

University Council Minutes

September 21, 1998

Present: Dave Ostroth (for Landrum Cross), Ben Dixon, Don Barber (for Peter Eyre), Rene Rios (for Eileen Hitchingham), Elyzabeth Holford, Bob Schubert (for Paul Knox), Peggy Meszaros, Carole Nickerson, Len Peters, Lisa Wilkes (for Minnis Ridenour), Jean Eversole (for Ray Smoot), Robert Sumichrast (for Rich Sorensen), Charles Steger, Bill Stephenson, Andy Swiger, Tom Tillar, Martin Day (for Jim Burger), Sean Blackburn (for Clyde Harris), Cindy Harrison, Pat Hyer (for Charles Lytton), Robert Tracy, Eugene Brown (for Muzaffer Uysal), Terry Swecker, Deborah Mayo, Bruce Obenhaus (for Paul Metz), Kevin Pelzer, Eliza Tse, Bob Benoit, David de Wolf, Bernard Feldman, Bob Parsons (for Rosemary Goss), Frank Gwazdauskas, John Randolph, John Seiler, Donna Cassell, Anita Haney, Terry Lawrence (for Nancy Phillips), Ben Poe, Peggy Rasnick, Joel Donahue, Aashish Jain, Paul Wagner, Jody Olson, Kathleen Knight

Absent: Bob Bates, Erv Blythe, Greg Brown, Janet Johnson, Paul Torgersen, Richard Bambach, Neal Vines, Skip Fuhrman, Norm Marriott, Sam Hicks, Jamaa Bickley-King, Curtis Lynch, Pete Martens

Guests: David Ford, Bruce Harper, Laurence D. Moore

1. Adoption of Agenda

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

2. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of May 4, 1998

Dr. Meszaros noted that the minutes from the May 4, 1998, University Council meeting have been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System on the WEB.

3. Introductions

Dr. Meszaros shared with members and guests that Dr. Torgersen is in Richmond. Each person present introduced him or her self. Carole Nickerson noted for the minutes that we are adding a new Vice President to the University and to Council. Dr. Benjamin Dixon is Vice President for Multicultural Affairs and will have membership on University Council by virtue of position.

4. First Reading, Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs (CAPFA) Resolution 1998-99A Resolution Concerning Grievance Panels

Pat Hyer reported that CAPFA represents those faculty members at Virginia Tech who are administrative and professional faculty employees such as administrators in Student Affairs, Admissions, or Extension Agents. The Commission has responsibility for managing its own grievances since there is no faculty senate equivalent for this group. A set of procedures was approved several years ago and it is the responsibility of this Commission to manage those grievances. Due to difficulty scheduling grievance panels of five persons, chair, grievant, witnesses and possible legal counsels, the resolution calls for the panel to be reduced from five to three members plus an alternate and a non-voting chair. The resolution also calls for panel members to be nominated by the grievance panel chair from among the administrative and professional faculty at large with consultation of the CAPFA chair and one or more of the ex officio members of CAPFA. This is instead of the current selection from a pre-recruited pool of A/P faculty members who have agreed to serve. Infrequent grievances and some employee turnover have made the pool concept not very functional. Several council members expressed concern in regard to the request to reduce the number of panel members from five to three. Dr. Hyer explained that more than half the members are off campus, some having to drive five hours to be here and five hours back to attend the hearings, creating a multi-day obligation. The difficulty comes when trying to get a date agreeable to all parties. The Commission feels a fair hearing could be held with three panel members, a non-voting chair, and an alternate. This panel hearing is the fourth step to the grievance process. For Extension Agents, the grievance has been heard by the District Director, the Associate Director of Field Operations, and the Dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. When it is appealed to the Provost, she turns to the hearing panel for their recommendation prior to making a decision. It was noted that for teaching and research faculty the panel consists of five members. This resolution will be presented for second reading at the October 5, 1998 University Council meeting.

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

Commission on Administrative & Professional Faculty Affairs, February 18, 1998 Note: Dr. Hyer apologized for the delay in submission of these minutes. In regard to tuition waiver for spouses and dependents, Ben Poe noted that the staff senate has also been actively pursuing this possibility.

Commission on Administrative & Professional Faculty Affairs, March 19, 1998 Clarification of members present, members absent, and guests was requested.

Commission on Administrative & Professional Faculty Affairs, April 16, 1998

Commission on Research, March 25, 1998

Commission on Student Affairs, September 3, 1998

Minutes Withdrawn: Commission on Research, May 7, 1998

Regarding Item # 5, Library Report, a concern was expressed regarding the accuracy of this information as it relates to the library report. Eileen Hitchingham was asked to review this portion of the minutes and the original library report to assure information is accurately reflected in the Commission on Research minutes of May 7. In response to a question about the status of a letter regarding cancellation of serials, the answer was that the letter has been sent out. These minutes will be brought forward at the October 5, 1998, University Council Meeting.

6. For Information Only

It was noted that the minutes of the University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning for March 3, 1998, and April 9, 1998, were distributed for information only. In response to a question about the March 3 minutes, Dr. Meszaros shared with Council that the \$1.50 per credit

hour technology fee is an allowable fee that goes directly to support students. The Provost's office matched the \$191,000 that went to colleges so the colleges have twice this amount. The entire amount went totally to serve university needs as help for students and other related services. In response to questions regarding lab fees, Dr. Meszaros stated that any fees we impose would have to go through our Board of Visitors. Dr. Meszaros suggested that if this is a topic of interest this might be one to put on our list of discussions to get an update on how the freshman computer requirement actually has been implemented, what glitches we may see in it, how we are planning for next year. Many positive comments have been received as to how well and quickly students have been served.

7. Announcements

Publication

Dr. Charles Steger reported that a compilation of articles published in national and local papers about Virginia Tech have been put into a publication that should be out by the end of next week. Also starting last week, a series of commercial television ads began running highlighting accomplishments of Virginia Tech. We have only received accolades about these ads.

Reports from Commission Chairs

Introduction of commission chairs and report from the chairs regarding their activities for the year.

- Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs - Pat Hyer for Charles Lytton

Differential appropriation for merit adjustments in the General Assembly for administrative and professional faculty versus teaching and research faculty.

- Classified Staff Affairs - Cindy Harrison

Will concentrate on the legislation out of Richmond, part of which is Senate Bill # 126, sick leave and disability for classified staff. This will go into effect January 1, 1999.

Governor has appointed a commission to study the pay schedule for classified employees. The Classified Staff Affairs Commission will be following this closely. The 1500-hour employees with no benefits situation will be studied.

- Faculty Affairs - Pat Hyer for Richard Bambach

To explore faculty service rewards and evaluation of service.

Revision of periodic review of department heads and deans.

- Graduate Studies and Policies - Martin Day for Jim Burger

Procedures regarding disputes about membership on graduate student advisory committees and how these disputes are handled. The plan is to form an ad hoc committee to deal with this issue.

Review of graduate catalog.

Several items came out of SACS report that will need to be addressed. Admissions procedures and goals, distance learning programs, review of departments about residency requirements for advance degrees, five requests for new programs at the Northern Virginia Graduate Center.

- Outreach - Terry Swecker

Participate in selection of new Vice Provost for Outreach and continue to work with the individual selected.

Continue to work with other commissions in regard to awarding faculty for service.

- Research - Eugene Brown for Muzaffer Uysal

Review centers and center administrative policies.

Appointment of research faculty and their evaluation of university centers.

Integrating research and teaching.

Finding new ways to address the non-academic needs of graduate students. Perhaps fuller implementation of training future professors. This may be done in conjunction with the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies.

- Student Affairs - Sean Blackburn for Clyde Harris

Attorney General's Task Force on Alcohol Abuse

Student Budget Board

Commissions Membership

Innovated Space Plan

- Undergraduate Studies and Policies - Bob Tracy

Most of the Commissions business is done by the committees that report to the Commission: University Core Curriculum, Undergraduate

Curricula, Athletics, Honor System Review Board, Academic Support, and Academic Policy.

Freshman Rule Policy Review - Ad hoc committee is being chaired by Max Stephenson from Architecture and Urban Studies

Transfer Policy Review - Ad hoc committee being chaired by Norrine Bailey Spencer from College of Business

Academic Eligibility Policy - Undergraduate appeals ad hoc committee will review this.

At meeting last week, Leon Geyer, representative of undergraduate honors system, spoke to Commission regarding increase in reported incidents of cheating especially in regard to computers. The undergraduate honors system will be taking a look at any special policies that may be needed to deal with cheating involving computers.

- o University Support - Carole Nickerson for Neal Vines

More closely define the role of the Commission.

Explore potential relationship between university support and distance learning and technology.

Reminder: Immediately following today's University Council meeting, there will be a workshop for commission chairs and others. The workshop is for those new to the University Governance System, and includes a historical review by Larry D. Moore, minutes preparation by Steven Wilson, how to write effective resolutions by Pat Hyer.

8. Dr. Meszaros adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/sws

Virginia Tech Governance Information

URL: </uc9798/ucm98-09-21.html>

University Council Minutes

October 5, 1998

Present: Greg Brown, Landrum Cross, Ben Dixon, Peter Eyre, Michael Perry (for Janet Johnson), Paul Knox, Peggy Meszaros, Carole Nickerson, Len Peters, Lisa Wilkes (for Minnis Ridenour), Mode Johnson (for Ray Smoot), Robert Sumichrast (for Rich Sorensen), Andy Swiger, Richard Bambach, Jim Burger, Clyde Harris, Spencer Allen (for Cindy Harrison), Charles Lytton, Robert Tracy, Muzzo Uysal, Deborah Mayo, Paul Metz, Kevin Pelzer, Eliza Tse, Bob Benoit, David de Wolf, Bernard Feldman, Rosemary Goss, Frank Gwazdauskas, Sam Hicks, John Randolph, John Seiler, Jamaa Bickley-King, Donna Cassell, Irene Glennon (for Anita Haney), Pete Martens (via phone) Nancy Phillips, Deb Williams (for Ben Poe), Terry Lawrence (for Peggy Rasnick), Joel Donahue, Aashish Jain, Janey Miller (for Paul Wagner), Jody Olson, Kathleen Knight, Duncan Neasham, Laurie Steneck, Sean Blackburn

Absent: Bob Bates, Erv Blythe, Eileen Hitchingham, Elyzabeth Holford, Charles Steger, Bill Stephenson, Tom Tillar, Paul Torgersen, Terry Swecker, Neal Vines, Skip Fuhrman, Norm Marriott, Curtis Lynch

Guests: David Ford, Pat Hyer, Gerry McLaughlin, Valerie Conley

1. Call to Order

Dr. Peggy Meszaros called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and announced that a quorum was present. Dr. Meszaros shared with members and guests that Dr. Torgersen is in Washington.

2. Adoption of Agenda

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

3. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of September 21, 1998

Dr. Meszaros noted that the minutes from the September 21, 1998, University Council meeting have been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System on the WEB.

4. Second Reading, Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs (CAPFA) Resolution 1998-99A Resolution Concerning Grievance Panels

Charles Lytton presented CAPFA Resolution 1998-99A: Resolution Concerning Grievance Panels for second reading. The resolution requests a change from a five person panel to a three person panel in the grievance process for A/P faculty, not to include tenured faculty. A friendly amendment was introduced to delete some of the wording under THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED. The deleted wording includes: ", as is currently the case" and "(Current procedures call for panel members to be selected from a pre-recruited pool of A/P faculty who have agreed to serve on the grievance committee.)" A motion was made and seconded to accept the friendly amendment. A motion to conduct a roll call vote was defeated by a vote of 28 to 7. A motion was made and seconded to accept the resolution with the friendly amendment. The resolution passed.

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

- Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, April 15, 1998.

Minutes Withdrawn:

1. Commission on Research, May 7, 1998 Eileen Hitchingham was not present to clarify a question raised at the September 21 University Council meeting regarding accuracy of information in the original library report. Therefore, minutes were withdrawn by Muzzo Uysal, Chair of the Commission on Research.
2. Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, September 14, 1998 Following a request to specify what committees are being referenced in these minutes, Robert Tracy, Chair of CUS&P, elected to withdraw these minutes until clarification is obtained.

6. Discussion

Dr. Meszaros introduced Gerry McLaughlin and Valerie Conley from Institutional Research and Planning Analysis and David Ford, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, who gave a presentation on the U.S. News Rankings. A "Virginia Tech Executive Summary" of the report was distributed and reviewed with individuals present. Questions and discussion followed. Those who would like to receive a copy of the handout materials should contact Ms. Conley in Institutional Research.

7. Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/sws

University Council Minutes

October 19, 1998

Present: Landrum Cross, Eileen Hitchingham, Mary Ann Lewis (for Janet Johnson), Robert J. Dunay (for Paul Knox), Peggy Meszaros, Carole Nickerson, Len Peters, Lauren Coble (for Minnis Ridenour), Hap Bonham (for Rich Sorensen), Charles Steger, Bill Stephenson, Andy Swiger, Tom Tillar, Richard Bambach, Julia Beamish (for Jim Burger), Clyde Harris, Cindy Harrison, Robert Tracy, Muzzo Uysal, Paul Metz, Bill Ley (for Kevin Pelzer), Bob Benoit, David de Wolf, Rosemary Goss, Frank Gwazdauskas, Sam Hicks, John Randolph, John Seiler, Jamaa Bickley-King, Donna Cassell, Anita Haney, Pete Martens (via phone), Judy Fielder (for Nancy Phillips), Ben Poe, Peggy Rasnick, Joel Donahue, Aashish Jain, Paul Wagner, Jody Olson, Dan Richter (for Kathleen Knight), Duncan Neasham, Laurie Steneck, Sean Blackburn

Absent: Bob Bates, Erv Blythe, Greg Brown, Ben Dixon, Peter Eyre, Elyzabeth Holford, Ray Smoot, Paul Torgersen, Charles Lytton, Terry Swecker, Neal Vines, Skip Fuhrman, Norm Marriott, Deborah Mayo, Eliza Tse, Bernard Feldman, Curtis Lynch

Guests: Wanda Dean, David Ford

1. Call to Order

Dr. Peggy Meszaros called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and announced that a quorum was present. Dr. Meszaros noted that Dr. Torgersen is teaching his class.

2. Adoption of Agenda

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

3. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of October 5, 1998

Dr. Meszaros noted that the minutes from the October 5, 1998, University Council meeting have been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System on the WEB.

4. First Reading, Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Resolution 98-99A Resolution Regarding Offering of Master of Science in Life Sciences

Julia Beamish, representing Jim Burger, presented Resolution 98-99A, Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Resolution Regarding Offering of Master of Science in Life Sciences for first reading. Bill Newton responded to a question raised regarding specialization. Dr. Newton explained the two reasons for undertaking this course. The major one has been dictated by SCHEV who said that the productivity numbers for the individual masters degrees are too low, these programs are endangered and if the numbers do not increase those programs will be eliminated. The master's degree in the four departments is thought of as an integral part of the academic program and part of the academic program that we do not wish to lose as individual departments. The second part is that for the last 20 years there has been a Ph.D. in Life Sciences that has been offered by several of the same departments and has been eminently successful. There has been a high enrollment in that program and the graduates of that program do not suffer at all from any negative aspects of graduating with a Ph.D. in Life Sciences. Dr. Newton reported that we have had 20 years experience with a similar Ph.D. program with no negative effects that we can measure. Dr. Newton responded to a comment regarding this degree not being listed in the catalog and the confusion this may cause. Dr. Newton noted that this has not been a problem with the Ph.D. in Life Sciences degree and feels the chances of misidentification are slim. The relationship between Biology and the programs in Life Sciences are such that the department can recognize when a student applies to the wrong program. A question was raised as to why this was not called "Agriculture and Life Sciences" instead of "Life Sciences." Dr. Newton responded that the MS in Life Sciences was paralleled exactly with the Ph.D. in Life Sciences that was approved 20 years ago. In the past problems with SCHEV have occurred when using the Masters Degree as a fallback masters - someone comes in to finish research early or has been unable to make the grade as a Ph.D. student and allowed to fall back into the masters program. Problems occur when the Ph.D. and Masters Degrees have different titles. If a student is enrolled in a Ph.D. in Life Sciences they could not fall back to a masters degree in biochemistry and nutrition. It was noted that other departments, such as geological sciences, have single degrees at the masters and doctoral levels, yet there are students who are mineralogists, paleontologists, geophysicists and so forth that identify adequately.

Clarification of degrees is sorted out in the admissions process and is not a problem. Concern was raised that this resolution has no mechanism for creating a specialization notation on the degree. A second issue raised concerned the lack of representation by graduate students in the decision making of this resolution. A motion was made by Joel Donahue and seconded to defer this resolution back to the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies so they may 1: consider the option of adding the notation as to the specialty on the degree to parallel the Ph.D. program and 2: seek consultation with the graduate student representatives in those four departments. A handout to clarify the concerns expressed in the motion was distributed by a GSA representative. Dr. Newton reported that in biochemistry there was no response at all to the students being notified of this merger taking place. Dr. Newton also noted that this process started four years ago and the population of graduate students at that time were solicited for their input, plans were explained and it was agreed to go forward. The length of this process is creating some of the problem addressed in this motion. Dr. Newton reported that if something were not done there would be no master's degree. Three of the programs are on the SCHEV endangered list. The response of some of the presidents of the various clubs within these departments has been that they are not happy with this merger and are not happy with losing the specialization notation, but recognize having this degree is better than having no degree at all.

Dr. Newton responded to a question regarding the new degree curriculum as follows: the main difference is there are three core courses that are identified and these core courses will be a requirement of every student in this program. Most students were taking one or two of these core courses anyway. There is a requirement for biochemistry which almost all students took, there is a requirement for statistics which almost all students took, and the third is an information technology course that is being developed specifically for this degree because we believe that information technology is going to be part of everyone's future and would be reasonable for all students to take. The goal is not to increase the load, but still meet the SCHEV requirement of at least nine core hours for a degree. There is no degree in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences that notes the specialization. The specialization is noted on the official transcripts generated for the students. The proposal that is proposed to go forward to SCHEV says: this is the merged degree, these are the core courses, these are the concentrations within that degree (biochemistry, food science and technology, entomology, plant pathology physiology weed science, and two new masters degrees (non thesis, non research degrees) because we think there will be an increased demand for professional degrees to compete within their industries. We are trying

to turn this into an opportunity to get more masters students and to satisfy what we see as an increase demand from industrial professionals for higher degrees. Dr. Meszaros clarified with Bill Newton that the way they propose to handle the specialization designation for this master's degree is parallel to the way it is handled for the Ph.D.; the specialization is not noted on the diploma but is noted on the transcript. Council Member Donahue agreed this would clarify his point regarding specialization; however, this is not made specific in the resolution. Julia Beamish, Graduate Curriculum Committee member, noted that the diploma will say the same thing it says now (Master of Science), it has never had any specialization on the diploma, but has always had it on the transcripts and this is the way we handle the Ph.D.

Dr. Beamish shared that there was discussion with the graduate student representatives at the Commission meeting, and they understood the concern, but the Commission felt it was important for this to go through governance because it was under some timelines in terms of actually losing the program if action was not taken. This proposal has been through all the stages through the departments and colleges. Dr. Len Peters noted that it is fairly common practice across the United States that degrees at the graduate level do not necessarily have specialization noted. The transcript, thesis or dissertation is used to indicate the area of expertise for a particular student. Dr. Newton commented that SCHEV is pushing for a proposal. Dr. Meszaros noted that at the IPAC meeting on September 25, Donna Brodd, Associate Director in charge of academic programs, told all provosts that the State Council will be reviewing all endangered programs and eliminating this year. This is on the schedule to the Board of Visitors in November, which means that if it were approved at each level, something would be in your hands before the first of the year. It was noted that a six-week deferral does not mean we have to wait six weeks. The resolution says the proposal for the masters be approved and forwarded. We have not seen the full proposal although it has been worked through its various groups. The concern is that there are still questions imbedded in the proposal that interested groups feel they have not been properly consulted on. Deferral of the resolution back to the Commission for appropriate consultation with the affected student groups passed by a voted of 24 in favor of the motion, 17 opposed. Therefore the resolution is deferred for a maximum of six weeks. Dr. Meszaros noted that if the resolution is approved at the November 2 meeting there will be time to take it to the Board of Visitors. If not, then negotiations are in order with State Council. Julia Beamish will take this resolution back to the Commission and also keep Dr. Meszaros informed if it is to go forward.

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

- o Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs, September 17, 1998, presented by Donna Cassell for Chair Charles Lytton. In response to a question regarding item six "University Council Meetings," pertaining to Charles Lytton's attendance at University Council, Ms. Cassell noted this was for one meeting only. In response to a question regarding "A/P Extension Faculty Salary Review of Peer Institutions" and the statement "Individual and specific information about the 17 institutions cannot be made available to the public," Ms. Cassell noted that a number of institutions asked that their information not be released publicly attaching their name to the salary information, but could be presented in averages, statistics and summaries.
- o Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, September 9, 1998, presented by Chair Cindy Harrison.
- o Commission on Faculty Affairs, September 11, 1998, presented by Chair Richard Bambach.
- o Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, September 16, 1998, presented by Vice Chair Julia Beamish for Chair Jim Burger. A request was made to submit minutes in a different format to make them easier to receive.
- o Commission on Research, May 7, 1998 (resubmitted with clarification), presented by Chair Muzzo Uysal, who called on Eileen Hitchingham to clarify a concern raised at the September 21 University Council meeting regarding Item #5, Library Report, and the accuracy of these minutes as it relates to the library report. Dr. Hitchingham shared a chart that makes it appropriate to accept the minutes from the Commission on Research. In response to a question Dr. Hitchingham commented that due to the limited staff this also limits differentiation and specialization by discipline.
- o Commission on Student Affairs, September 17, 1998, presented by Chair Clyde Harris. Sean Blackburn responded to a question regarding Item C under New Business, "increasing the student membership on the Commission." Mr. Blackburn explained they are looking at the issue of who is on the Commission and whether or not more student votes should be added. This is just a suggestion at this point.
- o Commission on Student Affairs, October 1, 1998, presented by Chair Clyde Harris.
- o Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies (amended), September 14, 1998, presented by Chair Bob Tracy. Dr. Tracy noted that the reason these minutes were tabled at the last meeting was because of some incomplete wording in the section on Other Business. These minutes have been amended to clarify the unnamed committee referred to in the minutes as the University Core Curriculum Committee.
- o Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, September 24, 1998, presented by Chair Bob Tracy. Dr. Tracy confirmed the accuracy of the length of time noted in the minutes of this meeting. For clarification, the 4984, Special Study: Research Presentation, Area 1 (WI), fall 1998 approval is for one time writing intensive.

6. Discussion

Dr. Meszaros introduced Wanda Dean, University Registrar, to provide an update on the implementation status of the resolution to establish the 15-minute class breaks on Monday-Wednesday-Friday. Ms. Dean handed out and reviewed the Timeline of Approval of Change in Scheduling M, W, F Classes, University Registrar Update of Status of Implementation, and Implementation Timeline. Presidential Policy 177 went through two readings at University Council. This was a policy that was supported by the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies and was not supported by the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies. Once brought to University Council it was not approved until amended. The Policy was passed with the effective date of fall 1998. At that time we were sure this deadline could not be met and in fact it could not, Ms. Dean reported. Dr. John Seiler expressed a concern that at the time the policy was passed it was not made known that the implementation date of Fall 1998 was not possible. In December 1997 Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies endorsed and University Council agreed to move the deadline to fall 2000. This is to coincide with the new system coming up and give time to deliberate different alternatives to how to implement the 15 minutes between classes on M,W,F. Fall 1998 is being used as the baseline and this will be presented to the departmental schedulers (typically a faculty member in the department). Ms. Dean will work with them individually and as a group and take suggestions to see what is the best solution. Consensus has to come by March 1999, to build course offerings in the fall of 1999 and consider how to build new system. After speaking with the schedulers and getting some consensus on how to proceed, she will report back to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies and University Council. Concern was expressed that students cannot get from some classes to others in ten minutes. It was suggested that some of the money from technology fees be used for this project. Ms. Dean responded that the software has already been purchased. The concern at this point is not the purchase of software, but sufficient classrooms and course offerings. Ms. Dean assured the members that this is a much more complex issue than just changing the time between classes. At this time three approaches are being modeled as a baseline and being

presented to departmental schedulers no later than December of 1998 to bring all of this to conclusion in March 1999.

7. Adjournment

Dr. Meszaros adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/sws

Virginia Tech Governance Information

URL: </uc9798/ucm98-10-19.html>

University Council Minutes

November 2, 1998

Present: Joe Merola (for Bob Bates), Richard Alvarez (for Erv Blythe), Landrum Cross, Ben Dixon, Peter Eyre, Donald Kenney (for Eileen Hitchingham), Elyzabeth Holford, Janet Johnson, Paul Knox, Carole Nickerson, John Eaton (for Len Peters), Minnis Ridenour, Ray Smoot, Hap Bonham (for Rich Sorensen), Charles Steger, Tom Tillar, Paul Torgersen, Richard Bambach, Jim Burger, Clyde Harris, Cindy Harrison, Pat Hyer (for Charles Lytton), Robert Tracy, Muzzo Uysal, Nicolaus Tideman, Terry Swecker, Wayne Durham, Paul Metz, Kevin Pelzer, Bob Benoit, David de Wolf, Bernard Feldman, Rosemary Goss, Bennet Cassel (for Frank Gwazdauskas), Sam Hicks, John Seiler, Lane Rasmussen (for Anita Haney), Nancy Phillips, Ben Poe, Terry Lawrence (for Peggy Rasnick), Joel Donahue, Janey Miller (for Aashish Jain), Paul Wagner, Jody Olson, Duncan Neasham, Laurie Steneck, Sean Blackburn

Absent: Greg Brown, Peggy Meszaros, Bill Stephenson, Andy Swiger, Skip Fuhrman, Norm Marriott, Deborah Mayo, Eliza Tse, John Randolph, Jamaa Bickley-King, Donna Cassell, Curtis Lynch, Pete Martens, Kathleen Knight

Guests: Dianna Benton, Susan Bright, Ron Daniel, David Ford, John Husser, Bill Newton

1. Call to Order

Dr. Paul Torgersen called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and announced that a quorum was present.

2. Adoption of Agenda

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

3. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of October 19, 1998

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the October 19, 1998, University Council meeting have been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System on the WEB.

4. Second Reading, Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Resolution 98-99A Resolution Regarding Offering of Master of Science in Life Sciences

Dr. Torgersen noted that it is his understanding that it would be very helpful if this resolution could be brought to the Board of Visitors on November 9, 1998, to meet a SCHEV deadline set for January. Dr. Burger noted that the resolution was deferred back to the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies. The resolution was reviewed and the concerns of the graduate students were addressed. Jim Burger made a motion seeking approval of Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1998-99A by University Council. The motion was seconded. Joel Donahue expressed his appreciation for all those involved in this very constructive process. John Eaton addressed a question concerning the possibility of confusion between biological sciences and life science degree programs. Dr. Eaton responded that this does not seem to have caused problems in the past. Bill Newton added that there has been a merged PhD program for almost 20 years and students do not get mixed up coming into biochemistry or food science versus biology. Dr. Newton thanked Joel Donahue, the Graduate Student Assembly representatives, and the graduate student representatives in each of the four departments for helping in this process. The Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, Resolution 1998-99A, Regarding Offering of Master of Science in Life Sciences passed unanimously.

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

- o Commission on Faculty Affairs, September 25, 1998, presented by Chair Richard Bambach.
- o Commission on Faculty Affairs, October 9, 1998, presented by Chair Richard Bambach. Dr. Bambach responded to a question the regarding passport charge. This is a minor issue, which has to do with recreational sports requiring dependents who are over 16 to have a passport, which costs \$15.00. The question is why a charge is being imposed for something that has been free. Minnis Ridenour commented that \$15.00 is the cost of processing the card.
- o Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, October 7, 1998, presented by Chair Jim Burger.
- o Commission on Research, September 9, 1998, presented by Chair Muzzo Uysal.
- o Commission on Student Affairs, October 15, 1998, presented by Chair Clyde Harris.

6. Announcements

- o Dr. Torgersen is on a speaking tour across the state for the Alumni Association, meeting with alumni chapters and civic organizations. Legislators and high school teachers are invited to attend. The turnout has been good. This is an attempt to get the Virginia Tech message out and to provide a status report on instructional technology and how this is changing the way we teach. He will visit 16-18 chapters this year.
- o The Board of Visitors will meet on Sunday and Monday. There are two new board appointees. One issue for this meeting is a set of recommendations out of the Office of Student Affairs that will address the issue of alcohol and health hazards associated with alcohol. A question was raised regarding an article in the Colletiate Times that listed Virginia Tech as number one in the country for drinking the most. Landrum Cross responded that this information is incorrect and was called to the attention of the Collegiate Times.
- o A question was raised regarding the Governor's interest in Foundations. Dr. Torgersen responded that he is not sure why there is an interest.

7. Discussion

Dr. Ron Daniel distributed and reviewed a handout regarding the computer requirement update. The update included: summer orientation,

freshman move-in/ResConn, training, computer sales, assessment, and 1998-99 computer requirement committee. Dr. Daniel recognized Greg Kroll, Erv Blythe and Wayne Donald who organized a task force that put together the work teams. Others instrumental in this process are: Dianna Benton, Coordinator of Computer Requirement; John Husser, Music Department Head and Chair of workgroup that coordinated the baseline hardware and software specifications; Susan Bright, AIS, handled the move in. Students (135) were trained to help over 2,600 students get hooked up. This year the Computer Requirement Committee will replace the Task Force and will include six subcommittees: specifications subcommittee, training and support, vendor relations, curriculum and course issues, ownership and access, and communications.

In response to a question regarding connection issues that will come in the next three years as students move off campus, Dr. Daniel commented that the basic Virginia Tech modem pool has been expanded and that we need to wait and see which way students are going to connect. Ms. Benton commented that many of the apartment complexes are moving to ethernet based connections. Some apartments have connections, some do not. A comment was also made that this is an issue that cannot be ignored. Susan Bright noted that the help desk answered 6,000 questions about modem connections. Ms. Bright noted that we are looking at the possibility of getting residential computer consultants in some of the apartment complexes. One concern is the liability issue of making "house calls."

Regarding the issue of access, a question was raised about our ability to capture how successful students were in getting scholarships to cover computer cost? Dr. Daniel shared his larger concern about students who may never have applied because of the additional cost. John Husser noted that this was discussed with Financial Aid and agreed that scholarships for computer purchases need to be included in the financial aid package. There is data that can be run to get answers to these questions.

There was no available information regarding the Town of Blacksburg possibly taking on fiber optics.

Can we go to Bell Atlantic or some of the internet service providers and let them bid for a student rate? Dr. Daniel replied that the training and support subcommittee would be the group to handle this.

Will the new building on campus make a difference in the way we do business with students? Dr. Daniel responded that it should have an impact, but not a giant impact.

A concern was expressed concerning the need for computer assistance for faculty. Dr. Torgersen commented that his best help comes from students. Dr. Daniel shared that Wake Forest has a highly successful program that does not cost them a lot of money where they connect students with faculty, similar to a work-study program. 4-Help is also available for faculty.

8. Adjournment

Dr. Torgersen adjourned the meeting at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/sws

Virginia Tech Governance Information

URL: [/uc9798/ucm98-11-02.html](#)

University Council Minutes

December 7, 1998

Present: Myra Gordon (for Bob Bates), A. H. Moore (for Erv Blythe), Greg Brown, Ben Dixon, John C. Lee (for Peter Eyre), Janet Johnson, Paul Knox, Peggy Meszaros, Carole Nickerson, E. F. Brown (for Len Peters), Laurie Coble (for Minnis Ridenour), Rich Sorensen, Bill Stephenson, Tom Tillar, Richard Bambach, Jim Burger, Cindy Harrison, Pat Hyer (for Charles Lytton), Jay Sullivan (for Robert Tracy), Muzzo Uysal, Nicolaus Tideman, Terry Swecker, Bruce Obenhaus (for Paul Metz), Kevin Pelzer, Bob Benoit, David de Wolf, Bernard Feldman, Rosemary Goss, Frank Gwazdauskas, Shep Zedaker (for John Seiler), Pete Martens, Nancy Phillips, Ben Poe, Joel Donahue, Jody Olson, Duncan Neasham, Kathleen Knight, Laurie Steneck, Sean Blackburn, Landrum Cross

Absent: Eileen Hitchingham, Elyzabeth Holford, Ray Smoot, Charles Steger, Andy Swiger, Paul Torgersen, Clyde Harris, Wayne Durham, Skip Fuhrman, Norm Marriott, Deborah Mayo, Eliza Tse, Sam Hicks, John Randolph, Jamaa Bickley-King, Donna Cassell, Anita Haney, Curtis Lynch, Peggy Rasnick, Aashish Jain, Paul Wagner

Guests: Dixon Hanna, Larry Hincker, Bill Tranter

1. Call to Order

Dr. Peggy Meszaros called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and announced that a quorum was present.

2. Adoption of Agenda

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

3. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of November 2, 1998

Dr. Meszaros noted that the minutes from the November 2, 1998, University Council meeting have been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System on the WEB.

4. First Reading, Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1998-99B, Resolution Regarding Offering of a Masters Degree in Information Technology

Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Chair Jim Burger presented Resolution 1998-99B for first reading. In response to a question regarding the starting date of fall 1998 as indicated in the resolution, Dr. Burger noted that the last sentence of the resolution will be removed and an edited resolution will be forthcoming.

Bill Tranter gave an overview of this resolution. Information has been distributed via a web page and open houses for potential students have been held which 122 students attended. Instructions for applying to the program are on the web page. Once a student applies, the faculty looks at the application and makes a judgement. A number of faculty members from Blacksburg and Northern Virginia in the three units that are developing the program are involved in this process. This is a non-thesis degree. The program grew from a number of studies that were performed in Northern Virginia and elsewhere indicating the need for more activity in the area of information technology. The Blueprint for Virginia and a number of SCHEV reports spoke to the need for this program.

The basic characteristics of the program: designed for the practicing professional, it has a degree and non-degree component. The program is developed into a number of modules, which students can take for continuing education credit or they can combine a number of modules and apply for a masters degree in information technology. It is a joint program operated under engineering, arts and sciences, and business. Day to day operations are conducted through a steering committee with approximately 3 members from each of the 3 units that have been involved in the program for approximately 18 months. Bill Tranter chairs the steering committee. There is representation from electrical and computer engineering, computer science, and business. The entire group meets every Thursday. The program consists of six modules: communications, networking, computer engineering - courses are contributed by electrical and computer engineering department; software development - courses are contributed by computer science; business information systems, decision support systems - courses are contributed by Pamplin College of Business.

In most cases, background work is needed before students can enter the technical material that constitutes the modules. There are six hours of foundation work that can be tailored to the student depending upon the modules that that student wishes to pursue for that degree. To obtain a degree in this program students complete 3 of the modules of 7 1/2 semester units each for a total of 22 1/2 semester units. They combine with this 6 1/2 units of foundation work for a total of 28 1/2. The last course is 1 1/2 semester units that is tailored to the specific student and could be a series of seminars, a paper, a special project, or an individual investigation.

This project has come together over an 18 month period with collaboration of all three departments and three colleges involved. Completion of any one of the six modules will allow a student to get a certificate. There is no residency requirement for a master's degree. At this time the degree is only given at the Northern Virginia Center. This is done through the Commonwealth Campus. In response to a question, Dr. Pat Hyer explained that if approved, this matter will go to the Board of Visitors in February and then to SCHEV.

Dr. Tranter noted that there is flexibility to add new modules. The steering committee is currently working on mechanisms by which departments who wish to propose additional modules may do so. An infrastructure would be set up by which students will be evaluated and determined appropriate or not appropriate to the program. Mechanisms are being developed where students can obtain the material and the foundation courses through web-based activities. The need to take background coursework before taking the modules will depend upon the background of the student.

Dixon Hanna applauded the efforts of Dr. Tranter, the committee and the colleges involved for their efforts, noting that this is about the fastest that Virginia Tech has listened to the marketplace, put a fairly sophisticated program together, and brought it this far so quickly. Bill Stephenson commented that he feels this program is incredibly important for our presence in information technology. Rich Sorensen commented that this comes forward with the enthusiastic support of the Pamplin College faculty. Dr. Meszaros noted that this resolution will come back for second reading at the January 18 University Council Meeting with the editorial change.

5. Council approved a packet of Commission minutes comprised of: Approval of the Collective Commission Minutes.

- Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs, October 15, 1998, presented by Pat Hyer for Charles Lytton.
- Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, October 14, 1998, presented by Cindy Harrison.
- Commission on Faculty Affairs, October 23, 1998, presented by Richard Bambach.
- Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, October 21, 1998, presented by Jim Burger.
- Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, November 4, 1998, presented by Jim Burger. In response to a question about where are we with the residency requirement, Dr. Burger commented that this is still being deliberated and we are about a month or two away from a recommendation.
- Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, November 18, 1998, presented by Jim Burger.
- Commission on Research, October 14, 1998, presented by Muzzo Uysal.
- Commission on Student Affairs, November 5, 1998, presented by Sean Blackburn for Clyde Harris.
- Commission on Student Affairs, November 19, 1998, presented by Sean Blackburn for Clyde Harris. A request for clarification of "committee" under III. Committee Reports, B. Sean Blackburn accepted the editorial correction to read "ad hoc committee on membership."
- Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, October 12, 1998, presented by Jay Sullivan for Bob Tracy. Mention was made that James Yardley was listed as both present and absent. Through Jay Sullivan this will be brought to the attention of the Commission and clarification will be brought to the attention of University Council. The importance of SGA attendance at the commission meetings was mentioned. SGA representatives appreciated Council bringing this to their attention and assured Council that the matter will be addressed.
- Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, November 9, 1998, presented by Jay Sullivan for Bob Tracy.
- Commission on University Support, October 15, 1998, presented by Nicolaus Tideman.

6. For Information Only

Dr. Meszaros noted that the minutes of the University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning for May 7, 1998, June 11, 1998, and August 13, 1998, were distributed for information only. A concern was raised in regard to the delay of these minutes reaching Council. Dr. Meszaros will address this at the next meeting of the University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning and ask that the minutes be submitted in a more rapid fashion.

7. Announcements

There being no announcements, the meeting proceeded to the next item of business.

8. Discussion

Larry Hincker, Associate Vice President for University Relations, gave a presentation on the university's recent ad campaign and public response. This campaign grew from a need to help people understand the nature of a research university. It was felt that Virginia Tech's specific accomplishments need to be communicated, to demonstrate the value of faculty research, to share the impact of research on our community and society, then position Virginia Tech as a place that has real world impacts. The strategy was to reach key opinion leaders through an advertising campaign.

Ads are being broadcast in the areas of Roanoke, Tidewater, Richmond and Washington, DC. By reaching these four television markets, we reach 91% of all Virginians. There was also time bought on ABC and NBC affiliates. A heavy campaign began the week of September 7, two weeks off, a light campaign began October 12, one week off, light campaign November 2, another heavy campaign during Thanksgiving week.

The media goal with these ads is that 90% of the targeted audience would have seen the ads 5 times. Programming is very heavy in news, a little in prime time, and some sports. Advertising is done so there is complete control of the message and traditional gatekeepers (newspaper reporters, someone presenting information to key committees or councils, editorials in newspaper) can be bypassed.

Advertising is an opportunity to distill extraordinarily complex topics in a simple easily understood manner. The creative approach is to identify three of seven cross cutting initiatives - information technology, biotechnology and learning communities. To communicate these 4 - 15 second television spots, they are shown by themselves or two back-to-back for a 30 second spot, or as bookends - 15 second Virginia Tech spot, 30 seconds for other ad and another 15 second Virginia Tech spot.

There has been a very positive response. From a telephone poll 7 out of 10 people said they saw the ads. Summer Productions out of Alexandria produced the ads. In a 15 second ad every word had to count. \$50,000 was spend on the production. The buy was \$267,000. These ads were shown during televised Virginia Tech games this year. It was noted that these ads were seen in Kansas through ESPN. There are focus groups to determine if these ads should be shown during shows students watch.

9. Adjournment

Dr. Meszaros adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/sws

Virginia Tech Governance Information

URL: [/uc9899/ucm98-12-07.html](#)

University Council Minutes

January 18, 1999

Present: Judy Lilly (for Bob Bates), Greg Brown, Landrum Cross, Ben Dixon, Peter Eyre, Eileen Hitchingham, Elyzabeth Holford, Dianne Yardley (for Janet Johnson), Ellen Braaten (for Paul Knox), Peggy Meszaros, Carole Nickerson, John Eaton (for Len Peters), Lisa Wilkes (for Minnis Ridenour), Rich Sorensen, Bill Stephenson, Andy Swiger, Tom Tillar, Paul Torgersen, Richard Bambach, Jim Burger, Madonna Mendoza, Cindy Harrison, Pat Hyer (for Charles Lytton), Robert Tracy, Muzzo Uysal, Bruce Obenhaus (for Nicolaus Tideman), Skip Fuhrman, Deborah Mayo, Paul Metz, Kevin Pelzer, Bernard Feldman, Sam Hicks, John Randolph, John Seiler, Jamaa Bickley-King, Lane Rasmussen (for Anita Haney), Pete Martens, Ben Poe, Peggy Rasnick, Joel Donahue, Aashish Jain, Paul Wagner, Jody Olson, Duncan Neasham, Sean Blackburn

Absent: Erv Blythe, Ray Smoot, Charles Steger, Terry Swecker, Wayne Durham, Norm Marriott, Eliza Tse, Bob Benoit, David de Wolf, Rosemary Goss, Frank Gwazdauskas, Donna Cassell, Curtis Lynch, Nancy Phillips, Kathleen Knight, Laurie Steneck,

Guests: David Ford, Bill Tranter

1. Call to Order

Dr. Paul Torgersen called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. and announced that a quorum was present.

2. Adoption of Agenda

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

3. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of December 7, 1998

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the December 7, 1998, University Council meeting have been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System on the WEB.

4. Second Reading

Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1998-99B, Resolution Regarding Offering of a Masters Degree in Information Technology

Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Chair Jim Burger presented Resolution 1998-99B for second reading. A motion was made and seconded to approve this resolution.

Bill Tranter gave an overview of this resolution. This is a modular program consisting of six modules Three modules (communications, networking and computer engineering) are supported by the department of electrical and computer engineering. One module (software development) is represented by the department of computer science. Two modules (business information systems and decision support systems) are supported and will be taught by the Pamplin College of Business. The completion of a masters degree requires the successful completion of three of the six modules plus appropriate foundation work and a wrap up course at the end.

The resolution passed unanimously.

5. Approval of the Collective Commission Minutes.

Council approved a packet of Commission minutes comprised of:

- o Commission on Student Affairs, December 3, 1998, presented by Chair Madonna Mendoza.
- o Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, October 12, 1998. These minutes were approved at the December 7, 1998 University Council Meeting. As a point of clarification, Chair Bob Tracy confirmed that James Yardley was in attendance at the October 12 Commission meeting.

6. For Information Only

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes of the University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning for October 8 and November 12, 1998, were distributed for information only.

7. Announcements

Dr. Torgersen shared with Council that he met with Anne Whitemore with McGuire Woods Battle and Boothe and member of State Council. She was very complimentary of our graduate degree program proposal in computer engineering and said it was the most carefully prepared document of degree program proposal she has seen since she came on board. This reflects well on the whole university.

Updates on Semester Agenda from Commission Chairs

Reports from the Commission Chairs regarding their activities for the year.

Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs (CAPFA), Pat Hyer for Chair Charles Lytton. CAPFA is considering a resolution that modifies the faculty family sick leave policy. Currently we have six days per year and no more than three days per incident under paid sick leave that can be applied toward care of a family member who is ill or due to death in the family. The resolution refers to ten days of paid leave during the year for the care of a family member and no limit per incident. This resolution will affect the Commission on Faculty Affairs.

Classified Staff Affairs (CCSA), Chair Cindy Harrison. CCSA does not plan to bring any resolutions forward this year. They will be getting information from Richmond and trying to determine the best way to share it with employees. The Commission is looking at a number of benefits for employees and trying to stay on top of legislative issues.

Faculty Affairs (CFA), Chair Richard Bambach. CFA has one item which may eventually get to University Council related to the changing nature of the campus and its off-campus work. This may involve a small modification in the faculty handbook to suggest that faculty be consulted in advance before being assigned to off-campus teaching. There has been at least one time this has become an issue that could not be resolved very well by the faculty review committee because there was no policy regarding this type of assignment. A survey of the faculty senate has just been completed on the attitudes and perceptions on how service is evaluated.

Graduate Studies and Policies (CGS&P), Chair Jim Burger. Two resolutions have been brought forward so far this year. CGS&P is currently working on an item which deals with residency requirements for Ph.D. students at extended campuses. Another issue deals with ownership of intellectual materials in thesis and dissertations. At this point, Virginia Tech's policy is that the graduate student owns the information. There is some concern about this policy. An additional item relates to joint degrees.

Outreach (CO), Peter Eyre for Chair Terry Swecker. Things have been quiet this past semester. With the appointment of the new Vice Provost for Outreach it may become more active.

Research (COR), Chair Muzzo Uysal. Last semester COR meetings were informative and focused more on exchanging ideas. The Commission is positioning itself to be supportive of all research initiatives on campus and "expect" the administration to support the outcome of those initiatives. We will continue our discussion on this as different university initiatives, including Cross-Cutting Initiatives, start converging. On Saturday the 16th of January, with Dr. Brown's initiation some COR members attended the Cross-Cutting Initiatives workshop. Discussion on this will likely happen at future COR meetings. Based on our pre-commission and commission meetings, Dr. Brown's several productive meetings and talks with the Dean of Library, Dr. Hitchingham, there is a possibility that COR may have a joint resolution on "library resources" with the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policy (CGS&P) this semester. The following centers will be reviewed: Center for Wireless Technology (CWT), Center for Composite Materials and Structures (CCMS). The review committees for these centers have already been established by Dr. Reifsnider's office. Reviews holding over from last year are also being finalized and will be presented to the Commission this semester. These include: Gerontology, Interdisciplinary Center for Applied Mathematics (ICAM), and Virginia Water Resources Research Center.

Student Affairs (CSA), Chair Madonna Mendoza. CSA is preparing to bring in more speakers - one to address campus and classroom climate. Most of the speakers have been suggested by the students to discuss topics students would like further information on before the end of the year. Two committees, Judicial Affairs Review and Ad hoc Membership, are still in research stages and recommendations should be forthcoming.

Undergraduate Studies and Policies (CUS&P), Chair Bob Tracy. Most of the work of CUS&P is accomplished through five on-going standing committees which are: Committee on Undergraduate Curricula, University Core Curriculum Committee, Library Committee, Athletic Committee, Academic Support. In addition, three ad hoc policy reviews are to be completed this semester which include: Review of Freshman Rule Policy, Review of Transfer Student Policy, and a Review of Academic Eligibility Policy. The Freshman Rule Policy Review Committee is due to finish its work the end of January. The Academic Eligibility Policy Review is being done by associate deans and chaired by John White and will be finishing by the end of January. The Transfer Student Policy Review, chaired by Norrine Bailey Spencer will be finishing in March.

University Support (CUS), Bruce Obenhaus for Chair Nicolaus Tideman. CUS has gotten themselves up and running and have had presentations on the campus master plan and buildings and facilities. Upcoming for the Commission and its Committee: through the committee on computing they will be talking about network securities. The transportation and parking committee has just finished a parking survey - once the survey is evaluated some information will be forthcoming. CUS will be exploring the cost of communication on campus.

Remarks by Dr. Torgersen

Dr. Torgersen will go to Washington tomorrow to a reception for our congressional delegation. This event was initiated four or five years ago and is scheduled the same day the President gives his State of the Union Address. More recently Virginia Commonwealth University jointly hosts this reception with Virginia Tech. The reception is held in the Rayburn Building and includes our Virginia Delegation and all of their aides. There is a very large turnout including members of the Board of Visitors. This is a good opportunity for lobbying. Dr. Torgersen will spend some time in Richmond. The Agriculture Community, including the College of Agriculture, hosts a very large reception/banquet that attracts a large turnout of legislators. This is well done every year. The next morning Virginia Tech hosts a legislative breakfast (last Thursday) for our delegates, graduates of Virginia Tech about 13 or 14, plus friends of Virginia Tech for a total of about 20 people. One-on-one contacts begin in earnest later this week and extend over the next two weeks. In a couple of weeks we will host jointly with the University of Virginia a reception for legislators prior to the Tech/UVA basketball game which is scheduled in Richmond this year. We have a list of amendments we are proposing to add to the Governor's budget recommendations. We were successful with the appropriation that the Governor added for the Advanced Communication and Information Technology Building. This came in at an estimated cost of \$25 million, half appropriated by the Commonwealth of Virginia, the other half raised from private sources. The bid actually was \$27 million creating a \$2 million gap. The Governor has recommended that this \$2 million gap be funded by the state. We have some other capitol projects as well as some operating budget increases we would like to see. We will work these one at a time with key legislators. This short session is over late in February. In response to a question regarding how the proposed reduction in sales tax will affect higher education, Dr. Torgersen responded that this will impact all state agencies in that there is less money available. It will impact us. The tuition reduction of 20% will be great for parents. This is being funded out of the budget surplus and does not bring any new revenue to the university. On campus, we just completed a diversity summit by Ben Dixon and Barbara Pendergrass, very well done.

8. Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/s/ws

University Council Minutes

February 15, 1999

Present: Greg Brown, Landrum Cross, Peter Eyre, Eileen Hitchingham, Janet Johnson, Paul Knox, Carole Nickerson, Lisa Wilkes (for Minnis Ridenour), Jean Eversole (for Ray Smoot), Rich Sorensen, Bill Stephenson, Andy Swiger, Paul Torgersen, Richard Bambach, Jim Burger, Madonna Mendoza, Cindy Harrison, Pat Hyer (for Charles Lytton), Robert Tracy, Muzzo Uysal, Nicolaus Tideman, Terry Swecker, Wayne Durham, Paul Metz, Kevin Pelzer, David de Wolf, Joann Boles (for Rosemary Goss), Frank Gwazdauskas, Carola Haas (for John Seiler), Donna Cassell, Anita Haney, Nancy Phillips, Ben Poe, Joel Donahue, Paul Wagner, Jody Olson, Duncan Neasham, Kathleen Knight, Natalie Wilson,

Absent: Bob Bates, Erv Blythe, Ben Dixon, Elyzabeth Holford, Peggy Meszaros, Len Peters, Charles Steger, Tom Tillar, Skip Fuhrman, Norm Marriott, Deborah Mayo, Eliza Tse, Bob Benoit, Bernard Feldman, Sam Hicks, John Randolph, Jamaa Bickley-King, Curtis Lynch, Pete Martens, Peggy Rasnick, Aashish Jain, Sean Blackburn

Guests: David Ford

1. Call to Order

Dr. Paul Torgersen called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and announced that a quorum was present.

2. Adoption of Agenda

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

3. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of January 18, 1999

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the January 18, 1999, University Council meeting have been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System on the WEB. (/)

4. First Reading, Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1998-99C, Resolution Regarding Committee Approval of Theses and Dissertations

Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Chair Jim Burger presented Resolution 1998-99C for first reading.

Chair Burger shared that the resolution removes the option of a committee member to include a written dissenting opinion that is to be bound with the theses or dissertation. Marty Day, Chair of the Committee on Degree Requirements, Standards, Criteria and Academic Policies for the Commission, gave background on discussions regarding this resolution. This resolution changes the printed policy in the catalog that currently appears on page 26 of the Graduate Catalog. The first sentence states it requires unanimous approval and the last sentence states it does not require unanimous approval. The existing policy statement in the catalog will be changed. It also removes the provision that allows dissenting members of the theses or dissertation committees to have a letter bound with the theses or dissertation. This resolution will assure that the published copies of the students' theses or dissertations, both electronic and the copy on university microfilm, adequately record which faculty members approved and which might not have approved. The Graduate School has received in the past some inquiries about the policy of binding letters of dissent. There is no recollection of this being done before. Therefore the sub-committee was asked to consider the policy and decide if it is appropriate. The sub-committee's feeling is that the policy of binding letters of dissent is not appropriate. If a committee member has a concern about a student's thesis or dissertation work, it is hoped that this will be discussed with the student and the advisory committee at an early stage to resolve this constructively. There are times that a committee member has a concern that is not shared by the entire committee and the committee cannot convince their faculty colleague to share their view. This is the reason for the last two phrases of the resolution, to ensure that dissent is duly recorded and is visible to anyone who looks at copies of published theses or dissertations. The sub-committee did not feel, however, that the published dissertation or thesis is the place for the debate that took place within the committee. The only dissent recorded is with the signature. The Electronic Theses and Dissertation Committee is working on the actual technical recording of a signature. In response to a question regarding whether or not a letter of dissent would be available for viewing in the future, Dr. Day noted that nothing in the resolution resolves this issue. Dr. Bambach commented that the resolution is appropriate and that in published journals, dissenting reviewers' comments are not published with the paper, but are recorded as comments, and comments and replies are published. In response to a question regarding the policy of other universities, Dr. Day responded that of the universities reviewed, a vast majority has no written policy to allow the publishing of the dissenting comments with the theses or dissertations. In response to a question regarding having no dissenting votes, Dr. Day responded that this is not an issue with this resolution and the idea of no dissenting votes is just being pondered. It was noted that there are very few dissenting votes, possibly a couple out of hundreds, and not all of these are cases where the faculty member feels a need to bind a letter.

5. Approval of the Collective Commission Minutes. Council approved a packet of Commission minutes comprised of:

- o Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs December 17, 1998, presented by Pat Hyer for Chair Charles Lytton
- o Commission on Classified Staff Affairs December 9, 1998, presented by Chair Cindy Harrison
- o Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies December 2, 1998, presented by Chair Jim Burger
- o Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies January 20, 1999, presented by Chair Jim Burger
- o Commission on Student Affairs January 21, 1999, presented by Chair Madonna Mendoza
- o Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies January 25, 1999, presented by Chair Bob Tracy

In response to a question regarding attendance, Dr. Tracy will clarify and send a note to Sandy Smith who in turn will correct the minutes. Student Government Association will be working to improve attendance at these meetings. As a point of clarification, under other business, there are progress reports on the three ad hoc policy review committees from Norrine Spencer, Max Stephenson and John White. There will be three resolutions coming forward at a later date, one from each of the three ad hoc committees. The Freshman Rule sub-committee and the Academic Eligibility sub-committee are finishing their work now. Transfer Policy sub-committee will not be reporting until the end of

March.

Note: A question was raised regarding up-to-date minutes posted to the web. Carole Nickerson shared with Council Members that we have a web administrator and asked Sandy Smith to check on status and inform Council Members via e-mail of the URL address for access to University Governance information. Ms. Smith will also check to see if we are registered on the search entry.

6. For Information Only

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes of the University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning for January 14, 1999 were distributed for information only.

7. Announcements

Dr. Torgersen shared with Council that he spent the last two weeks in Richmond and will be there this week as we near the end of the budget cycle. He also commented on an article in the Roanoke Times describing Dr. Covington's trip to Richmond. Both the House and Senate have recommended additional budget appropriations for a variety of state agencies including higher education and specifically colleges and universities including Radford and Virginia Tech. The House appoints six people, three republicans and three democrats, to a Conference Committee, the Senate does the same. The co-chair of the Senate Finance Committee, Republican John Chichester, is an alumnus of Virginia Tech. Dr. Torgersen met with ten of the twelve committee members and hopes to meet with the other two by the end of the week. Most of the surplus money has been spent. The House is hoping to see a bond bill approved that was passed in the House by an 81 to 18 vote. It includes a number of capital projects including fairly significant projects for Virginia Tech. If passed by the Senate, the Governor has to approve, and if approved it comes up for referendum in November. In the Senate some generally modest capital projects are called for, some for Virginia Tech. A newly appointed alumnus to the Appropriations Committee is Jack Rollison from Woodbridge. The Appropriations Committee and the Senate Finance Committee are important committees to the budget process. Dr. Torgersen commented on the difficulty of managing funding requests that are not central to our legislative agenda.

8. Discussion (see [Attachement](#) for additional details.)

The University Libraries in the Digital Age - Dr. Eileen Hitchingham Dr. Hitchingham distributed and reviewed with Council Members information about library access. White section - Data Points. Yellow section - Database Availability. Blue section - Subject Resource Guides and Library Contacts. Dr. Hitchingham reviewed a chart depicting the Virginia Tech library borrowing by type of user. The land-grant role is taken very seriously. Virginia Tech ranks in the top 50 research institutions. Virginia Tech's library ranks 79 out of 110 in total expenditures. We spend almost 50% of the dollars available to us on resources; our colleagues might spend a third for resources. Almost two years ago we were number 51 in overall spending for materials and number 41 in expenditures for serial journals type publications. We are 102 out of 110 in our staff size. The library web page (<http://www.lib.vt.edu/>) is the best place to begin to locate Virginia Tech library information. The library catalog is now named Addison, named after the first Virginia Tech student. Addison and VTLS is the same. With our system as large as it is, it is important to make students feel comfortable with the system. Dr. Hitchingham reviewed the library web page with Council Members, and the importance of working with extended campus users. Dr. Hitchingham reviewed the available databases and meanings of symbols used with this information. Not only vt.edu users, but also users such as those on America On Line can access these resources. An item on the agenda is funding for VIVA, the virtual Library of Virginia. With \$10 million in resources, we buy as a consortium and make information and materials available through all the academic higher education institutions in the state. We also supplement this with materials that are unique to Virginia Tech. Associations Unlimited is a publication that lists more than 144,000 regional, state and national publications. The Encyclopaedia Britannica is called Britannica Online. With 2000 students in Northern Virginia, Abingdon and Hampton Rhodes, we need to move to digital resources. It was noted that each college has one or more college librarians. In closing Dr. Hitchingham noted that the Electronic Thesis is looked at with lots of interest and is the most highly hit upon web site.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/s/ws

Virginia Tech Governance Information

URL: /uc9899/ucm99-02-15.html

University Council

February 15, 1999

Discussion

The University Libraries in the Digital Age - Dr. Eileen Hitchingham

Dr. Hitchingham distributed and reviewed with Council Members information about library access. White section - Data Points. Yellow section - Database Availability. Blue section - Subject Resource Guides and Library Contacts. Dr. Hitchingham reviewed a chart depicting the Virginia Tech library borrowing by type of user. The land-grant role is taken very seriously. Virginia Tech ranks in the top 50 research institutions. Virginia Tech's library ranks 79 out of 110 in total expenditures. We spend almost 50% of the dollars available to us on resources; our colleagues might spend a third for resources. Almost two years ago we were number 51 in overall spending for materials and number 41 in expenditures for serial journals type publications. We are 102 out of 110 in our staff size. The library web page (<http://www.lib.vt.edu/>) is the best place to begin to locate Virginia Tech library information. The library catalog is now named Addison, named after the first Virginia Tech student. Addison and VTLS are the same. With our system as large as it is, it is important to make students feel comfortable with the system. Dr. Hitchingham reviewed the library web page with Council Members, and the importance of working with extended campus users.

Dr. Hitchingham reviewed the available databases and meanings of symbols used with this information. The library recognized that some VT users may work with an Internet Service Provider like America On Line rather than come to the library page via a vt.edu address, so it has developed ways to authenticate access to databases for these members of our community also. Part of our database support comes through participation in VIVA, the Virtual Library of Virginia. This is a state-funded program that supports consortial buying of selected electronic resources for Virginia's public higher education institutions. Total funding available for common purchasing/licensing for all of the schools has averaged about \$2,000,000+ per year. Many additional databases in the library's electronic holdings are unique to Virginia Tech and are supported by VT funding. Associations Unlimited is a publication that lists more than 144,000 regional, state and national publications. The Encyclopaedia Britannica is called Britannica Online and serves as a background source for many general topics. Other databases mentioned included ABI Inform, a business/management/human resources source, HarpWeek a complete reproduction of Harpers Weekly from 1857-1865, and ISI's Web of Science - a unique citation database of primary publications for the arts and humanities, social sciences, and science and technologies. With 2000 students in Northern Virginia, Abingdon and Hampton Rhodes, we need to move to digital resources. It was noted that each college has one or more college librarians.

Dr. Hitchingham concluded with two concepts: First, while use of physical resources (books, journals, etc) remains high we are seeing a significant growth in electronic resource use. A time of creating branch libraries is past, and an increasing emphasis on digital resources is needed to meet our teaching and research needs (2000+ students) around the state. Second, the university community has a wealth of resources available to it, but knowledge of which resources are available and how they might best be used in support of teaching and research is generally not an intuitive skill. The College Librarians noted in the subject handout can work with faculty to ensure that students are introduced to the resources that will support their information needs now and in the future as they work and live in an information age.

In response to a question about Electronic Theses and Dissertations Dr. Hitchingham noted that these pages are some of the most highly accessed on the library web.

Virginia Tech Governance Information

URL: </uc9899/ucm99-02-15a.html>

University Council Minutes

March 1, 1999

Present: Michael Williams (for Erv Blythe), Greg Brown, Landrum Cross, Peter Eyre, Elyzabeth Holford, Janet Johnson, Paul Knox, Peggy Meszaros, Carole Nickerson, Len Peters, Minnis Ridenour, Ray Smoot, Hap Bonham (for Rich Sorensen), Charles Steger, Bill Stephenson, Andy Swiger, Tom Tillar, Paul Torgersen, Richard Bambach, Jim Burger, Cindy Harrison, Robert Tracy, Muzzo Uysal, Terry Swecker, Wayne Durham, Skip Fuhrman, Paul Metz, Kevin Pelzer, George Simmons (for Bob Benoit), David de Wolf, Bernard Feldman, Joann Boles (for Rosemary Goss), Frank Gwazdauskas, John Randolph, John Seiler, Anita Haney, Pete Martens, Nancy Phillips, Ben Poe, Peggy Rasnick, Joel Donahue, Sean Blackburn

Absent: Bob Bates, Ben Dixon, Eileen Hitchingham, Madonna Mendoza, Charles Lytton, Nicolaus Tideman, Norm Marriott, Deborah Mayo, Eliza Tse, Sam Hicks, Jamaa Bickley-King, Curtis Lynch, Donna Cassell, Aashish Jain, Paul Wagner, Jody Olson, Duncan Neasham, Kathleen Knight, Natalie Wilson,

1. Call to Order

Dr. Paul Torgersen called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and announced that a quorum was present.

2. Adoption of Agenda

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

3. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of February 15, 1999

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the February 15, 1999, University Council meeting have been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System on the WEB. (/)

4. Second Reading, Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1998-99C, Resolution Regarding Committee Approval of Theses and Dissertations

Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Chair Jim Burger presented Resolution 1998-99C for second reading.

Chair Burger shared that the resolution changes a policy in the Graduate Catalog that currently appears on page 26. 1) It eliminates a discrepancy in one sentence that states it requires unanimous approval and an additional sentence that states that it does not require unanimous approval. This language is eliminated and new language will be: One dissenting vote is allowable for masters and dissertation committee votes. 2) This resolution removes the existing provision that allows dissenting members of the thesis or dissertation committee to have a letter bound with the thesis or dissertation.

Chair Burger moved that University Council accept Resolution 1998-99C Regarding Committee Approval of Theses and Dissertations. This motion was seconded.

A question was raised asking if the dissenting faculty member could be the chair, and if so, do these procedures address this concern? It was agreed that this would be an unusual situation.

The resolution passed by unