constituency comprised of 140 members of the General Assembly. He noted that Virginia Tech is regarded very favorably by members of the General Assembly, more favorably than many other institutions. Mr. Byers presented a chart tracking the reduction in appropriations for higher education from 1990 until the present. He explained how the Business Higher Education Council is working to get funding for higher education in Virginia up to the average for the Southeastern states (which would be several hundred dollars more per student). He contrasted the 1990's with the 1980's, when the state budget was expanding and higher education did relatively well. During the 1990's, higher education has increased very little with most of that increase coming during this biennium. He noted the Business Higher Education Council's successful campaign to have candidates for the General Assembly sign up to support higher education. Over two thirds of both parties of the General Assembly candidates did sign. In addition to that successful effort, restructuring of institutions has helped rebut some of the nationwide criticism of higher education. Mr. Byers said that post tenure review has been successful in proving that tenure is not necessarily a lifetime job and shows that we have measures that we are willing to take when someone is not performing at the appropriate level. All of these measures have increased our support within the general public a great deal. Surveys show that higher education basically has a favorable perception among the people of Virginia; they think they are getting a good value for the money. Mr. Byers pointed out that part of the higher education budget problems in Virginia exist because Virginia is a low revenue state; we are in the bottom ten states in the nation in revenues and in the bottom ten states in per-student-support for higher education. He reminded that during the recession, when many other states were raising taxes to provide some of these services, Virginia chose not to raise taxes and instead to take money out of state agencies such as higher education. He also noted that we don't have a large legislative delegation here in our region so

we have to work much harder to influence legislators in Norfolk, Richmond, and Northern Virginia.

Mr. Larry Hincker addressed the issue of college rankings by first explaining that thousands of data points are used to achieve the results, and he prefers to use the U.S. News Guide because their methodology is the most responsive to higher education. Mr. Hincker listed some of the data points used to comprise the rankings in U.S. News Guide: 1) reputational survey - arrived at by surveying university presidents, provosts, deans, directors, etc.; 2) student retention and graduation rate - graduation rates are highly correlated to the quality of the incoming student profile; 3) faculty resources, percent of faculty with doctoral terminal degrees, percent of full-time faculty, faculty salaries, etc.; 4) selectivity - includes acceptance rate, yield, SAT scores, class standing; 5) class size, expenditures for public service, financial aid and things of that nature.

After Mr. Hincker's presentation, Dr. Bob Benoit questioned the issue of our overcrowded classes, sometimes 200+ students per class, when the survey quotes us as having a 17-1 student/faculty ratio. Mr. Hincker advised that the truest and best answer to this conflicting information is that our lower level classes are large but our small upper level classes compensate for them.

Dr. David deWolf and Dr. Len Peters referenced our graduate versus our undergraduate rankings. They pointed out that, as mentioned earlier by Dr. Steger, we have many audiences and one of the issues with respect to national universities is whether or not we are a research university. Dr. deWolf said that if we are a research university our graduate rankings suddenly become more important and the issue arises as to what extent they help drive the undergraduate rankings. Dr. deWolf noted that a strategic aspect of the self study relates to where Virginia Tech might be ten years from now. Though uncertain, it seems clear that the student base may change as we see graduate students increasingly unwilling to physically come to this campus. As we see an increasing need for graduate students to do their graduate work while they are actually employed, we will see more distance learning and a larger off-campus course following. He believes that in the future undergraduates may choose universities based upon the academic, scholastic, or research reputation of the university. Dr. deWolf pointed out that as we decide who our audience will be, the interplay between graduate and undergraduate rankings will become more important. There may be a conflict between being the best undergraduate school and being the best graduate school.

Mr. Hincker agreed that graduate schools are increasingly ranked now. Dr. Peters pointed out that where graduate school rankings are concerned it is important to recognize that reputation is still the bottom-line factor. He feels there is a great deal of similarity between the quality of the graduate program and the perceived quality of the undergraduate program. Dr. Peters also feels that all the colleges within a university can be heavily influenced by the reputation rankings of specific colleges within that university, producing the halo effect.

Lastly, Jay Hulings, president of the Student Government Association said he thought that the college rankings were very important and widely utilized by prospective students.

Dr. Peggy Meszaros adjourned the meeting at 4:20 p.m. and announced that we will continue this discussion at the next University Council meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson  
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, December 2, 1996

Present: D. Stetler (for B. Bates), G. Brown, L. Cross, P. Edwards, P. Eyre, R. Rios (for E. Holford), J. Johnson, P. Meszaros, C. Nickerson, L. Peters, M. Ridenour, R. Sorensen, C. Steger, T. Tillar, P. Torgersen, J. Aughenbaugh, B. Ley, J. McKenna, V. Myers, J. Seiler, N. Spencer, T. Swecker, C. Goodsell, N. Marriott, K. Pelzer, N. Shumsky, B. Benoit, R. Daniel, D. deWolf, R. Goss, Gwazdauskas, P. Scanlon, J. Yardley, K. Burke (by phone), G. Johns, K. McNinney, M. Norstedt, N. Phillips, C. Couples.

Guests: P. Hyer, Provost Office; J. Fulton, Provost Office; P. Metz, Faculty Senate; S. Allen, Staff Senate.

1. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion passed.

2. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of November 4, 1996.

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the November 4, 1996 University Council meeting had been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System of the GOPHER.

First Reading, Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, Resolution 96-97C: Reclassification of Undergraduate Academic Levels.

Before presenting Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, Resolution 96-97C: Reclassification of Undergraduate Academic Levels, Dr. John Seiler, chairperson of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, requested that University Council waive second reading and vote to adopt the new policy during this meeting. As rationale for his request, Dr. Seiler stated that approval of this resolution would allow the Registrar's Office to immediately implement the changes for Spring of 1997.

Dr. Seiler went on to explain that the new resolution would set the undergraduate student's academic level in increments reflecting 25 percent of the total number of credits required for the bachelors degree based on a 120 credit minimum degree requirement.

The motion to waive second reading passed, and subsequently the resolution was voted upon and passed.

Council approved a packet of Commission minutes comprised of:

Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, October 9, 1996.

Dr. Torgersen expressed concern over the number of classified staff who have received low marks (by their supervisors) on their yearly evaluations for participating in governance activities. Ms. Valerie Myers, chairperson of the Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, noted that the administration generally has not adequately encouraged governance participation by staff members; hence supervisors' unwillingness to support employees' time away from work. Dr. Torgersen asked Valerie to supply him with specific evaluations so he can study this situation further.

Commission on Faculty Affairs, October 25 and November 8, 1996.

Dr. Torgersen expressed concern over the paragraph regarding severe



sanctions: "...faculty do not want a policy that would abet the arbitrary and capricious actions of an administrative witch-hunt...." Dr. Jim McKenna, chairperson of the Commission on Faculty Affairs, assured Dr. Torgersen that this is a direct quote from the CFA meeting, and is reflective of the faculty concern that an administrator initiating a problem should NOT be the person seeking a solution; in other words there must be a faculty oversight group involved.

Dr. David deWolf expressed confusion when CFA minutes reflect only the first names of individuals and asked for clearer identification of individuals.

Responding to a Council member's question regarding how severe sanctions will affect departments who are currently working on post tenure review, Dr. Pat Hyer clarified that severe sanctions do not come into the picture until after post tenure review has been conducted and subsequent action discussed.

Commission on Graduate Studies & Policies, September 18, 1996.

Commission on Outreach, November 11, 1996.

Commission on Research, October 23, 1996.

Commission on Student Affairs, October 17, 1996.

Commission on Undergraduate Studies & Policies, September 23, 1996.

#### Announcements

Dr. Torgersen had no announcements to make but he did mention that with Virginia Tech hosting the Commonwealth football game, we were able to use the occasion to bring an enormous turnout of legislators, including the Governor, to our university.

Dr. Torgersen complimented Mr. Larry Hincker for the commercial aired during the football game. Rather than separate videos of Virginia Tech and the University of Virginia, Mr. Hincker arranged a combination video with the notion of two institutions working together in one collaborative effort. Dr. Torgersen said the commercial was well done and well received. He further commented that any time we can bring large groups of legislators and spectators to our campus, it works to our advantage.

#### Discussion/Question/Answer Forum

Continuing discussion: Rankings of the university, image and perceptions of the university, and the idea of this university.

Dr. Torgersen introduced Charles Steger who brought everyone up to date on the November 4th University Council meeting where the presentation centered around the numbers of external and internal constituencies, where Mr. Ralph Byers talked about government relations' efforts, and where Mr. Larry Hincker discussed the various rankings and how they are accomplished. Dr. Steger pointed out that we ran out of time and will now complete the discussion/questions.

Dr. Charles Goodsell asked what role the Business Higher Education Council would play in this upcoming year. Dr. Torgersen explained that the Council, under the direction of Til Hazil, was able to impact the appropriation for higher education last year in a way that universities could not have done on their own. Dr. Torgersen said the Council will continue to function again this year and is the best thing higher education has going for it at this time. The Council has done a fine job of comparing the support-per-student in Virginia with other states

and has been able to point out to every legislator that we currently rank in the lower 40's out of 50 states. Since the Commonwealth appears to be having a successful economic year, and there will be a surplus due to the revenue stream being ahead of expectations, it remains to be seen who will be in the queue to take advantage of the surplus. Dr. Torgersen expressed his concern that since higher education was successful in its endeavors last year, legislators might feel that other priorities should be addressed in the upcoming year. To address this possibility, the Business Higher Education Council is currently completing a report, to be issued to the General Assembly, on the economic development impact of higher education in Virginia. The report will speak to the leverage that colleges and universities have had in attracting industry and providing jobs. Dr. Torgersen pointed out that Virginia Tech will probably be featured prominently as an institution that has been successful in these efforts.

Dr. Norrine B. Spencer asked how the university decides what position it will take on specific instances, i.e., the Christy Bronkala incident. Dr. Torgersen said that he and people with specific experience discuss the issue, bringing others into the discussion as needed. He explained that if the issue had legal implications, Kay Heidbreder or Jerry Cain would be consulted; if it was an academic issue, Peggy Meszaros would be the source; if an issue dealt with buildings and grounds, Minnis Ridenour or Ray Smoot would be consulted. Dr. Torgersen went on to explain that in many instances, Larry Hincker would respond to a situation or develop a positioning statement after talking to as many people as possible and trying to discern why specific actions have occurred.

A question regarding the recruitment of undergraduate students arose. Faculty are concerned about a possible trend toward departments doing their own recruiting and if this is so, faculty in large departments feel they are already overworked and this trend would be troublesome. Dean Richard Sorensen explained that the self study is looking at the whole issue of technology and how it might be used not only for the academic programs but also for administrative and staff support in other areas.

Dr. Paul Metz presented a series of questions regarding our image: 1) What we would wish to be known as; what would we wish the guidance counselor, the legislator, the parent to know us as? 2) How do we want to be perceived; we are engineering but what else according to the average person's perception? 3) What have we learned from the image study (which reflected opinions of key leaders around the state) that will be actionable and affect what we do? 4) Where are we going from what we learned from the image study?

Mr. Hincker explained that Dr. Torgersen's Inaugural Address in 1994 laid the foundation for our slogan "Putting Knowledge to Work." He explained that he and Dr. Torgersen were trying to find a niche where Virginia Tech could position itself as unique from other universities. They discovered that in the 1980's, the Research Division was using the slogan "Putting Knowledge to Work" and it seemed that this slogan was still appropriate today. Looking at Virginia Tech's degree programs, one sees they are a little bit different, more practical, more applied in nature than other universities. The idea of this institution being a place that "puts knowledge to work" -- in the types of degree programs, in the type of research we do, in economic development or cooperative extension -- seems to work. Regarding the land-grant university issue, the Image Study pointed out that although the concept is of great value, the term "land-grant" is completely misunderstood. The Study pointed out that as a land-grant university we have much to be proud of but the term "land-grant university" at the bottom of our letterhead or as a positioning statement could actually be counterproductive. Mr. Hincker said the land-grant concept has been so radically successful that a lot

of universities have picked it up and usurped it. The mission statement of almost any Virginia university is using the same statement. Therefore, even though we are officially a land-grant university, we are no longer that unique because other universities have taken our great model and used it. Dr. Goodsell reminded Council members that the Morrill Act was a revolutionary statute, worldwide, and part of our heritage. He feels that if we were to completely eliminate it from our masthead we would be denying our fundamental roots. Dr. Torgersen echoed Dr. Goodsell's sentiments about the Morrill Act but reiterated his concern that few people, including Virginia Tech faculty, are even aware of the Act and what it stands for. Dr. Peter Eyre expressed his feelings regarding our obligation towards feeding the world's burgeoning population and dealing with environmental degradation. Dr. Eyre said that even though land-grant means more than agriculture, four out of our eight colleges participate significantly in our obligation to work with the food and fiber production industries. Dr. Eyre pointed out that the university receives approximately \$60 million or more appropriated specifically for that function. Therefore he feels this is one of the functions that makes us truly unique from other universities. Dr. Eyre said he thinks Virginia Tech, the land-grant university of the 21st century, must continue, in an aggressive and meaningful way, it's special responsibility towards the food and fiber industry of Virginia. Dr. Eyre expressed his concern that this responsibility not get lost in the invention of a new slogan (which is fine as long as we don't lose sight of our responsibilities to society). Mr. Minnis Ridenour expressed his feelings that there are certain things about the land-grant university that we must find a way to keep before the public. He reiterated Dr. Eyre's feeling that Virginia Tech plays a unique role and that no other university in the Commonwealth receives the \$60 million that we receive because of our land-grant mission. Mr. Ridenour pointed out that most other universities, while they do research and while they are in public service, do not receive the level of state or local governmental funding we do. He said that somehow we need to make certain that we keep the concept of land-grant understood because if we don't, we run the risk of losing funding and without the funding for research, through the Agricultural Experiment Stations, we would not be in the top 50 research universities in the country. He noted that this is not an insignificant concept we are dealing with in terms of how we continue to relate to the land-grant philosophy. Dr. Rich Sorensen spoke about the November 27 Pamplin Advisory Council meeting, where 60 members, consisting of former legislators, officers or past officers of the alumni association, current or former members of the Board of Visitors, prominent business executives participated. Dr. Sorensen said these members' concept about land-grant was consistent with the report of the image study; they felt the concept is good and the service necessary but very few people understood it or were able to define it. Dr. Sorensen pointed out that the land-grant term is definitely not as well understood as we think it is.

At this point, the conversation turned towards the Art & Science Group, Incorporated Report. Mr. Hincker indicated that he had received the final report several days before the Thanksgiving break and the report will be distributed shortly. The report points out perceptions about the institution and offers a few concrete recommendations. We will need to decide what to do about these recommendations and the concept of who we are and what we want to be known as. Mr. Hincker said it will be extremely important for us to decide whether we want to be known as a land-grant university or not. He feels the tags we place on ourselves are very important and hang with us for a long, long time. Dr. Torgersen said that occasionally he has taken "land grant" out of his speeches and uses the phrase "state university" instead because that phrase is better understood.

Dr. David deWolf asked how the President, Peggy Meszaros, and Mr. Ridenour see the importance of our rankings in US & World News. Dr.

Torgersen said he feels they are very important although it is difficult to say how much they impact our appropriations, our ability to attract faculty, and our ability to attract students. Dr. Meszaros said because of the national visibility of these rankings, we are looking at how the rankings are derived and how we might systematically raise our rankings.

She pointed out that we hope to have that data very soon to see if there is a way to do things differently and raise our rankings. Dr. Meszaros went on to say that she thinks rankings should generally be important to this university because they are very visible and parents of prospective students do increasingly look at rankings. Dr. Torgersen pointed out there is a more informal type of ranking that everyone on campus can be involved in and that is the impression that people across the state have of this institution. He said the reasons a youngster applies here versus some other institution is a very complex question, but we know in part it has to do with how well they have been received in the dormitories, by food services, in the classroom, by an adviser; therefore the totality of the experience we provide the student is incredibly important and some thing we all can influence. Dr. Meszaros spoke to the graduation rate being an important part of the rankings, and explained that it is one of those measures we are looking at, how it is determined, how it is reported, and how we might improve it.

A discussion ensued about the new university logo. Dr. Torgersen explained that there was a history of each college and department's tendency to have their own stationary and their own logo, leading to troublesome public confusion about the university itself. In an effort to standardize into one logo and one letterhead, a committee was formed of 24 individuals from colleges, faculty, administration, etc. Ms. Carole Nickerson placed on record that the effort to adopt a uniform logo was brought about in Dr. McComas's presidency, not as a way of getting some snazzy new logo, but because he was genuinely distressed over the diverse images that represented the university, and the confusion about our name -- Virginia Tech University vs. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University vs. Virginia Tech. This was a deep concern to Dr. McComas; he wanted us to have a unifying image, a common image and set of identifiers to represent the university. Mr. Hincker reiterated that this history is the reason why we need rigid administrative standards on our visual identity, and why the letterhead and logo are so important. He mentioned that Cornell University referred to us in three different ways in their own university newspaper about the Virginia Tech alum who won the Nobel Peace Prize. Dr. Paul Metz remembered the confusion he felt 20 years ago when he first came to Virginia Tech. He feels that not having consistent membership in an all-sports conference, having two athletic mascots, and the combination of orange and maroon colors deepens the challenge of figuring out who we are.

Dr. Steger interjected that at this time we are in the process of putting together a working group to look at a number of elements--the Art and Science Group, Incorporated Report is just one of them. He pointed out that Mr. Hincker and his staff are working on the strategic communications plan where the focus will be to position the university and how it registers in people's minds. All the external constituencies we discussed earlier view us a little differently so we need to come forth with a strategic plan that will employ some of our resources and deal with the confusion a lot of people have about us. It will take some analysis and testing on groups like this before we set forth any particular set of steps.

One last item of discussion arose. Dr. Patrick Scanlon spoke to the issue that we have a very poor system of gauging what issues might impact members of the community, i.e., the closing of Spring Road.

Paul E. Torgersen thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, January 20, 1997

Present: D. Stetler (for B. Bates), G. Brown, L. Cross, E. Hitchingham, E. Holford, J. Johnson, P. Meszaros, C. Nickerson, L. Peters, A. Spencer (for M. Ridenour), R. Smoot, R. Sorensen, J. Osborne (for F.W. Stephenson), A. Swiger, T. Tillar, P. Torgersen, J. Aughenbaugh, B. Ley, J. McKenna, V. Myers, J. Seiler, M. Smith, N. Spencer, P. Squires, T. Head, T. Lawrence, P. Dolezel, T. Swecker, C. Goodsell, K. Pelzer, T. Sherman, N. Shumsky, B. Benoit, D. deWolf, R. Goss, Gwazdauskas, P. Scanlon, K. Burke (by phone), M. Norstedt, N. Phillips, C. Couples.

Guests: P. Hyer, Provost Office; J. Fulton, Provost Office; P. Metz, Faculty Senate; S. Allen, Staff Senate; W. H. Dean, Enrollment Services; J. Sina, Enrollment Services.

1. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion passed.

2. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of December 2, 1996.

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the December 2, 1996 University Council meeting had been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System of the GOPHER.

3. New Business: None received to date.

4. Council approved a packet of Commission minutes comprised of:

- Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs, October 10, 1996.
- Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, November 13 and December 11, 1996.
- Commission on Faculty Affairs, November 22, 1996.

Dr. Jim McKenna, CFA chairperson, responded to Dr. Torgersen's question about severe sanctions by explaining that at this time CFA is grappling with several issues. Some of the issues, raised by Elyzabeth Holford, director of EO/AA, are the concerns of faculty and staff regarding confidentiality of investigative reports, involvement of a peer committee, adequate fairness in the system, adequate representation of women and minorities on review committees, and so forth. Dr. McKenna pointed out that although it would be nice to finish this year, and bring a resolution to the April Board of Visitors meeting, it would not be desirable to move along capriciously without extensive attention to these types of details.

Dr. Pat Hyer explained that currently CFA is proposing to run severe sanctions on a parallel process with dismissal for cause. This means that if the committee recommends severe sanctions, the same procedure as dismissal for cause would be applicable. She reminded council members of the successive steps in dismissal for cause: 1) First step is negotiation between Provost, department head, dean, and faculty member with an eye toward mutual settlement; 2) second step is validation by a standing or ad hoc committee (in the case of post tenure review, that has already occurred beforehand); 3) third step is essentially when the president decides to proceed--he writes a statement of charges to the faculty member who then has a right to a university-wide appeals committee (there is a two page single-spaced guideline on how the appeals committee operates).

Dr. Frank Gwazdauskas asked about changes he had noticed in the post tenure review policy and wondered how those changes would affect plans that departments had already submitted for review and approval. Dr. Pat Hyer explained that only two sections of the policy are being examined: 1) what

the severe sanctions would be and how they would be implemented; and 2) the possibility of putting forth a resolution limiting a single period of remediation to not more than two years. Dr. Hyer further explained that these proposed changes to the post tenure review policy would in no way affect the departmental minimum expectations which are being written now. Dr. Gwazdauskas asked for feedback on the current review process and it was ascertained that the College of Agriculture has received three out of ten drafts; the College of Business has received one out of six; the College of Business has a pilot review done by one department and adopted by two others as well as a different review being considered by the other two; the College of Forestry has one so far and it is one of the original prototypes; the Library draft review is completed. Dr. Hyer pointed out that the review drafts are scheduled to be in the respective dean's offices by February 1 and in the Provost's Office by March 1.

\* Commission on Graduate Studies & Policies, October 16 and November 20, 1996.

Dr. David deWolf noted that he was pleased to see the statement regarding the nine-month period between the preliminary examination and the final exam back in the catalog. He expressed his concern that the average person will not know the statement is back in the catalog and wonders if some notification can be made. Dr. William Ley, CGS&P chairperson, assured members that Dr. Eaton will make that announcement to all department heads as well as announcing it in Spectrum.

Dr. Torgersen asked Chairperson Ley how the discussion of 15 minutes between classes was progressing and wondered if other commissions addressing it. Dr. Ley pointed out that the Commission on Undergraduate Studies & Policies will take the lead on this proposal and they are awaiting Mike Denbow's presentation and discussion of various questions before a vote is taken. Mr. John Aughenbaugh, chairperson of Commission on Student Affairs, informed Council that CSA would also be looking at this proposed resolution at their February meeting, at which time Dr. Mike Denbow will address the commission.

Dr. Pat Scanlon raised a question/concern about electronic thesis which is in place this semester. He was curious as to what safeguards are in place to help students publish their works even after they have been on the network (the network is considered publications by some journals). Dr. Len Peters assured Dr. Scanlon that there has been discussion between himself, Dr. John Eaton, and Dr. Ed Fox regarding the possibility of a problem. Dr. Peters said it is unclear as to why the issue applies to a thesis or dissertation in an electronic format versus the long standing practice of archiving them on the university microfilms. Dr. Peters pointed out that the electronic thesis is available at this time but the provision for holding them on a server that is not accessible outside of Virginia Tech is the strategy being looked at.

\* Commission on Outreach, November 11 and December 8, 1996.

\* Commission on Student Affairs, November 14, 1996.

\* Commission on Undergraduate Studies & Policies, November 11, 1996.

\* Commission on University Support, December 3, 1996.

## 5. Announcements

FOR YOUR INFORMATION ONLY: Minutes from the University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning, October 24, 1996.

Dr. Frank Gwazdauskas noted a lack of attendance at commission meetings, and wondered if this is an indication that the governance system is overwhelming faculty and staff regarding participation time.

Dr. Torgersen updated Council members on the capital campaign by reporting that the campaign has already achieved \$225 million of its \$250 million

target. Dr. Torgersen said there is a very upbeat feeling about the campaign from alumni, foundation, and other supporters, and we will probably achieve our target by the summer of 1997.

Regarding General Assembly activities, Dr. Torgersen reported that our highest priority is to advance the assured two (2) percent faculty salary increase to at least a five (5) percent increase. He said that money for innovations in technology and financial aid are the next highest priorities on our list. Dr. Torgersen reported that the Business Higher Education Council has been supportive and hopefully will continue to influence members of the General Assembly in our favor. He said the big question is how much incremental money will be available and what priorities might receive more attention than education. Upon a request from Dr. Tom Sherman, Dr. Torgersen agreed to distribute the unified amendment and our own amendments to Council members.

Dr. Torgersen introduced Provost Peggy Meszaros and asked her to explain the benchmarking process. Dr. Meszaros explained that the Board of Visitors did approve the update to the university plan (also referred to as the President's Plan) and we must now design the strategic directions for implementing that plan. Hence, we are about to embark on national benchmarking which is one of three phases of planned implementation. The second phase of implementation, the development of the academic agenda which will tell us in more concrete detail how we are implementing teaching directions, will be occurring simultaneously. While these two phases are being pursued, the third phase will also be happening and that is where each college is engaged in its own strategic restructuring plan. Dr. Meszaros explained that the benchmarking visits will include visits to six institutions that have been chosen because they are land-grant institutions and are leading universities in different ways and in different areas. She said there will be teams of faculty, administrators, and representatives >from the Strategic Budget & Planning Council visiting Texas A&M, Purdue, Penn State, NC State, Cornell, and the University of Illinois. Dr. Meszaros pointed out that consistency is important in these teams but due to schedules, it has been impossible to have the same people on each team. During these visits we will be gathering detailed information and more importantly looking at some larger strategic directions issues. Minnis and Dr. Meszaros have met with each of the vice presidents and vice provosts to understand what our baseline data are in each of the areas of instruction, research, outreach, and support areas. We have compiled that information and it is available to anyone who would like to have it. Dr. Meszaros said that Mr. Minnis Ridenour will be leading half of the visits and she will be leading the other half, with a goal of attending at least one of the visits together.

Dr. Meszaros said that the institutions have been very eager to have us visit because they see the value for them in our coming to talk with them directly about our strategic directions and how we are getting there. She said that after each visit a report will be compiled. At the conclusion of all six visits, we will integrate all the information into a report that will be presented in April to the BOV. What do we hope to gain out of all of this? We hope to gain insights that will help us determine the larger direction for our university as well as set more specific targets. This is a process that we are working our way through and we need to be creative and insightful in bringing information back, sharing it broadly, and discussing exactly where that information takes us in shaping the future direction of the university.

At the conclusion of Dr. Meszaros' presentation, Dr. Tom Sherman asked if this effort coincided with the president's plan from last year. Dr. Meszaros replied that the president's plan laid out directions and strategies, but assumed the development of a subsequent implementation plan, which the BOV has requested. Dr. Meszaros suggested that a report to Council members on the progress of the benchmarking visits might be enlightening; she will address this at a later meeting.



Dr. Torgersen asked Ms. Carole Nickerson to inform Council on the upcoming post-University Council information sessions. Ms. Nickerson reminded council of how discussion topics were prioritized and pointed out that the next agenda topic was to have addressed resource allocations. However, due to the benchmarking trips, the key players in that discussion will be tied up. Therefore, we might want to skip to the next topic which is the relationship between new information technology developments and instructional technology development along with on- and off-campus instruction. With everyone in agreement, it was decided that information and instructional technology development would be next on the agenda and we would visit the processes and resource allocations at a later date in the year. Ms. Nickerson also reported that the subcommittee formed to study governance has completed their report and that report will be placed on an upcoming Council agenda.

Mr. John Aughenbaugh expressed interest in whether or not Council will engage in having the commission chairs gather again, as they did in the fall, to discuss what agenda items each of them might have. Dr. Torgersen indicated that it is probably more appropriate to do that at the start of the school year but he will certainly accommodate their wishes on this subject. It was agreed that commission chairs will communicate with Ms. Nickerson their desire to meet again this spring semester.

Discussion/Question/Answer Forum: Admissions policies, methods, and outcomes.

Dr. Torgersen introduced Ms. Karen Torgersen, Interim Admissions Director, who made the presentation on admissions policies, methods, and outcomes. Ms. Torgersen invited any and all members of Council to come to the Admissions Office for a personal tour as well as a review of the application process. She explained that she is in her eleventh year in Admissions and finds the atmosphere challenging, as well as continuously changing. Ms. Torgersen said she has a working knowledge of about 1000 high schools and these are the high schools that produce about 85 percent of our students. She pointed out that guidance counselors in high schools have thorough knowledge of about 25 universities and that is where they funnel the majority of their students.

Ms. Torgersen presented overheads outlining exactly how the recruitment process works, the scholarship coordination efforts, the details of the application process, average SATs and GPAs, and other pertinent information. She also addressed yield activities, volume of calls and visits for 1996, as well as various other points of interest. (Please contact Ms. Torgersen directly for the data from her overhead presentation.) After her presentation, Ms. Torgersen welcomed questions >from the floor. Student member Christopher Forstner reiterated the importance of a personally signed letter in the recruiting process. He shared his memories of how important the personal touch was in his decision making. This same student spoke to the issue of students with low overall high school GPAs who realize too late what it will take to compete for college admission, and whose junior and senior grades are better than earlier years. He wondered how will they fit into the admissions process. Ms. Torgersen said that it is tough to weigh that student against a student who has four solid years. She explained that in those cases, Virginia Tech is willing to work with the student by writing out a contract, stipulating their attendance at a community college, taking certain courses, and making certain grades. If the student meets all of these goals, Virginia Tech will guarantee them admission the following fall. She explained that this procedure is done on an individual basis.

Responding to a question about how we balance athletic and academic achievers, Ms. Torgersen explained that if she cannot offer admissions, there is a group of faculty members, the Academic Appeals Committee, who will review the student's credentials. This committee listens to appeals >from athletes, musicians, or art students--students who can contribute

something else to the university above and beyond what a typical student would do.

In response to a question regarding the staffing of the Admissions Office, Ms. Torgersen said there are 25 people in the office. The office is comprised of two sections, the Transfer Section, headed by Ms. Susan Bambach with 2 1/2 staff members, and the Freshmen Section, headed by Ms. Torgersen, with a staff of five full-time freshman counselors, 1 1/2 public relations personnel, 1 1/2 counselors who do summer school, two full-time receptionists who not only answer the phone but greet visitors when they come in, four full-time people who work in word processing, four full-time people who work in the mail processing section, a full-time bookkeeper, and an assistant to Ms. Torgersen.

Ms. Torgersen explained that the freshmen counselors are assigned alphabetized case loads. Each counselor reviews his/her applications, using firm parameters to make good strong solid offers, and to deny clear rejects. The counselors do not deal with the gray areas but refer those cases to Ms. Torgersen. Ms. Torgersen also spoke to the legacy issue, students whose mothers, fathers, or other relatives have attended Virginia Tech, and the fact that they are mailed specific information.

Council members queried what type of special recruiting occurs for African-American students. Ms. Torgersen assured members that there is a concerted effort to visit schools with a high African-American concentration. She explained that this particular type of recruiting had been neglected in past years but is now being focused upon. There is a new minority recruiter, Tyson Frederick, who is working closely with her to develop a minority recruiting plan and it will include repeat high school visits. Ms. Torgersen said that the practice of waiving application fees for African-American students is still in effect. Dr. Roselle started this process years ago because he felt it might enhance applications if the application fee were waived. Once these students have applied and we know who they are, we can follow up with additional information. She explained that we also purchase specific lists, one list which has everyone listed and another with only African-American students.

Next, Ms. Torgersen explained that we do actively recruit transfer students but we use a different process. We will visit all community colleges at least twice a year and in some cases, do onsite evaluations. We've also developed a special transfer student guide, have a special home page for transfer students, and a separate transfer e-mail address. Transfer students are informed that they will have to take a foreign language at Virginia Tech if they did not meet that target in their high school years.

Ms. Torgersen explained that she will be very cautious this year in the applicant selection so we do not end up with an extremely large freshmen class as we did last year. She said that because we were the first school in the state not to increase our tuition and because our financial aid packages were in the mail two weeks before the closest school, these were factors that influenced an increase yield rate, hence a large freshman class.

Paul E. Torgersen thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson  
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, February 3, 1997

Present: B. Bates, G. Brown, S. Yeagle (for L. Cross), E. Holford, P. Edwards, P. Eyre, J. Johnson, C. Nickerson, J. Eaton (for L. Peters), A. Spencer (for M. Ridenour), R. Smoot, R. Sorensen, J. Osborne (for F.W. Stephenson), T. Tillar, P. Torgersen, J. Aughenbaugh, B. Ley, J. Seiler, M. Smith, N. Spencer, D. Williams (for T. Swecker), T. Lawrence, P. Dolezel, B. Dyck, C. Goodsell, K. Pelzer, T. Sherman, N. Shumsky, B. Benoit, C. Carrig, D. deWolf, R. Goss, F. Gwazdauskas, R. Lalik, P. Scanlon, K. Burke (by phone), M. Norstedt, N. Phillips, J. Aughenbaugh, C. Couples, K. McNinney, P. Dolezel, C. Forstner, and J. Hulings.

Guests: P. Hyer, Provost Office; P. Metz, Faculty Senate; S. Allen, Staff Senate; M. Lambur, Committee on Faculty Ethics; J. Eustis, Director of Planning for Information Systems ;T. Luke, Professor of Political Science and leader of Cyberschool Project; V. Reilly, ADA Coordinator, EO/AA Office.

1. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion passed.

2. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of January 20, 1996.

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the January 20, 1997 University Council meeting had been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System of the GOPHER.

3. New Business:

a. First Reading, Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 1996-97A: Professional Ethics.

Dr. Mike Lambur presented Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 1996-97A: Professional Ethics for first reading. Dr. Lambur opened by reading a letter written by former CFA Chair Dr. John Christman to former Faculty Senate President Dr. Larry Shumsky. The letter cited the need for a revision of the present statement because the existing principles were overly specific, dealt chiefly with instructional activities, and did not address the rich variety of values and principles that faculty share. Also cited was the need to present a document that was positive in nature rather than a restrictive one of musts and must nots.

Discussion ensued regarding the proposed resolution. Dr. Metz, president of Faculty Senate, complimented the proposed resolution and assured Council that the members of the Faculty Senate are pleased with the direction the resolution has taken. Several members of Council proposed rewriting several sections of the resolution in order to make the committee's purpose clearer at the outset. Dr. Bob Dyck suggested that the committee's purpose (charge) be stated at the beginning of the resolution regarding what it does (or doesn't do) in relation to other bodies on campus. Dr. Dyck also suggested that some concerns could be allayed by simply stating the committee's duties in the first paragraph, and to state who the committee advises -- faculty senate on a regular basis as well as a host of other people from the president to the faculty senate president. There was general agreement that a lead statement be developed to encompass all of these suggestions.

The issue of how administrative and/or professional faculty should be included in this process was discussed. The Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs has studied this resolution and accepts it as it stands, but with the addition of administrative and/or professional

faculty members to the committee where an allegation concerns an administrative or professional faculty.

Regarding the conditions under which a procedure should come before the Committee on Faculty Ethics, Dr. Lambur assured members of Council that CFE's first action in any case is to meet and decide if there is in fact an ethical issue at stake, and if the issue is being dealt with in any other venue. If it is being handled by another path, then the CFE does not investigate it. Additionally, if the case is not determined to be an ethical issue, it is channeled to the proper area for resolution. Dr. Lambur also pointed out that a decision is made within 15 working days on whether an issue is of an ethical nature.

Dr. David deWolf underscored the need to carefully monitor the storage of written records and to maintain their complete confidentiality. Dr. Lambur noted that no electronic taping of this group's deliberations takes place.

A final concern related to double jeopardy -- dealing with an issue administratively and then having it referred to the Ethics Committee. Dr. Lambur felt that in this type of case, the committee would examine the history and conclude that if it had originated as a grievance, ethical behavior would not be at stake.

b. First Reading, Joint Resolution, Commission on Classified Staff Affairs Resolution 96-97B and Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 96-97B: Accommodation of Disabilities.

Dr. Elyzabeth Holford, Director, EO/AA, presented Commission on Classified Staff Affairs Resolution 96-97B and Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 96-97B: Accommodation of Disabilities for first reading. Dr. Holford explained that even though Virginia Tech, through the efforts of Mr. Minnis Ridenour and Ms. Ann Spencer, has a long history of accommodating individuals with disabilities, the university has not issued a formal belief statement to address our commitment to the provision of accommodations for individuals with disabilities. Therefore, this joint resolution, "Accommodation of Disabilities," will serve as Virginia Tech's umbrella statement reflecting our compliance with the American Disabilities Act, clearly defining our responsibilities, and stating that we have achieved a university-wide coordinated effort.

Dr. Holford provided history of our commitment to the disabilities issue by stating that in 1991 Mr. Ridenour and his office started an ADA Management Committee which had university-wide membership and dealt with many of the overarching issues needed to bring Virginia Tech into compliance with the ADA. During those early years, budgets were established and the university conducted a self study to deal not only with physical barrier issues on campus, but also to look at programmatic issues. Since then our continuing commitment has culminated in a budget, as well as the implementation of an ADA Coordinator, Ms. Virginia Reilly (who is currently housed in the EO/AA Office).

Dr. Holford explained the procedures for dealing with ADA issues by pointing out that we currently have an ADA Executive Committee assigned to deal with day-to-day issues; additionally, we have an ADA Advisory Panel consisting of students, faculty, and staff with disabilities who bring forward issues, ideas, and suggestions to the ADA Executive Committee. Dr. Holford explained several avenues to resolve complaints: 1) Virginia Tech staff members may take their complaints directly to Personnel Services; 2) students, faculty, and staff have the right to go outside the university; 3) Services for Students with Disabilities in the Dean of Student's Office.

Discussion amongst Council members ranged from questions regarding the issue of administrative authority as it pertains to the enforcement of our compliance with services for the disabled to concerns about increasing the

workload of Virginia Tech's faculty. Ms. Reilly, ADA Coordinator, pointed out that the purpose of the ADA is to ensure equal opportunity for people with disabilities. Therefore, it is hoped that a teamwork approach can be facilitated by defining which administrative offices can be helpful, as well as stating that the responsibilities of compliance lie not only with faculty but also with students. The team effort has to take place among the student, the faculty member, and the Dean of Student's Office. Ms. Reilly and Dr. Holford noted that because of the unique characteristics of some disabilities (often health issues are involved), it is sometimes important for the Dean of Student's Office to intervene. They pointed out that if a faculty member feels specific accommodations are inappropriate, there is an appeals committee the faculty member can go to. This appeals committee, comprised of administrators, faculty members, and people experienced in working with people with disabilities, provides an opportunity to openly discuss specific situations and arrive at acceptable solutions.

In determining what the term "disabilities" entails, Ms. Reilly pointed out that the term covers a range of disabilities with specific definitions and these are based on medical testing (medical doctor or psychologist) and also include invisible disabilities such as learning disabilities, attention deficit disorder, psychological disorders. When asked questions about "our policy," Dr. Holford and Ms. Reilly were quick to point out that this is not a Virginia Tech mandate; it is a federal law and all Virginia employers with a staff of over 50, or any employer who offers service to the public, MUST follow the ADA guidelines. Regarding faculty, administrators, or staff who are mentally ill or have sustained a traumatic injury, and their continued employment with Virginia Tech, Dr. Holford stated that the federal law insists upon accommodation for anyone who is able to perform their essential job functions.

4. Council approved a packet of Commission minutes comprised of:

- \* Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs, November 19 and December 17, 1996.
- \* Commission on Faculty Affairs, December 13, 1996.
- \* Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, December 4, 1996.
- \* Commission on Research, November 13.
- \* Commission on Student Affairs, December 5, 1996. A question arose regarding a Student Budget Board report on efforts to retrieve money from non-registered student organizations, and how many organizations are involved. Aughenbaugh replied that this year there were roughly 21-22 student organizations that were not registered and had received monies from the Student Budget Board; this involves roughly \$20,000.
- \* Commission on Undergraduate Studies & Policies, December 9, 1996.

5. Announcements

Dr. Torgersen brought Council up to date on the business of the General Assembly by stating that even though the discretionary money available for higher education was very limited, approximately \$30 million, the number one priority, increasing faculty salaries, looked very encouraging. He assured Council that he would continue to work towards this goal by spending time in Richmond and trying to solidify this need.

6. Discussion/Question/Answer Forum

7. Information and instructional technology developments related to on- and off-campus instructions. Call on presenters: Bob Bates, Joanne Eustis, Tim Luke

Ms. Joanne Eustis, Director of Planning for Information Systems, explained that this is the beginning of a two-part presentation on the topic of technology at Virginia Tech. The second part will take place late in the semester, and will be led by Erv Blythe, Vice President for Information

Systems, and Anne Moore, Project Manager for Information Systems Technology Initiatives. Ms. Eustis pointed out that today's presentation, a brief overview of a changing context for higher education, is designed to provide background on the role of technology and transforming academic institutions.

Following are excerpt from Ms. Eustis's remarks: Virginia Tech's plans for the future couple time honored values with its emerging strengths. The university motto, Ut Prosim, that I may serve, takes on a new meaning in a world where advances in technology are changing the ways we organize ourselves, relate to each other, and accomplish our work.

To achieve its goals in the 21st Century, Virginia Tech must make a commitment to new approaches to teaching and learning, to acquire and disseminating knowledge, and to interacting with students. In recognition of these new relationships and new responsibilities, we need to consider the following goals: serving student population with a markedly changing demographic profile and new expectations; creating a campus atmosphere where students and faculty form partnerships which ensure that discovery and learning will occur; allowing graduates to demonstrate competence in aspects of specific disciplines; developing the ability to learn and to work with people over a lifetime; providing new learning opportunities for extended campus students through the use of traditional and technology-assisted instruction. In order to take advantage of current opportunities, we need a critical mass of faculty, administrators, staff, and students working together to develop information and instructional technology systems. Strategic actions are now being undertaken (or are being considered) which include working in partnership with other institutions of higher education, collaborating with other institutions and commercial vendors to develop new technology-based courses and programs, investing in our faculty through the FDI so they may investigate, create, and utilize alternate instructional strategies, realigning the reward system to match new university priorities, encouraging faculty to develop network accessible coursework, developing electronic libraries to support designated courses, designing and developing on-line around-the-clock course consultation services, providing classroom and presentation facilities, designing, developing, and implementing new assessment and certification processes.

Information technology will increase student choice, modify the degree-granting process, and change the face of higher education.

Challenges before us: remain both cost effective and responsive to the changing demographics; will students choose to purchase and enroll in open-market widely-available network courses due to the prestige of the institution competitive fees and teaching methods regardless of institutional affiliation; will students continue to be content having all or most of their courses taught by a particular institution; will a calendar of semesters, summer breaks, and credit for contact continue to be the rule; what will a plan of study look like in a networked environment, who will design it and who will award the degree; will institutions assist students in choosing appropriate instructional material from outside sources rather than providing a complete program of study; what about tuition payments and residency requirements.

Excerpts from Tim Luke's comments: Cyberschool essentially had its origins out of the Dean of Arts and Science's ad hoc committee on instructional technology - 1994. Charge of committee was to consider new applications for instructional technology to alter the credit for contact paradigm. The first venture involved using preexisting skills and FDI training to create some net-centered classes that could mostly be aimed at core curriculum offerings. Secondly, we would target our course development at on-campus learners during summer school because they are here, and if the networks crashed or we had problems we could speak to them physically. We were running this on a shoestring, basically supported by CEUT and College of

Arts and Sciences. Next we would extend our course development to Internet applications which could be run on and off-campus mainly during summer school but ultimately run conceivably at any time during the year. The first year, 1995, we had a class in English and Communications; in 1996 we extended to courses in Black Studies, Philosophy, Biology, Political Science, Communications, and Art History. So far the outcomes have been interesting and exciting. The Access Project (supported by a grant from the Sloan Foundation) was designed to redesign our Intro Biology classes and as part of that redesign initiative we redid general biology, intro to microbiology, and principles of biology. Additionally there is the LIT project - a series of team-taught classes using experimental formats and topics via networks, hypertexts, on-line reading. It is a computer-mediated environment which involves faculty from several other departments beyond English - Political Science, Urban Affairs, Sociology. The ATEC project is an attempt to link athletes to tutoring and regular classes via a lap top computer and networks while they are on the road to keep them up to speed while they are off campus. Beyond that, a series of regular courses - 20+ - are being offered this Spring - biology, computer science, English, geology, math, political science, and religion. In addition, most of our colleges are trying to use the Cyberschool methods to develop a net-centered form of learning that would be asynchronous where students could at any time, any location, pull in the course, take the course, and complete credits while in Blacksburg or not. My own course, "Plato to NATO," allows students to access an entire text off the server, write and submit weekly essays which are the requirements for the course, participate in on-line chat sessions and ongoing seminar exchange, and exchange e-mail. All this was developed and made possible by a grant from CEUT.

Luke observes that he is a cautious pessimist when it comes to technology because it does crash, there are many people who want to put it to cheap, unsustainable, unsatisfactory uses, but there is a tremendous capability for changing what we do and how we do it. However, The Net itself is clearly changing what we would imagine to be our sources of information, our sources of interaction, and much more research is being done by net-based resources. These learning interactions are being networked in ways that may not always be as satisfying as face to face, but might in the end be more satisfying because of what the technology allows us to do.

Excerpts from Dean Bates remarks: Not surprising that Arts & Sciences got involved very early in this activity because Arts & Sciences faculty are involved in teaching more than 70 percent of the lower division courses, and we actually we teach over 50 percent of all student credit hours while they are on campus. But we could not have done it without some other things happening around the same time. The Faculty Development Initiative was a key turning point that happened about the same time. There were vision, direction, and opportunities from many directions that helped put us in the right place at that time. FDI has been immensely popular, faculty feel they have benefited from the FDI program, and now we are looking at about 95% of the faculty having been through some form of FDI by Aug. of 1997. Very impressive- when you go around the state and around the country there are few places where faculty have been involved to this extent across the board in upgrading or learning how this tool can be useful to them.

Is this a gimmick or is this the future? It is the future but also a gimmick in the sense that it is a tool, not the end in itself. Anyone who uses computers knows that some times it seems like it is the end in itself. It is a tool that will help us transform what was largely a passive teaching environment to an active learning environment. Key words - active learning environment. We are finding that we are interacting with students and with our colleagues in ways that are surprising and in ways that actually work against some of the folklore of those who say we shouldn't use technology, shouldn't get involved with technology. One of the major accomplishments of the FDI initiatives is that faculty started to look at

their courses and how they might do something different. They began to reevaluate exactly how they were presenting their material, ways they might change it, ways they might improve it. We have also learned lessons: these are expensive technologies, not cheap, and are going to require a continued investment over time, and human resource intensive too, requiring a lot of technical support from people who specialize in the details. We would hope that not all faculty would have to learn to that level unless they had particular interest. We will always have people who teach certain material or courses in a traditional manner. So the trick for us in academics is to figure out what to save, what to preserve, what to change, when to change, how much to change.

Some of these answers have come out of the Cyberschool. Very simple things can be done with the computer in course management - why not list on the Web when the paper is due or when the exam is scheduled to cut down on the nuisance factor. Almost everyone can benefit from that enhancement.

Across the university many faculty who are computer literate have done these types of things on their own without a special course or lots of special help -- more and more people have gotten involved.

This year the Provost and others have provided support for more funds across the university to help faculty develop courses. Now we have CyberCore, focused on core curriculum and lower division courses; all colleges will be involved in the formal process, and several hundred thousand dollars have now been awarded to help faculty develop their courses. Some need equipment, some faculty release times, some need summer support, some need technical support. The program will move onto the upper level courses, and eventually to graduate courses and probably some mixing over those lines as a formal way to continue to infuse meaningful and helpful techniques in the classroom, and to give faculty more time and more resources to bring this about.

Final point - Center for Innovation and Learning. This is a larger organization that grew out of earlier ideas, out of the teaching and learning area of education. Early conversation with Tom Sherman about faculty leadership and faculty involvement in working across lines and letting the College of Education contribute to this process was melded into a broader activity which has evolved into the Center. Not a center that has a physical location, not a center that has a big staff, but one that is more of a concept to unite people, people who are already working in these areas, people who need access to various elements. It has two primary areas of focus: one is internal, work with what we already have here but also to pull all of this together and present it externally, whether it be for the State Appropriations Committee, or to State Council or whatever else. Anne Moore, who spent many years as a staffer at State Council, understands the visibility and recognition we have for being leaders in technology in the state and elsewhere, and she felt that by taking a broader look at this and pulling it toward a conceptual center, we might better present ourselves and position ourselves for funding elsewhere. The center is an emerging thing - conceptually it is down on paper, but technically it is still finding its way.

Questions: Could Luke elaborate on the teaching he sees others doing using the Cyberschool business--can see chat sessions and such but how do you present your initial construction of reality as a professor to the students? Luke says it can be done; the idea he had to begin with was to do it as summer school since he had already met the students, interactions had already occurred. They were going home and this seemed a method of extending our campus wherever they went -- that is the way I think the teaching is useful and successful. Graduate students have the discipline and have the application and maturity to do it on their own after one or two face-to-face visits to a class, along with intermittent contact. Luke would not advocate it as a way to teach freshmen or sophomores. He noted that many students are being educated to technologies in K-12 now, and by



the time those cohorts arrive they may prefer to interact this way. Bates interjected that in a residential environment like this the students get a mix of experiences so it is a tool but not all of what happens. Here on campus there are faculty who have more contact, more interaction, and more discussion, because of the computer as a medium, than they ever did when they taught the classes before. Some faculty have students who will now approach them on a personal basis that would not have ever approached a faculty member without having already made some link in another way. We are still learning about the human behavior side of these interactions.

Eustis recounted a project at NC State where they are using the technology to transmit a course from Raleigh to Asheville and it is an interactive two-way video - course in which the professor has to be seen all the time - ergonomic design - they were very satisfied because the people in Asheville were practicing engineers and the people in Raleigh were graduate students -- the interaction of these two groups added a great deal to the class.

Bates pointed out that some of the questions that need to be addressed are: how do you keep people hooked in when they don't have the markers - how do they have the motivation to complete something when they don't have the prompt of a quiz on Friday or whatever, and how often should they get together with a real instructor?

Bates concluded by saying that some of the faculty in his college who stated they would not participate are now telling him of the great things they are able to do with technology. There has been a fair amount of student pressure; they have had a good experience in classes in which technology is involved, and they start asking other faculty why they don't participate!

Paul E. Torgersen thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson  
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, February 17, 1997

Present: D. Stetler (for B. Bates), S. Yeagle (for L. Cross), E. Holford, P. Edwards, J. Johnson, C. Nickerson, M. Ridenour, J. Eversole (for R. Smoot), R. Sorensen, C. Steger, A. Swiger, T. Tillar, P. Torgersen, J. Aughenbaugh, B. Ley, J. McKenna, S. Allen (for V. Myers), J. Seiler, M. Smith, N. Spencer, T. Swecker, B. Dyck, C. Goodsell, N. Marriott, K. Pelzer, T. Sherman, N. Shumsky, R. Daniel, D. deWolf, R. Goss, F. Gwazdauskas, R. Lalik, P. Scanlon, J. Yardley, K. Burke (by phone), T. Head, T. Lawrence, M. Norstedt, N. Phillips, C. Couples, K. McNinney, P. Dolezel, and C. Forstner.

Guests: P. Hyer, Provost Office; S. Allen, Staff Senate; M. Lambur, Committee on Faculty Ethics;

1. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion passed.

2. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of February 3, 1997.

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the February 3, 1997 University Council meeting had been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System of the GOPHER.

3. First Reading, Joint Resolution from the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies 1996-97D and the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies: Establishment of Schools.

Dr. John Seiler presented Joint Resolution from the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies 1996-97D and the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies: Establishment of Schools for first reading. He began the presentation by introducing Dr. Pat Hyer, Associate Provost for Administration, who explained that this resolution was written on behalf of, and at the request of, the Board of Visitors. Dr. Hyer explained that at the time Virginia Tech sought and received approval from the Board of Visitors to establish two new schools, the School of the Arts and the School for Public and International Affairs, the Rector of the Board asked us to develop more implicit guidelines and a formal process for new schools.

To accommodate this request, a task force chaired by Dr. Pat Edwards, and staffed by members from the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies and Dr. Hyer was formed. Rather than starting from scratch, the task force actually utilized a study that Institutional Research had completed regarding the formation and rules other universities used in establishing schools. The resolution put forth today is a result of that study.

Dr. Hyer explained that the difference between a school and a research center is that a school has a curriculum or programmatic focus whereas a research center has research and/or outreach as its mission. She pointed out that in attempting to be flexible, there may be varying levels of budgetary and administrative independence and those kinds of questions will be part of the proposal process negotiated throughout the proposal discussion. Dr. Hyer cited important criteria for the establishment of a school: 1) it must be consistent with the objectives of the university; 2) it generally consists of more than one department or unit; 3) it must have a critical mass of students and faculty; 4) must have a strong curricular programmatic justification; 5) a university benefit will be the result; and 5) there are unique features

that make our current structure inappropriate, inflexible, unacceptable, and non-nurturing to the kind of relationship that would exist within the school.

Dr. Hyer explained that the process would begin with a preproposal to identify if there is enough support to sustain the idea. Once it appears there is enough interest, a full proposal will be developed involving the departmental faculty, college curriculum committees, the deans, CGS&P AND CUS&P, University Council, the President, and the Board of Visitors.

Dr. David deWolf inquired as to the meaning of "critical mass" and who would make that official decision. Dr. Hyer responded that all the people involved in the review process would help decide that issue. She explained there needs to be a reason why the department structure is not working and is inadequate. Virginia Tech is not interested in proliferating administrative units so there must be justification to create a school - one of which is the critical mass - but there is no exact figure mind. Dr. Pat Edwards pointed out that "critical mass" would depend on the goals of the school and that the number should remain flexible. Dr. deWolf expressed his concern that the wording, as it now stands, appeared to be very loose, and Dr. Edwards assured him that was the intention of the policy (in order to remain flexible).

Dr. Torgersen encouraged Dr. Edwards and Dr. Hyer to provide a "sense" of what a school looks like. Dr. Edwards explained that the School for Public and International Affairs (SPIA) is considered a "weak" school model because it has less authority inherent in the school and more authority inherent in the departments. The initial group is comprised of two departments, the Department of Architecture and Urban Studies and the Department of Public Administration and Policy and Urban Affairs and Planning. Additionally there are two participating departments in the College of Arts and Sciences (and other departments may join in later on). Dr. Edwards explained that not every faculty member in that department is necessarily involved; the school is governed by the department heads who form a committee with one person responsible for coordination. Dr. Edwards pointed out that this is a way of more efficiently engaging in teaching and research activities, but that all the degree programs are maintained within the colleges and departments that currently exist.

Dr. Hyer continued by describing the School of the Arts as a much stronger model because administrative support and a division director already existed at the time of its conception. The purpose of the school was an attempt to coordinate the performance aspects of three departments, Music, Theater, and Arts, and to provide additional visibility, enhance fund raising efforts, help with grant proposals, enhance performance opportunities, curricular issues, and help attract students.

In answer to a question regarding degree granting, Dr. Hyer pointed out that the degree granting authority lies within the departments. This proposal does not preclude the notion that a school could eventually award a degree but that degree process would be run through the governance process like any other process.

Dr. Torgersen pointed out that although the BOV was initially not supportive of the "school" idea, it did agree to establish schools based on the stipulation that guidelines be established. He noted that a concern was expressed regarding "schools" becoming "colleges."

Dr. Terry Swecker wondered when it would be appropriate to merge similar departments versus creating a new school? Dr. Hyer explained that there would be different goals, and it would be a college level decision. She felt that a merger would address increased administrative efficiency

whereas the establishment of a school would be designed to raise up the visibility of programs. Dr. Torgersen pointed out that typically the combining of two departments involves combining a degree program also.

#### 4. First Reading, Commission on Research Resolution 96-97B: Policy on Animal Disposal.

Dr. Mark Smith presented First Reading, Commission on Research Resolution 96-97B: Policy on Animal Disposal for first reading. He led the discussion by pointing out that Dr. Len Peters appointed a task force to create an animal disposal policy. Dr. Smith commended the task force for working in an efficient and timely manner toward the creation of such a policy, and pointed out that the new policy would serve as an umbrella policy for the entire university regarding the disposal of animals used for instruction, research, and/or for scholarly activities. He pointed out that the resolution basically acknowledges state and federal regulatory laws, animal use, the acquisition of animals, the source of animals, the adoption of animals, as well as the need for disposal of animals. Dr. Smith said the Commission on Research unanimously approved the resolution and it would serve as the framework for a second document, an administrative policy, providing the necessary implementation of details. Dr. Pat Scanlon reiterated that Virginia Tech must recognize the fact that we are in the animal care business and that it is important to introduce a policy statement into the governance system. Dr. Marilyn Norstedt suggested an editorial change that would make certain phrases easier to understand.

#### 5. First Reading, Commission on Graduate Studies and Policy Resolution 1996-97A: 5974 and 5984 Hour Limits on the Plan of Study.

Dr. Bill Ley presented Commission on Graduate Studies and Policy Resolution 1996-97A: 5974 and 5984 Hour Limits on the Plan of Study for first reading. Dr. Ley explained that this resolution grew out of a Graduate School concern that a number of courses, originally designed as Special Studies in the 5984 category, turned into regular courses throughout Ph.D. plans of study and that the credit hours, currently set at six hours for master's and nine for Ph.D., were potentially too restrictive. A second concern spoke to the quality of the educational experience with respect to 5974, Independent Study, use might have been too liberal. Having reviewed all the factors, the Degree Requirements Committee presented this resolution which has been adopted by the CGS&P with the intent to limit the number of hours for independent study and to expand the available credit hours for master's students to a total of six out of nine and similarly for the Ph.D. program.

Dr. Torgersen noted a conflict in timing because the resolution states that a plan of study must comply with the new requirements by January 13, 1997 even though the resolution has been presented to Council on February 17, 1997 for the first time.

Dr. Richard Sorensen expressed concern that some college academic programs may have a greater number of listed courses and find from time to time that they actually want to use the independent study without necessarily going through the development of a new course proposal. Dr. Sorensen said that since the current policy requires the faculty members' approval, the college administrative approval, as well as the approval of the Graduate School, he find it hard to understand why this would be considered inadequate to provide structure to the graduate programs. Even though Dr. Sorensen understands the reason to provide restriction, he is concerned that approval of the new policy will direct the focus toward developing separate courses where currently individual independent studies might adequately meet the needs of a particular academic degree program. There could actually be pressure to lean toward proliferation of additional courses when they might not be in the best interest of the university. Dr. Sorensen offered this concern so

that others might be able to think about the issue before it is brought to a vote at the proper time.

It was suggested that an editorial change be made to more clearly state the required combination of hours.

Dr. Tom Sherman questioned what CGS&P considered too many independent studies. Dr. Ley pointed out that presently a total of 6 hours of independent study could be allowed for a master's degree program and some felt that was an excessive number of hours for an unstructured, unformatted type of educational experience. This explanation brought up another question regarding the definition of "unstructured experiences."

It was pointed out that where small departments are concerned, an independent study could offer a channel to pursue material they wouldn't otherwise fit into a plan of study. Dr. Ley said this had been considered by the commission and the commission felt although independent studies did have their place, the current hours were excessive.

Dr. Pat Edwards asked for an explanation of "excessive." She thought limiting these hours would diminish the flexibility of graduate programs and therefore she would be opposed unless some rationale could be presented. In response to her query, Dr. David deWolf mentioned that in some cases the independent study option is often chosen by graduate students to sneak in a research hour that won't fit in otherwise and that upon being denied that option, they often camouflage the independent study unit as a sequel to a nonexistent course.

Further debate will occur at the next UCOUNCIL meeting.

#### 6. Second Reading, Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 1996-97A: Professional Ethics.

Dr. Mike Lambur presented Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 1996-97A: Professional Ethics for second reading. Dr. Lambur stated that subsequent to suggestions at the first reading, certain editorial changes had been accomplished including defining the duties of the Ethics Committee more specifically and earlier in the document. Dr. Lambur also pointed out that a meeting has been arranged with the Executive Vice President and his staff to alleviate some of their concerns. Mr. Ridenour reiterated that concerns were expressed by members of his staff who would be affected by this policy but who have not had the opportunity to review it or have input.

Dr. Torgersen introduced Ms. Kay Burke, Amelia County Extension Agent, who visits each UCOUNCIL meeting via our teleconferencing equipment. Ms. Burke expressed concern that when resolutions are brought forth it is important to make sure that all faculty who might be affected by it are taken into consideration and are fully informed of the changes. Ms. Burke said that as a representative of the field extension faculty, she knows that very few of the faculty, unless they are serving on a commission, are aware of this policy.

At this point, Dr. Torgersen quoted "...when the allegation is against an administrative or professional faculty member without tenure or continued appointment, the committee shall compose a special panel of five members: the chair or an experienced designee from CFE, one additional CFE member, and three administrative and professional faculty members chosen from among members of the Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs (CAPFA) by the chair of this Commission." He asked if everyone understood this section and if it was acceptable. Dr. Pat Hyer interjected that the language should read "three members chosen from among the administrative and professional faculty," not "from among members of the Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs..." Conversation followed that

indicated this section needs to be rewritten so that it is clearly understood that when choosing AP faculty members to serve on the Ethics Committee, the members should be chosen from among the broad and general administrative & professional staff.

A deferment of one month was voted upon after Dr. Steger observed that the presentation of the resolution to the EVP staff would occur after UCOUNCIL voted today, as would further clarification to the field extension agent constituency. Dialogue will continue at the next UCOUNCIL meeting.

7. Second Reading, Joint Resolution, Commission on Classified Staff Affairs Resolution 96-97B and Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 96-97B: Accommodation of Disabilities.

Dr. Elyzabeth Holford presented Joint Resolution, Commission on Classified Staff Affairs Resolution 96-97B and Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 96-97B: Accommodation of Disabilities for second reading. Dr. Holford reminded Council that at the first reading she explained that this resolution was not the creation of any new commitment nor responsibilities but merely the expression of our current commitment. She explained that the reasons for presenting this resolution were twofold: 1) it is the right thing to do according to federal law; and 2) we must have an umbrella policy in place when we are audited by federal agencies.

Dr. Jim McKenna, chairperson of Commission on Faculty Affairs, noted that CFA has approved this resolution but there are concerns regarding faculty responsibilities in the implementation of the policy. Mr. Spencer Allen, chairperson of Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, stated that members of CCSA have similar questions and concerns.

Dr. Holford assured members of Council that the university as a whole has a shared responsibility. She pointed out that the university has various structures to assist in accommodations of disabilities; there is no one department head or one person with total responsibility for implementation of the policy. Dr. Holford agreed that it would be a good idea to inform the university population of not only the services that are provided, but the type of issues we address and the ways we go about it. Dr. McKenna and Mr. Allen agreed that their commissions would find this most helpful.

The resolution was voted upon and passed.

8. Council approved a packet of commission minutes comprised of:

∑ Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, January 8, 1997. Mr. Spencer Allen presented the minutes in lieu of Ms. Valerie Myers.

∑ Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, January 15, 1997. Regarding the recent dialogue about the upcoming dramatic reduction in serial budget funding, concern was expressed over the lack of a University Library Committee report and update. Dr. Ley explained that there was no report because Dr. Hitchingham had not been available at the January 15 meeting, but a recent update on the budget issue indicates it is not as ominous as once thought..

∑ Commission on Research, January 22, 1997.

∑ Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, January 27, 1997.

9. Announcements

∑ University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning Minutes, December 5, 1996 were presented for information only.

## 10. Discussion/Question/Answer Forum

Dr. Torgersen pointed out that our relations with the administration in Richmond are critical to the future of the University. He mentioned that we also have an interest in our relationship with the Federal Government, and through the efforts of Mr. Ralph Byers, we recently hosted a reception for the 11 congressmen who represent the Commonwealth, as well as the two senators and their aides. Some Virginia Tech people attended as well as a number of our alumni. Dr. Torgersen said the turnout was very high and provided him the opportunity to speak about the university. Dr. Torgersen identified the three Virginia Tech personnel who spend the most time in Richmond as: 1) Mr. Minnis Ridenour, who in addition to other duties, spends a great deal of time working with the administration and its staff in both the House of Delegates and the Senate; 2) Dr. Torgersen who spends a great deal of time individually visiting legislators and when the time is right visiting with specific groups; and 3) Mr. Ralph Byers who coordinates all of our governance relations efforts, both on- and off-campus.

Mr. Byers passed out handouts which provided the following overview of General Assembly Session: 1) Background; 2) General Assembly actions; 3) Prospects for future revenue increases for higher education; 4) issues in General Assembly; and 5) Prospects for the coming year. As he delved into each of these areas, Mr. Byers pointed out the good news that the two major items Virginia Tech requested, faculty salary increases and money for the Information Technology Building, were successful endeavors. The less-than-good news was directed towards salary increases for administrative and professional faculty (including extension agents). The argument supporting faculty receiving higher salary adjustments is that teaching and research faculty are peer calibrated and administrators are not. Regarding the observation that classified staff salaries are approximately 10-15 percent behind the private sector, Mr. Byers pointed out that one of Virginia Tech's alums, P. C. Shields, is a lobbyist for the Virginia Government Employees Association and we keep in close touch with him. Mr. Byers explained that faculty salaries are budgeted into each university budget, but classified staff increases are budgeted centrally and looked at across the entire state employee work force.

Mr. Minnis Ridenour explained that lack of additional money from the General Assembly was not unexpected because traditionally the second year of a two-year biennium budget receives less than the first year. He reiterated the importance of the General Assembly continuing to support the concept of returning faculty salaries (over a four-year period) to the 60th percentile of our benchmark group. Mr. Ridenour pointed out that if you study the following trend, it is easy to see why we are not getting ahead: 1) in the early 60s and 70s higher education received tremendous increases in terms of general fund growth; 2) in 1991, during the period of all the budget reductions, we were down to a negative growth; and 3) now revenues have leveled off to approximately 4-5 percent increase at the state level. He pointed out that without a major tax adjustment, and with all the different groups competing for their share, there is no way to get additional general fund money. In addition to this problem, we, like many other states, have pushed in- and out-of-state tuition to the maximum, so we cannot look for financial relief in that area. Mr. Ridenour stated that something must be done at the state level to alleviate this situation. When asked by a commission member what about the status of a tax increase, Mr. Byers stated that it would be very unlikely to see that as one of the upcoming campaign issues. Even though the leadership of the General Assembly is sympathetic to the plight of higher education, Governor Allen has made it clear that he would veto any attempt for a tax increase at this time.

Dr. Torgersen pointed out that the Business Higher Education Council is

already strategizing and preparing for the next General Assembly.

Asked to comment on the Georgia tuition plan, Mr. Byers noted that Lt. Governor Byer and Attorney General Gilmore have had competing scholarship plans. The idea of providing scholarships is very popular nationwide and many politicians are getting on this bandwagon. The case in Georgia is different from ours, because they have a low college-going rate, where Virginia has an extremely high college-going rate. Massive scholarship programs will not help the institutions in terms of operating funds. Virginia is the 12th largest state and we have the 10th largest system of higher education, so the issues are different. Providing scholarships based on merit for students helps students and parents, but does not help higher education. We do not get additional operating money that way. We do need increased financial aid, but it should be need-based.

Mr. Byers and Mr. Ridenour spoke to a particular item of interest -- the possibility of increased premium increases in Key Advantage due to premium holidays causing a loss of reserve necessary to support that program.

Dr. Torgersen thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl



University Council Minutes, March 17, 1997

Present: D. Stetler (for B. Bates), L. Cross, E. Holford, P. Edwards, C. Nickerson, M. Ridenour, J. Eversole (for R. Smoot), R. Sorensen, J. Tront (for F. W. Stephenson), T. Tillar, P. Torgersen, J. Aughenbaugh, B. Ley, J. McKenna, S. Allen (for V. Myers), J. Seiler, M. Smith, N. Spencer, T. Swecker, B. Dyck, N. Marriott, T. Sherman, N. Shumsky, B. Benoit, D. deWolf, F. Gwazdauskas, P. Scanlon, J. Yardley, K. Burke (by phone), G. Johns, T. Lawrence, M. Norstedt, C. Couples, P. Dolezel, and C. Forstner.

Guests: P. Hyer, Provost Office; S. Allen, Staff Senate; M. Denbow, Commission on Undergraduate Studies & Policies; J. Fulton, Provost's Office; R. Alvarez, Information Systems; S. Gustafson, Faculty Senate; P. Metz, Faculty Senate.

### 1. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion passed.

### 2. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of February 17, 1997

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the February 17, 1997 University Council meeting had been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System of the GOPHER.

### 3. First Reading, Commission on Student Affairs Resolution 96-97A: Availability and Circulation Enhancement of Library Resources.

Mr. John Aughenbaugh presented Commission on Student Affairs Resolution 96-97A: Availability and Circulation Enhancement of Library Resources. Mr. Aughenbaugh explained that the resolution originated in the Graduate Student Assembly where GSA members thought greater recirculation in the library would be encouraged if all library patrons had a financial encouragement to bring their books back. He explained that the resolution was presented to the Commission on Student Affairs not as an attempt to bypass the Library Committee, but because CSA is the only university commission comprised by a majority of students.

Dr. Eileen Hitchingham, dean of the Library, expressed her appreciation regarding the value of student interest in library resources and campus morale. She explained that she feels that other commissions are actively and intimately involved with this issue: CUS&P, CGS&P, and the Commission on Research. Dr. Hitchingham pointed out that at the past several meetings, the University Library Committee, which is representative of all the colleges, the undergraduate and graduate students, and the staff organizations, has been looking at the issue of fines or no fines for university faculty and staff. She pointed out that the issue of fines or no fines is clearly NOT a punishment issue but rather a prevention measure; preventive because it will encourage the most responsible participation in the borrowing and lending of resources for the university library.

Dr. Hitchingham noted that currently approximately 12 percent of borrowers, and perhaps half of those people who have overdue items, are faculty, versus 25 percent of the rest of the university community.

Dr. Hitchingham expressed her view that the fine/no fine issue is an operational rather than a policy issue; it does touch many members of the university community; the University Library Committee is looking at it and soliciting input from the community at large; and therefore she

suggested a deferment of approximately five weeks to allow all agencies to respond. Dean Hitchingham directed submission of concerns to the University Library Committee chairperson, Lance Matheson. The committee can then make its recommendation, either to leave things as they currently are, or recommend a change with supporting legislation.

Discussion related to this issue covered the following points: 1) whether or not a first reading of the resolution had been presented to the Library Committee; 2) why the Commission on Faculty Affairs had not been consulted on this issue, since faculty are vitally interested and involved; 3) the view of some that the Library is a tool and faculty should not have to pay for tools used in their performance; 4) the system does need tweaking but not through a fine system.

Relative to the motion for deferment, Dr. Torgersen asked Mr. Aughenbaugh if he had further comments or concerns regarding deferment of this resolution. Mr. Aughenbaugh replied that as long as Council responds to the resolution, either positively or negatively, before the end of the academic year, he is in agreement that additional input will be helpful. Dr. Torgersen replied that a vote for deferrment would require final action before the end of this academic year. Consequently, a motion for deferment was made, voted upon, and passed.

#### 4. First Reading, Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1996-1997B: Change in Scheduling M, W, F Classes

NOTE: Because of low attendance on 3/17, and the importance of this issue to the campus community, minutes of this discussion are presented here nearly verbatim.

Dr. John Seiler explained that the resolution speaks to changing the Monday, Wednesday, Friday class schedule from on-the-hour to a staggered schedule of 15 minutes between classes. He introduced Dr. Mike Denbow to present data gathered by the Committee of Academic Support, a subcommittee of CUS&P, where this resolution originated. Dr. Seiler asked members to keep open minds, see all the data, and make an informed decision.

Prefacing his presentation, Dr. Denbow explained that a lot of misinformation was being distributed. He asked Council to view the data and give the resolution due process. He began his presentation with an overhead depicting the campus with marked areas representing the 10-minute walking campus. He pointed out that the campus has expanded markedly since the 10-minute walking campus was designed, and we now have many buildings located outside the 10-minute walking campus. Therefore, the issue under advisement recognizes that it is simply impossible to walk from certain buildings to certain other buildings in 10 minutes, regardless of the conditions.

Dr. Denbow assured Council members that this is not the only solution to be looked at, but that at the present time, it seems to be the best solution. He pointed out that this resolution would not alter classroom contact hours because we currently have four class periods in the morning from 8:00-11:50 a.m. and five class periods in the afternoon from 12-4:50 p.m. The altered schedule would maintain the four classes in the morning from 8:00 a.m. to 12:05 p.m.; and alter the five afternoon class periods to four (we would lose one class period per afternoon). With Registrar's Office figures in hand, Dr. Denbow explained that 94.5 percent of all classes have been held by 4:00 p.m. so if we lose one class period each afternoon, we are losing only 1.4 percent of cumulative class meetings.

Below are questions (and answers) that have been raised campuswide and in today's UCOUNCIL meeting:

Isn't it true that students can get between classes within 10 minutes if they don't waste time? Response: Simply cannot be done.

Can't we simply assure that students do not have classes back to back? Can't be done; according to the Registrar's Office, we don't have the flexibility to do that right now.

Is there an effect on the dining halls? Response: Dr. Ed Spencer has responded that there will be no effect on the dining halls.

Won't reduction in one class period reap havoc and chaos in the school day? Response: There seems to be a relatively insignificant impact by eliminating one class period per day - about 1.4 percent of all classes might be impacted.

In curriculums that offer adult education or satellite-delivered classes, won't this proposed change really mess up their schedules? Response: In talking with the Registrar's Office, Marvin Foushee and Barbara Simpson, the agreement is that after 4:00 p.m. and given the availability of classroom space, those classes can continue to meet when they are normally scheduled to meet. They also agreed that this will not affect satellite-delivered classes.

Won't altered class times bring disaster to the BT routes and professor/student schedules? Response: To quote one of our students, "I think we are smart enough to handle the different start times; after all we did it in middle and high school." In addition, Dr. John Seiler has been in contact with the Blacksburg Transit and has requested an official response from them (which has not been provided to date). The BT has had this resolution before them since October, 1996 and has hinted that it is not an issue; they will provide additional trippers if necessary.

How much space is in the current schedule to add additional classes before 4:00 p.m.? You are only talking about losing 1.4 percent, but is there a capacity to put that 1.4 percent in the previous hours? Response: Dr. Denbow had no answer to this.

Since our campus is much smaller than other campuses, how do they deal with this problem? Response: Numerous campuses already have more than 10 minutes between classes, some have as much as 20 minutes; some campuses block off traffic and everyone uses bikes; some campuses face the same problem as we have; just about every scenario you can imagine exists.

It was agreed that it would be totally inefficient to block students' ability to have consecutive classes, but is it possible to block consecutive classes between selective buildings? Response: Dr. Denbow responded that we don't have the flexibility to do that.

Has there been any discussion about exempting graduating classes and veterinary classes? Response: It has to be seriously discussed and the issue will soon become more acute as the College of Veterinary Medicine begins to offer undergraduate classes.

Could these students' (veterinary students) schedules be looked at individually and have their schedules developed separately vs. making hundreds of other students respond? Response: We would have to throw all 4000 level courses into the scenario which would make it more complicated.

Do graduate students go back to back to back? Response: No, but if graduate classes are on one time table and undergraduate on another time table, we would have to accommodate every place and there would be a potential conflict.

Why is there no problem on Tuesday & Thursday? Response: They already have 20 minutes between classes.

What proportion of students take classes just on M,W,F? Response: Probably not even 1 percent; usually there is a mixture of both.

Won't the proposed change negatively impact extracurricular activities including football and baseball practice, whatever? Response: No, because most of the classes are not being impacted by these activities--people in the Marching Virginians or whatever can mark on their opscans their practice times so the new scheduling should not impact extracurricular activities.

Will 15 minutes between classes on M,W,F solve all the problems? Response: No. It would be nice to have an expert system to assure that students would not have these conflicts but it does not appear to be happening in the near future. One thing that would be of immense help is if faculty enter class on time (a problem repeatedly cited by students).

Are many students affected by the problem of getting between classes? Response: this is the hardest question to get a handle on. Last year, the Committee on Academic Support developed a questionnaire to address this issue because the problem came up several years in a row. The question "do you have a problem getting to class on time on M,W F?" was asked of the Student Government Association and the response was affirmative by 84 percent of the members. Subsequently, Dr. Allen presented the same poll in one class period and got a 90 percent affirmative response. Dr. Denbow repeated the poll this fall in a freshman class with 125 people - Introduction to Animal and Poultry Science - and received 90 percent affirmative response. At the same time, Dr. Ellenbrock polled an Agricultural Economics class and also received a 90 percent affirmative response. The overwhelming reason for not getting to class on time is always distance.

Dr. Denbow provided examples of freshmen and sophomore students who have back to back classes. He provided, with the assistance of the Registrar's Office, the following figures for fall semester M,W,F classes in some of the buildings outside the 10-minute walking campus: Squires--4800 students; Litton Reeves--8600 students; Whittemore--3400 students; and Derring--3500 students. Dr. Denbow explained that he found the only way to really get the real answers was to sit down with student class tickets and go through them one at a time. He accomplished this by taking all 155 freshmen tickets in Animal Poultry Science and studying them. He discovered that 75 percent of these students had classes back to back. He pointed out that this was the best case scenario because his college had already invested in approximately 80 hours during the summer to ensure that most of our students didn't have back to back classes. After this process, Dr. Denbow worked with 156 biology student class tickets and discovered that 13 percent had classes back to back outside the 10-minute walking campus; the vast majority of biology students have classes on Tuesday and Thursday. Dr. Denbow explained that the discrepancy here is caused by students such as engineering students never having to leave one building because all their classes are scheduled within that building versus students, such as animal poultry science students in Litton Reeves, who must traverse back and forth across the campus.

Dr. Denbow explained that he has presented this resolution all over campus trying to gather as much input as possible. He stated that the proposal has now been endorsed by the CSA (who were originally opposed to the situation until they saw the data and the real problem), by CUS&P (also vehemently against it at the beginning of the semester), and CFA. He pointed out that it has not been endorsed by CGS&P and referred to

their memo citing "...one of the ways Virginia Tech might be transformed is to use scheduling and queuing theory in creating the timetable so that classes likely to be taken by any given student are not scheduled in contiguous time slots at opposite ends of campus....". Dr. Denbow also pointed out that the College of Veterinary Medicine has legitimate concerns and has presented a resolution against it. He noted that the Veterinary School is unique because all their classes meet within three classrooms (which can be traversed within five minutes). He urged everyone to read the attached Vet School resolution comments but he pointed out the comment of Dr. Peter Eyre, which encapsulates the issue:

"I will vote against the resolution to change class schedule times when the issue goes before University Council. It makes no sense for us and will be very disruptive for our scheduling. However, I do believe that the transit time for undergraduates between classes is very limited and in some instances it is impossible. The College of Veterinary Medicine has a number of university-wide cross-listed undergraduate and graduate courses. If these courses are to be freely accessible to the whole campus, then I believe the College of Veterinary Medicine will not be exempt from the policy." Dr. Denbow noted that if you evaluate the Veterinary School in isolation they should be exempt from this resolution but in view of the Veterinary School currently moving to offer more classes at the undergraduate level, it argues very strongly that 15 minutes is not long enough because there is no way to get to the vet school in 15 minutes, let alone 10 minutes.

Dr. Denbow mentioned out that he asked Dr. Fred Medley to assist him with a cost analysis statement to make the scheduling change, and since we do not have the support staff to make the change, we would have to acquire contract programming services which would result in costs of approximately \$38,500. Dr. Terry Swecker asked if we can get access to different software from that used in the Registrar's Office. He pointed out that at a university touting "putting information technology to work" it is upsetting when someone says "this is not possible." In response, Dr. Seiler mentioned that he had requested a representative from the Registrar's Office at today's meeting, and though they could not be present, the Registrar's Office has assured him each and every time they were asked that it is not possible to meet the scheduling challenge without these costs. Dr. Metz reiterated that he also felt the computer systems would not be able to handle this constraint considering its present constraint issues.

A poll of Arts & Sciences faculty was negative because many in the arts teach 20-25 contact hours per week, most of which are private lessons, etc. Using time effectively is extremely important. Additionally facilities are currently used every hour of the day. Losing one hour would require cancelling six general biology labs, and two general micro classes. Dr. Denbow responded that he hadn't figured out how this impacts the fact that biology labs run from 8:00 a.m.-10:00 p.m.

Dr. David deWolf spoke regarding concerns expressed to him. He acknowledged that the data shows there is a problem, but he is concerned about the solution because according to the problem, even 15 minutes may not be enough to solve the problem. Dr. deWolf expressed his belief that proper scheduling could take care of the problem. He feels that we should not only talk to the Registrar's Office, but also to Industrial and Systems Engineering where people deal with operations research and may be aware of some of the newer scheduling programs. Dr. Larry Shumsky agreed with Dr. deWolf and expressed his opinion that the problem will worsen when the upper quad conversion is finished, particularly since more classrooms in that area indicates more people walking further distances. He expressed interest in knowing what the alternative suggestions to this bizarre type of schedule might be; one example might be 45 minute classes with 15 minutes between classes, beginning on the hour and ending at quarter til the hour. Dr. Denbow responded that the concept of shorter classes was presented as one of

the solutions and most responded negatively (particularly the engineering faculty).

Ms. Gerri Johns asked what effect this would have on M,W or W,F classes?

Response: According to the Registrar's Office these are not supposed to exist; however, currently there are some unique situations where they do exist because the availability of spacing existed several years ago when a building was built and it has worked to this point. The Registrar's Office would like to get rid of them because they cause scheduling problems (if you put those classrooms on a different schedule from the rest of the university, it takes them out of circulation).

Several members of UCOUNCIL pointed out that it was important to keep graduate and undergraduate schedules in sync because there are graduate students involved as TA's in undergraduate classes, because undergraduates take graduate-level classes and visa versa, and because some professors teach both levels of classes.

Dr. Torgersen closed the discussion by pointing out that each dean should make sure that that information is distributed through their academic units and they are made aware that this issue will be discussed and debated again before a final vote taken. He pointed out that this will represent a significant change in the way we do business at Virginia Tech.

Dr. Torgersen apologized for having to depart for a fund-raising trip in Texas. He asked Mr. Minnis Ridenour to chair the remainder of the meeting.

5. First Reading, Resolution Regarding University Council Communications and Relevant Bylaw Changes.

Dr. Paul Metz, president of the Faculty Senate, presented a handout showing the chronology of this resolution. He explained that two years ago the Faculty Senate began to discuss ways by which the governance structure could be broadened and to possibly create a tighter and leaner university council. The Staff Senate joined in and a series of lunches including teaching faculty, graduate and undergraduate students, and A/P faculty representatives were begun to generate discussion. Dr. Metz pointed out that some real world restraints became evident at that time, such as the strong value across campus for active representation, and the discovery that a position for a full-time governance officer, while appealing to many, was not going to succeed in Richmond when time spent on governance was already frowned upon.

Dr. Metz continued that last summer Dr. Torgersen established a task force of major constituencies to look into this issue. The task force was comprised of Paul Metz, Norrine Bailey Spencer, John Aughenbaugh, Spencer Allen, David deWolf, Rosemary Goss, and Janet Johnson. The task force identified two important goals: 1) to provide better communications within the body; and 2) to improve communications between University Council and the university community at large. He explained that this resolution is actually institutionalizing several changes that have already been implemented this year: the straw poll by which topics deserving extended discussion are indicated; a more pro-active effort to identify critical issues; and to increase early availability of information related to upcoming business.

Dr. Metz reiterated that this resolution is an effort to institutionalize changes established earlier this year by the President's Office, and to create a somewhat larger role for Spectrum. He commented that we may still have to provide some fine tuning for discussion logistics, but are proposing these changes in the Bylaws as effective measures for increasing awareness and participation.

Dr. Metz addressed the UCOUNCIL membership concern. He recognized that at times absenteeism, both in commissions and at UCOUNCIL, appears to be a problem. One of the advantages of being on the UCOUNCIL LISTSERV is that if one is physically unable to attend a meeting, they are still in the information loop.

6. Second Reading, Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 1996-97A: Professional Ethics.

Dr. Norrine Bailey Spencer, chairperson of CAPFA, presented a motion asking that the Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 1996-97A: Professional Ethics be referred to the Commission on Professional and Administrative Faculty Affairs since the members of this commission wished to have another discussion of the issue in light of some new information. The motion was voted upon and passed.

7. Second Reading, Joint Resolution from the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies 1996-97D and the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies: Establishment of Schools.

Dr. Pat Hyer presented Joint Resolution from the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies 1996-97D and the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies: Establishment of Schools for second reading. Dr. Hyer pointed out that this resolution was written at the request of the Rector of the Board of the Visitors who asked us to put down in writing the procedures for approving the establishment of new schools. The motion was presented, voted upon, and passed.

8. Second Reading, Commission on Research Resolution 96-97B: Policy on Animal Disposal.

Dr. Mark Smith presented Second Reading, Commission on Research Resolution 96-97B: Policy on Animal Disposal for first reading. He led the discussion by pointing out that basically this resolution does not allow adoption of animals used in teaching, research, or other scholarly activities but will allow purchase of said animals. Dr. Smith explained that pending the approval of this resolution, the particulars of the purchasing process will be further addressed in an administrative policy from the Office of Research and Graduate Studies. The motion was presented, voted upon, and passed.

9. Second Reading, Commission on Graduate Studies and Policy Resolution 1996-97A: 5974 and 5984 Hour Limits on the Plan of Study.

Dr. Bill Ley, chairperson of the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policy, presented a motion to defer Resolution 1996-97A: 5974 and 5984 Hour Limits on the Plan of Study back to the original commission for the following reasons: 1) there are additional courses that need to be included under this proposed resolution, i.e., course 6974 and 6984; and 2) to further clarify the wording and justification that this policy would cover essentially the plain vanilla 30-hour master of science degree program and not the specific master of science degree program in colleges that have additional requirements. The motion was presented, voted upon, and passed.

10. Council approved a packet of commission minutes comprised of:

Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, January 21, 1997. Mr. Spencer Allen presented the minutes in lieu of Ms. Valerie Myers.

Commission on Faculty Affairs, January 24 and February 14, 1997. Mr. John Aughenbaugh asked for a report on the status of the proposal regarding tuition fee waivers for dependents and spouses. Dr. McKenna reported that the proposal has been remanded to Dr. Ray Smoot's area and Mr. Ridenour explained that the proposal is currently under discussion

in Ms. Ann Spencer's area.

Commission on Graduate Studies, February 5, 1997. Dr. Frank Gwazdauskas expressed a concern regarding whether or not a quorum was achieved in the voting procedures of these minutes. After a discussion regarding the necessity for quorum voting in the commissions, Ms. Carole Nickerson agreed to study this item and inform everyone of the necessary procedures.

Commission on Outreach, February 18, 1997. Dr. Terry Swecker explained to Council that this body was commissioned by the Provost to make a definition of outreach; hence, our major cultural shift for the university will be that outreach is a component on all three missions of the university - outreach to teaching, outreach to research, and outreach to service. The Commission has provided his definition to the Commission on Faculty Affairs.

Commission on Student Affairs, January 23 and February 13, 1997.

Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, February 10, 1997.

#### 11. Announcements

University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning Minutes, January 23 and February 6, 1997 were presented for information only.

#### 12. Discussion/Question/Answer Forum

Mr. Ridenour introduced Dr. John Eaton, Associate Provost for Graduate Studies, who made a presentation on Graduate School admissions. Dr. Eaton began by explaining the procedures used in processing graduate school admissions applications, beginning with the distribution of approximately 30,000-35,000 per year. Particular items of interest in his presentation involved financial aid for graduate students, recruiting of U.S. students (particularly Virginia Tech students), methods for overcoming language barriers, and specific trends regarding enrollment figures.

Dr. Eaton pointed out a specific trend showing declining interest from U.S. students and an increasing interest from Chinese students. He expressed his concern that as this decline is becoming obvious across the United States, it will be more and more important to aggressively recruit U. S. students. Hence, the Office of Graduate Admissions may soon have to behave like the Office of Undergraduate Admissions in their recruiting approach. He also noted that although we have less people applying to graduate school in general, the grade point average is accelerating, which may indicate a higher quality student. Dr. Eaton pointed out that one of the factors in the declining numbers of students interested in graduate school is due to the decline in certain areas of interest -- engineering and business -- and an increase in the health sciences and education area, areas where we have little or no focus.

Dr. Eaton commented that recently the application deadline has changed from February 15 to January 15 and this date change is helping tremendously in compiling applications and getting them out to the departments.

Dr. Eaton spoke to the English language competency issue at great length. He explained that all international students must take the TOEFL and that Virginia Tech accepts no score under 550. In fact some of our departments require a higher score. Once students have been accepted and actually enrolled, and if they scored under a 620, Dr. McKeon tests them to be certain that they are going to be able to cope with classroom situations. In the instances where the student will be offered a TA, he determines whether or not they are ready or whether



they need to take enhanced language classes. If a student has not passed the ITA, the departments know they must use that student in a capacity other than as a teaching assistant. In response to a question about student complaints regarding the language barrier between themselves and their TA's, Dr. Eaton said that the Graduate School was unaware of this problem.

Dr. Eaton did not present off-campus enrollment figures because it is too early in the year for that data. He did say that the rate of off-campus admissions is much higher than on-campus admissions, mainly because the off-campus student tends to be settled in a work environment, has a home and family, is place-bound, and in most cases, will apply to only one or two locations vs. the on-campus student who might apply to as many as five different locations.

Dr. Eaton explained that the new Commonwealth Campus Program will be helpful in attracting the student who already possesses a master's degree but needs a course or two to improve his/her skills in the workplace, or a student who graduated five-six years ago and wants to "test the waters" before actually committing to Graduate School. If after taking 12 hours of Commonwealth Campus courses, a student (once accepted) can use those courses towards their degree assuming they had satisfactory academic performance. Dr. Eaton pointed out that this program should help our extended campus enrollment. He mentioned that he feels professionally oriented master's degrees are going to become a very important market for us off-campus.

Mr. Ridenour adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, April 7, 1997

Present: D. Stetler (for B. Bates), D. Smith (for G. Brown), L. Cross, E. Holford, P. Edwards, P. Eyre, D. Kenney (for E. Hitchingham), D. Yardley (for J. Johnson), P. Meszaros, C. Nickerson, L. Peters, M. Ridenour, R. Smoot, R. Sorensen, C. Steger, F. W. Stephenson, A. Swiger, T. Tillar, P. Torgersen, J. Aughenbaugh, B. Ley, J. McKenna, J. Seiler, M. Smith, N. Spencer, T. Swecker, B. Dyck, C. Goodsell, R. Goss, S. Pleasant (for K. pelzer), A. Snoke (for B. Benoit), C. Carrig, R. Daniel, T. Sherman, P. Shires, N. Shumsky, B. Benoit, D. deWolf, F. Gwazdauskas, T. Head, N. Phillips, P. Scanlon, J. Yardley, K. Burke (by phone), G. Johns, T. Lawrence, M. Norstedt, C. Couples, and S. Schneider (for J. Hulings).

Guests: P. Hyer, Provost Office; M. Denbow, Commission on Undergraduate Studies & Policies; J. Fulton, Provost's Office; P. Metz, Faculty Senate; M. Harrington, Institutional Research; W. David Conn, Provost's Office; D. Shelton, Budget Office; M. Lambur, CFE.

### 1. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion passed.

### 2. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of March 17, 1997

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the March 17, 1997 University Council meeting had been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System of the GOPHER.

### 3. Opening remarks by Dr. Torgersen:

Dr. Torgersen began the meeting by noting that since there was no new business, he would take a few moments to speak about several issues of interest. He introduced Ms. Carole Nickerson, executive assistant to the president, and explained that she would clarify the "quorum" issue that had been raised at the previous meeting. Ms. Nickerson explained that the University Council Constitution and Bylaws, by design, were silent on the issue of quorum. She explained that ours is a "default system" which carries the automatic assumption, according to parliamentary law, is that a quorum is one-half plus one of the members. Ms. Nickerson pointed out that the "half plus one" is typically observed at institutions such as ours where there is a value of generous input opportunities and of consensus.

Dr. Frank Gwazdauskas explained that he had raised the question because he was concerned that some of the commissions were pushing items of business through the system with a quarter (or less) of its members being present for voting.

Dr. Pat Hyer added that quorum voting is not an issue unless someone raises a question and makes it an issue. Ms. Nickerson responded that Sturgis, our parliamentary guide, prescribes that a quorum issue must be raised at the time of a vote or at the time a meeting is called to order, and if it is not raised at that time, it cannot be raised later. After a discussion concerning commissions doing business without a quorum being present, the consensus was that commission chairpersons work diligently to ensure that the majority of members will be present for meetings.

Next Dr. Torgersen informed Council members about the large numbers of alumni and friends on campus for Founders Week and how supportive they were of the university.

Dr. Torgersen passed around an interesting editorial from the Lexington Herald Leader - the hometown paper of the University of Kentucky. He summarized the article, "Virginia Tech - a model for ascent: An example

for UK to follow," as follows:

- Virginia Tech has a modest sustained increase in research development - \$148 million to research, ranked 47th nationally--compared to UK's \$114 million for research and a ranking of 66.
- Virginia Tech has expanded and diversified its graduate programs - Tech confers 370 doctoral degrees, UK confers 236.
- Virginia Tech has an academically strong undergraduate student body drawn from all sectors of the state. The average freshmen SATs are 1160; thus Virginia Tech has become an attractive choice for high school seniors from Virginia and surrounding states.
- Virginia Tech has a nationally acclaimed presence in technology. The Blacksburg Electronic Village has been praised for having expanded the university's electronic interest to the entire community.
- Virginia Tech warrants attention because it has, like UK, long-term strengths in such fields as engineering, agriculture, architecture, and applied sciences. More surprisingly, in the past two decades Virginia Tech has been strong in such fields as economics, English, math, computer science, sociology, biology, and education.
- University of Kentucky can learn from Virginia Tech's motto "Ut Prosim" translated "That I May Serve."
- UK can learn from Virginia Tech how to nurture an excellent and complete university true to its land-grant charter.

#### 4. Second Reading, Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1996-1997B: Change in Scheduling M, W, F Classes

Dr. John Seiler, commission chair, presented Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1996-1997B: Change in Scheduling M, W, F Classes, for second reading. He began by summarizing the facts that had been previously presented: the distance between many of the buildings cannot be traveled in ten minutes; approximately 85 percent of the students polled cited distance as a problem; some departments have as many as 75 percent of their students impacted by back-to-back classes; about 5 percent of the overall student population has at least one of these building combinations; it appears that better scheduling is not going to be accomplished by adding another constraint to the system--in fact adding another constraint to the system will just increase the amount of students not getting to their classes on time; due to Tuesday and Thursday classes we already have two-fifths of the week not on the hour/half hour; and services like the Blacksburg Transit will not have to change their schedule. Dr. Seiler pointed out that he was aware of many different polls being conducted, some conducted in a vacuum, some involving biased questions, some with incomplete data being presented, and in some cases, the complete faculty body within a college were not polled.

After a lengthy discussion of pros and cons, and after several alternate suggestions, friendly amendments and motions were presented, Council members accepted and voted upon a friendly amendment provided by Dr. P. Scanlon. The friendly amendment makes the resolution less specific, and the new wording is "THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the ten-minute break between classes scheduled Monday, Wednesday, and Friday should be changed to fifteen minutes for classes scheduled prior to 5:30 p.m."

The motion was voted on and passed.

#### 5. Second Reading, Resolution Regarding University Council Communications and Relevant Bylaw Changes. (Passage requires approval of majority of Council members.)

Dr. Paul Metz, president of the Faculty Senate, presented Resolution Regarding University Council Communications and Relevant Bylaw Changes for second reading. He reminded Council that this resolution is designed to institutionalize modifications born out of concerns raised by the previous Faculty Senate. These modifications include: providing agenda-setting meetings among the commission chairs, President, and Provost at the beginning of each semester to alert and coordinate specific items of commission concerns; increasing awareness among UCOUNCIL members and other commission members about concerns; ranking the ordering of substantive discussion topics for UCOUNCIL; providing commission chairs the opportunity to report their commissions' activities/interests/concerns during the "commission minutes" presentation of UCOUNCIL; and communicating UCOUNCIL progress on specific business items through greater use of the Spectrum and Worldwide Web.

Dr. Metz noted that this resolution will formally institutionalize improvements in UCOUNCIL this year, due in large part to Ms. Carole Nickerson's initiatives. The motion was voted on and passed.

6. Second Reading, Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 1996-97A: Professional Ethics. (Returns from referral of March 17, 1997).

Dr. Pat Hyer presented Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 1996-97A: Professional Ethics for second reading after its referral of March 17, 1997. Dr. Hyer explained that the Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs had requested a referral of this resolution for the purpose of further discussion. She explained that CAPFA members were agreed that administrative and professional faculty's ethical behavior should be covered by this policy. Editorial revisions reflect the role of the Faculty Ethics Committee, what their charge and composition is, and prescribe which matters would or would not go to said committee. Matters that are normally addressed by an administrative officer or supervisor would not go to Ethics; also complaints concerning personnel actions taken by a supervisor are normally handled by the appropriate grievance procedure and are not meant to go to Faculty Ethics Committee unless a specific ethical issue or problem is developed by those proceedings. Regarding Faculty Ethics Committee membership, in the case of an A/P faculty member being charged with a violation, the committee that would hear such a violation would be composed of five A/P faculty members and, if the commission chairperson chose, he/she would ask for an experienced member of the other body to join and aid in the deliberation.

Dr. Hyer pointed out that the principles remain unchanged from the first reading and only editorial changes to Section 1.5.3. are being presented. The motion was voted on and passed.

7. Second Reading, Commission on Graduate Studies and Policy Resolution 1996-97A: 5974 and 5984 Hour Limits on the Plan of Study. (Returns from deferral effective February 17, 1997.)

Dr. Bill Ley, chairperson of the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, withdrew Resolution 1996-97A: 5974 and 5984 Hour Limits on the Plan of Study.

8. Commission on Student Affairs Resolution 96-97A: Availability and Circulation Enhancement of Library Resources. Deferred to April 22, 1997 UCOUNCIL Meeting.

Deferred to the April 22, 1997 UCOUNCIL Meeting.

9. Council approved a packet of commission minutes comprised of:

- Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs, February 18, 1997.

- Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, February 12, 1997. These minutes were deferred to a subsequent meeting since there was no CCSA representative at Council.

- Commission on Faculty Affairs, February 28 and March 14, 1997.
- Commission on Graduate Studies & Policies, February 18, 1997.
- Commission on Outreach, March 18, 1997.
- Commission on Research, March 12, 1997.
- Commission on Student Affairs, March 12, 1997.
- Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, March 10, 1997.

#### 10. Announcements

- Dr. Torgersen introduced Dr. David Conn who reminded Council the Self Study "Must Statements" had been mailed to the entire UCOUNCIL body of the UCOUNCIL. He explained that at this point in the review process, Council members are being asked to check on the accuracy and completeness of the responses to the "must" statements, NOT to determine whether we are doing things correctly now or are doing them the way we would like to see them done, but whether the responses are accurately and completely describing what we are currently doing. Dr. Conn asked members to mail comments to Marcia Harrington, who, he noted, has done a fantastic job of coordinating this process.

#### 11. Discussion/Question/Answer Forum

Dr. Torgersen introduced Dr. Peggy Meszaros and Mr. Minnis Ridenour for a presentation on resource allocation processes. After distributing a handout, Mr. Ridenour explained that the university allocation process is a shared process where decisions are reached by the President, Provost, and himself, based on initiatives moving through the university with input from vice presidents, deans, and the Advisory Council on Strategic Budget & Planning. He pointed out that the Advisory Council on Strategic Budget and Planning, established by the University Council and linked to the Council by the sharing of its minutes, is a key part of the total resource allocation process. The Budget and Planning Council is charged with reviewing all the budget decisions whether annual, biannual or the six-year capital outlay proposal which is placed before the General Assembly, and it studies issues having to do with budget and planning decisions. This Council has representatives from every college in the university, SGA, GSA, staff senate, faculty senate, the library association, the administrative and professional faculty, extension, professional faculty on campus, representatives from central offices of the administration, a number of ex officio members, and is co-chaired by Peggy and himself. Mr. Ridenour explained that the Council meets at least twice monthly during the academic year, once a month during the summer months, and at critical times of the year, the Council meets as often as necessary to handle matters of budget crisis.

Mr. Ridenour described how requests for resources are handled--each year a budget call goes out to the vice presidents and deans to identify resources needed for programs, and those requests are subsequently presented to the President, the Provost, and himself with input from the vice presidents, deans, and from the Council on Strategic Budget & Planning. Once allocation decisions are made, the budget goes to the Board of Visitors and subsequently resources are allocated. (We will be taking the budget for next year to the April BOV meeting.) At this time, the vice presidents and deans have the authority within their centers to make decisions (with the exception of line-item allocations such as faculty positions being allocated for specific colleges, departments, or technology).

At this time, Dean Pat Edwards noted that this year she had not passed on budget requests within her college because she had not been solicited herself. Mr. Dwight Shelton, Budget Director, explained that the

parameters for making budget calls are different this year. He pointed out that in the last three years, budget parameters have been different -- the first year was for reallocation where we did not have enough resources; last year there were additional resources to allocate; and this year we are basically flat. He explained that the normal process, on an annual basis, would call for a budget letter to go out to deans asking for input. Further explanation ensued regarding salary savings staying within the vice presidents' or the deans' discretion, as well as the fact that basically there is no money at the university to address issues because it has been allocated out except for a contingency fund (that we hold and roll forward each year to deal with emergencies). Most of the money we have received in the last several years at the General Assembly level has come to us earmarked, and we have very little discretion as to how that money can be used.

In response to a question about the \$10 million overage last year, Mr. Ridenour and Mr. Shelton explained that this was actually money that was not spent out by June 30 and was carried over by the Budget Responsibility Center. He explained that a plan had to be worked out for rolling over those dollars into the current year. He further explained that if a department did not spend all the monies allocated to it before June 30, a plan could be worked out where the Budget Office could carry that forward, and that a piece of equipment, for example, could be purchased after June 30. This is done by a procedure of trading dollars and budgets. If someone else has the need to pay for something or buy something that they can accelerate, we accelerate that payment; consequently there is no overage or shortage. Mr. Ridenour explained that while we try to provide year-end flexibility, long-term carryover in significant dollars beyond June 30 is risky business because dollars are appropriated to the university to be utilized within that specific year, and if dollars are moved beyond that year, there is a risk that they will be taken away.

Dr. Peggy Meszaros reiterated the university's lack of flexibility, and suggested that it would be helpful for members of Council to share this handout with colleagues to foster better understanding of the budget/resource allocation process. (Dwight Shelton will use the electronic DDD list to distribute the handout.) Dr. Pat Hyer suggested that we alter the phrase "that every year there will be a call for budget input from the deans and vice presidents" since this phrase is misleading and may cause concern.

In response to a question about the sprinkler system problem, Mr. Ridenour stated that all the auxiliaries must be, by state law, 100 percent self-supporting. Therefore, when political leaders talk about providing the resources to do the sprinkler system in the dorms, a cost of \$5 million, what they are really saying to the university is that the university will have the opportunity to put in the sprinkler systems and to find the money to make it happen, even though it is being mandated. Mr. Ridenour pointed out that the problem with this is that we are unable to increase student fees, and we can't spend all of our reserves because of the interest lost, so basically in order to cover the loss, the cost MUST go back to the student.

Dr. Torgersen adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson  
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, April 22, 1997

Present: B. Bates, E. Blythe, G. Brown, L. Cross, E. Holford, P. Edwards, P. Eyre, E. Hitchingham, J. Johnson, P. Meszaros, C. Nickerson, L. Peters, L. Martinson (for M. Ridenour), J. Eversole (for R. Smoot), R. Sorensen, C. Steger, J. Osborne (for F. W. Stephenson), A. Swiger, T. Tillar, B. Ley, J. McKenna, C. Rogers (for J. Seiler), N. Spencer, T. Swecker, B. Dyck, C. Goodsell, R. Goss, K. Pelzer, B. Benoit, R. Daniel, D. deWolf, C. Polan (for F. Gwazdauskas), T. Head, K. McNinney, N. Phillips, K. Burke (by phone), G. Johns, T. Lawrence, M. Norstedt, and S. Schneider (for J. Hulings).

Guests: P. Hyer, Provost Office; J. Fulton, Provost's Office; P. Metz, Faculty Senate.

#### 1. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion passed.

#### 2. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of April 7, 1997

Dr. Meszaros noted that the minutes from the April 7, 1997 University Council meeting had been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System of the GOPHER.

#### 3. First Reading, Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs Resolution 1996-97A: Proposal to Modify the Faculty Handbook Policy on Emeritus Status.

Dr. Norrine Spencer, chairperson of CAPFA, presented Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs Resolution 1996-97A: Proposal to Modify the Faculty Handbook Policy on Emeritus Status for first reading. She explained that this resolution was designed to amend the Faculty Handbook language to explicitly specify that senior extension agents are eligible for emeritus status.

#### 4. First Reading, Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 1996-97B: Severe Sanctions for Post-Tenure Review and Limitation of Period of Remediation.

Dr. Jim McKenna, chairperson for CFA, presented Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 1996-97B: Severe Sanctions for Post-Tenure Review and Limitation of Period of Remediation for first reading. He explained that last year CFA worked through post tenure review but, due to lack of time, was unable to complete the severe sanctions portion of the process. Therefore, this year, CFA has attempted to provide additional language defining severe sanctions for inclusion in the Post-Tenure Review policy under the section referring to "sanctions other than dismissal for cause." He also pointed out that concern had been expressed by Faculty Senate and CFA that small departments might be disadvantaged by the current procedure. Therefore, it was felt that the college Promotion and Tenure committees should be introduced into the proceedings earlier in the process because the P&T committees would be better equipped to maintain equal levels of treatment among college departments.

Dr. McKenna pointed out that after publishing this resolution in the February 27 issue of Spectrum, and providing a three-week period for faculty input, the resolution has achieved unanimous support from CFA and close to unanimous support from the Faculty Senate.

After some discussion, it was agreed that Dr. Pat Hyer will perform a minor editorial change to clarify the procedures discussing faculty members accepting or declining severe sanctions imposed upon them.

Discussion will continue at the May 5 UCOUNCIL meeting when the resolution appears for second reading and final vote.

5. Second Reading, Commission on Student Affairs Resolution 96-97A: Availability and Circulation Enhancement of Library Resources. (Returning >from deferral.)

Because of Mr. John Aughenbaugh's illness, Dr. Landrum Cross, Vice President for Student Affairs, presented Commission on Student Affairs Resolution 96-97A: Availability and Circulation Enhancement of Library Resources for second reading and return from deferral. Dr. Cross explained that the resolution is based on the assumption that in order to benefit all library patrons, fines for late returns should be levied on all patrons. He pointed out that at the last UCOUNCIL meeting, Dr. Eileen Hitchingham, dean of the library, requested a deferral back to the Library Committee so that the resolution could be studied in depth. Dean Hitchingham then pointed out additional information including: 1) the Library Committee, after fully considering the issue, decided to vote against the resolution; 2) the Library Committee would provide a substitute resolution to the Commission on Graduate Studies and Procedures and the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Procedures regarding issuing fines for failure to return recall items; 3) the Library Committee would introduce a further measure to study the current fine of 10 cents for overdue materials and whether that fine is effective as a deterrent; and 4) a resolution regarding the amount of fines to be levied would be directed to UCOUNCIL in the fall of 1997.

A motion for the deferred resolution was made, voted upon, and was defeated, with the understanding that the Library Committee would present their substitute resolution to CSA, CGS&P, and CUS&P, and subsequently to University Council for the May 5 meeting.

6. Council approved a packet of commission minutes comprised of:

- Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs, March 18, 1997.
- Commission on Faculty Affairs, March 28, 1997.
- Commission on Outreach, April 4, 1997.
- Commission on Student Affairs, March 27, 1997.
- Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, March 24, 1997.

7. Announcements

• University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning minutes, February 26 and March 12, 1997 were noted (these minutes are for information only).

• Dr. Meszaros thanked everyone for rearranging their busy schedules to attend this make-up UCOUNCIL meeting, and noted that a quorum was present!

• Dr. Meszaros announced that due to popular request, there would be no formal topic of discussion at today's meeting.

• Dr. Meszaros informed UCOUNCIL that the University must submit its final plan for implementation of the University Plan at the August Board of Visitors meeting. Relevant to that presentation, all Tech staff members will receive a document - Envisioning the Future: A Progress Report - which is the report that was presented to the Board of Visitors at the April meeting. Dr. Meszaros told UCOUNCIL that she is seeking their advice on how to structure input for this final phase of the implementation plan. She offered the following suggestions: electronic communication on the Web, commission chairs setting special meetings to discuss the plan, and open forums where people would have the opportunity for input and feedback. She explained that our window of opportunity for input and feedback is very small.



After some discussion, it was decided that instead of electronic communication on the Web, a LISTSERV would be developed for electronic communication, commission chairs would place this issue on their dockets if the opportunity arose, and two open forums would be scheduled for input and feedback.

· At the request of Carole Nickerson, Dr. Meszaros spoke about the peer grouping trip to Richmond. She stated that Virginia Tech's preparation, strategy, and a strong story about why the state of Virginia must have an institution like Virginia Tech were all compelling factors in our victory. Virginia Tech was able to present itself as the research institution for the state, as well as an institution with a very large and capable undergraduate population. Specific items of interest included: 1) We were called in to defend our enrollment projections and to negotiate our new peer grouping set of institutions (which will be used primarily for salary comparisons and for a host of measurements such as performance indicators; 2) Virginia Tech was the second university in the state (JMU was first) to make their presentation; 3) we had about one week's notice to put our strategy and defense together; thus many people worked around the clock in the preparation; 4) Dr. Torgersen, Dr. Meszaros, Mr. Ridenour and Mr. Dwight Shelton were able to defend our enrollment projections and our strategy for restoring the traditional balance of out-of-state students to in-state students; 5) We were able to respond to how our restructuring related to programs and therefore to students; 6) We were able to present our academic eligibility policy as a pro-student, pro-graduation policy and the fact that we have allocated funds and have pilot programs underway to build a stronger infrastructure for student support; 7) With four of us and ten of them, we were able to negotiate our peer groups utilizing our strategy for best positioning Virginia Tech in the most desirable peer grouping with the best parameters for us to maintain our research status in the state and to continue to be the economic engine for the state; 8) Through carefully thought out strategy on our part, we were able to use the list of institutions we chose rather than the list presented to us; 9) Virginia Tech was able to advance itself in terms of faculty salary perspectives; 10) Virginia Tech did have to make three concessions but we were prepared in advance as to which three we would choose - Pennsylvania, Washington, and Florida and our trades were SUNY-Buffalo, Texas A&M, and Nebraska.

Question: Is this peer negotiation permanent? Dr. Meszaros answered "no." It will not be permanent until the State Council of Higher Education takes everything under consideration and issues their final blessing -- probably at their June meeting.

Question: When can we comment on the university thrust areas? Dr. Meszaros replied that she hoped during the open forums discussions would evolve explaining how we going to use those thrust areas, what is actually encapsulated under each one of them, what people's roles will be in specific thrust areas, how long will the thrust areas remain, and questions of this nature.

Question: When will the peer list be reexamined again? Dr. Meszaros replied that the pattern has been to reexamine peer lists about every six years but no one knows for sure.

Question: What will our world be like when Gordon Davies leaves? Dr. Meszaros replied that there is a great deal of speculation and unease existing in the state higher education community about who will emerge in that leadership role and what that role will mean in the future.

Dr. Meszaros adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson  
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, May 5, 1997

Present: B. Bates, E. Blythe, L. Cross, E. Holford, P. Eyre, E. Hitchingham, J. Johnson, P. Meszaros, C. Nickerson, L. Peters, M. Ridenour, R. Smoot, R. Sorensen, J. Osborne (for F. W. Stephenson), A. Swiger, T. Tiller, P. Torgersen, B. Ley, J. McKenna, V. Myers, J. Seiler, M. Smith, N. Spencer, T. Swecker, B. Dyck, C. Goodsell, T. Sherman, A. Snoke (for B. Benoit), C. Carrig, R. Daniel, D. deWolf, R. Goss, F. Gwazdauskas, P. Scanlon, T. Head, N. Phillips, K. Burke (by phone), T. Lawrence, M. Norstedt, and P. Dolezel.

Guests: P. Hyer, Provost Office; J. Fulton, Provost's Office; P. Metz, Faculty Senate; R. Alvarez, Institutional Research; L. Schaefermeyer, CNS; J. Eustis, Information Systems.

#### 1. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion passed.

#### 2. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of April 22, 1997

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the April 22, 1997 University Council meeting had been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System of the GOPHER.

#### 3. First Reading, Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Resolution 96-97B: Regarding Fines for Faculty and Staff Failing to Respond to Recall Requests for Library Items.

Dr. William Ley presented Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Resolution 96-97B: Regarding Fines for Faculty and Staff Failing to Respond to Recall Requests for Library Items for first reading and second reading. He explained that this year the Library Committee has been addressing the problem of library users failing to respond to recall requests when another member of the community requests an item be returned to the library. Dr. Ley noted that the proposed resolution states that all borrowers who fail to respond to a recall request for returned materials should be fined and the fines should be equally applied across the university. The resolution also requests that there be a re-evaluation in the event that the fining procedures and implementation become too onerous or burdensome a task for the Library to handle. If necessary, the implementation procedures will be presented at a subsequent UCOUNCIL meeting in the fall of 1997.

Discussion amongst Council members covered the following areas of interest/concern:

- \* time limits--we will remain with the current practice of two weeks from the time a recall is instituted;
- \* notification--we will remain with the current practice of using mailing addresses instead of e-mail addresses;
- \* magnitude of the problem--approximately 100 recall requests per day; and
- \* distinction between school being in and out of session--currently there is no mechanism in place to substantiate a differential type of recall due to semester terms.

The motion was moved, voted upon, and passed.

#### 4. Second Reading, Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs Resolution 1996-97A: Proposal to Modify the Faculty Handbook

## Policy on Emeritus Status.

Dr. Norrine Spencer, chairperson of CAPFA, presented Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs Resolution 1996-97A: Proposal to Modify the Faculty Handbook Policy on Emeritus Status for second reading. She explained that this resolution was designed to amend the Faculty Handbook language to explicitly specify that senior extension agents are eligible for emeritus status. The motion was moved, voted upon, and passed.

5. Second Reading, Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 1996-97B: Severe Sanctions for Post-Tenure Review and Limitation of Period of Remediation.

Dr. Jim McKenna, chairperson for CFA, presented Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 1996-97B: Severe Sanctions for Post-Tenure Review and Limitation of Period of Remediation for second reading. Dr. McKenna pointed out that this resolution provides the final portion of the post-tenure review process and has received unanimous support from the Commission on Faculty Affairs and near unanimous support from the Faculty Senate. The motion was moved, voted upon, and passed.

6. Council approved a packet of commission minutes comprised of:

- \* Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, February 12, 1997.
- \* Commission on Faculty Affairs, April 11 and April 16, 1997.
- \* Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, March 19, April 2, and April 16, 1997. Dr. Torgersen pointed out that since a quorum did not exist at the April 2 meeting, these minutes can only be offered as information.
- \* Commission on Research, April 9, 1997.
- \* Commission on Student Affairs, April 10, 1997. Dr. Cross, in Mr. Aughenbaugh's absence, pointed out that Board of Visitors student representatives were voted upon at this meeting--Krista Johnson as undergraduate and Michael Herndon as graduate.
- \* Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, April 14 and April 28, 1997.

## 7. Announcements

Dr. Torgersen made the following general comments:

- \* The newly formatted information sessions at University Council have been very useful and informative;
- \* there is a general feeling of good will towards the University by alumni, legislators, and the general public;
- \* the student athletic misbehavior problem, having been addressed forcibly, appears to be under control;
- \* the size of our applicant pool is up significantly compared to last year, both in numbers and in the quality of the overall academic profile; we are providing an opportunity for 302 Corps of Cadets applications and have received 238 to date;
- \* Virginia Tech was able to secure a 4 percent increase for administrative/professional faculty and a 6 percent increase for faculty;
- \* Virginia Tech was successful in securing funding for several capital projects, such as the Advanced Communication and Information Technology Center, when there was almost no funding available;

\* the likelihood of a tax increase, which would be most helpful to state agencies like higher education is highly unlikely; therefore, there is concern that an expansion of higher education in terms of additional funds for salaries will have to come from economic growth but with the same tax rate;

\* the Board of Visitors has mandated a ceiling of 25,000 students;

\* and currently it appears that the Virginia lottery proceeds are part of the general fund and will NOT be redirected towards higher education.

Responding to Dr. Eyre's concern about the quality of commissions' minutes, Dr. Torgersen promised to share the importance of these official University records with the new commission chairs.

Dr. Meszaros and Dr. Fulton spoke to the issue of freshmen retention at Virginia Tech. They explained that in order to comply with our new academic eligibility policy, we will begin to carefully track our returning students from semester to semester. They pointed out that we already know that about 1200 students do not return due to poor grades and, in the case of freshmen, a sense of not feeling involved or connected to the faculty and/or to one another.

Dr. Meszaros invited University Council members to attend the upcoming open forum on the progress report of the implementation plan. She pointed out that comments and advice are sought and are being solicited through several methods in addition to the open forums. The final report will be presented to the Board of Visitors in August, 1997.

#### 8. Information and instructional technology update -- Dr. Erv Blythe.

Dr. Torgersen introduced Dr. Erv Blythe, vice president for Information Systems, who in turn introduced Mr. Richard Alvarez, administrative information systems area; Dr. Tom Head, instructional technology; Dr. Lynn Schaefermeyer who is representing Dr. Judy Lilly, networking services; and Dr. Eileen Hitchingham, dean of the Library.

Dr. Blythe advised University Council that he would present information relative to two categories: 1) issues relative to maintaining the integrity of the current infrastructure in current facilities; and 2) issues related to providing Virginia Tech with information technology which will provide a competitive edge as we move into the future.

#### Integrity of our current infrastructure:

\* Two of the issues relate to hardware--the 3084 and the 3090 mainframe computers, were both quite old, no longer maintained by IBM, and with no parts available. After being warned by IBM of an impending unrecoverable failure, we began the replacement of the 3084 with a new System 390 (not only the 3084 CPU but all its peripherals needed replacing); in the case of the 3090 only the CPU had to be replaced. Together, our staff and IBM's were able to beat the schedule for this work, and bring it in under budget. As of May, both of the newer generation systems will be on-line and operational;

\* our old administrative system cannot handle the year "2000" changeover because we are currently equipped to assign two digits for a year--thus, as of the year 2000, our computer applications will either terminate or provide incorrect results. We will adopt a "replace" strategy rather than a "fix it" strategy, and are seeking state funds to deal with the problem; and

\* serials funding problem resulting from dramatically inflated cost of serials in the past ten years; a task force of key faculty members will

aggressively assess the prospects of going a different route, creating digital network base alternatives to set aside faculty and student needs and to give feedback on the readiness of our faculty to accommodate that process.

Maintaining our ability to compete in a rapidly changing education environment:

- \* the way people learn will change in extraordinary ways over the next several years bringing about changes in the structure of education, in the relationship of universities, K-12 schools, community colleges, and private big industry to each other;

- \* this change is technology-enabled and is about becoming more efficient and effective in the way we deliver instruction;

- \* infrastructure developments that are key to giving Virginia Tech an advantage include:

  - à technology literacy and our faculty development program;

  - à enhancement of the administrative systems environment so we can enable people to do business with Virginia Tech like applying for admissions, financial aid, register for classes, pay their bills, and transact additional business with Virginia Tech without coming to the campus or to Blacksburg;

  - à the human resources system that came on line in January is the first major administrative system in this new environment and it will allow us to interface with network tools like the Web;

  - à our networking Infrastructure where, within three years, many faculty on this campus are going to have powerful teleconferencing capabilities from their workstation and offices enabling them to interact with students and classrooms on this campus and on other campuses throughout the state and the nation;

  - à through various initiatives and our network Virginia infrastructure we are the only university today with access to many key strategic network sites;

  - à \$413,000 in grants were awarded the Center for Innovative Learning to aid and assist faculty in developing courseware and enhancing their courses;

  - à three two-way video distance learning classrooms have been put in place at our Northern Virginia graduate center;

  - à there is ATM access and access with distance education capabilities developed in three classrooms on campus in Whittemore and Randolph Hall at this time; three other classrooms in War Memorial, Cogle, and Major Williams are under construction;

  - à we've upgraded 13 classrooms to enhance the computer presentation capabilities;

  - à there are distance education centers planned and budgeted for in the Northern Virginia Graduate Center, Hampton Roads, Richmond, Alexandria, Leesburg, Roanoke, and Abingdon and by next year these will be on line as distance learning sites;

  - à Mike Williams has worked with a number of key faculty around campus to develop the first computer laboratory that was budgeted for and is intended to support research for our graduate students; they will be equipped with high-end work stations and a visualization theme for each research laboratory with special orientation and capability in terms of serving a researcher's needs; and

à if successful, The Math Emporium, intended to create a different kind of learning environment for supporting mathematics, will be a model for other high volume course offerings desiring the same kind of learning environment.

At the conclusion of the presentation, Dr. Blythe answered several questions regarding the faculty development initiative. He indicated that for the past year or two faculty have had a choice regarding whether they wished to use a Macintosh or a PC. Currently, the faculty is divided in half with the multi-media development faculty leaning towards the Macintosh. Dr. Blythe assured members that we will maintain the ability to support PCs, Unix, and Macintosh operating systems. He also assured members that the faculty will continue to drive their choice, usually selected according to disciplines. Dr. Blythe answered a question about distributed maintenance by indicating that departments will have to pick up the cost of repairing broken machines. He pointed out that the dollars allocated to the faculty development program were basically equipment trust funds, not funds for covering maintenance costs. Although several people were hired at the onset of the Faculty Development Initiative specifically to try and fix some of the simpler kinds of problems, the department has to come up with the money to fix broken machines. Another problem mentioned by UCOUNCIL members is the fact that some faculty offices located in Blacksburg rental areas are not hard-wired yet. Dr. Blythe discussed several of the alternatives being explored regarding this problem.

Dr. Meszaros adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson  
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl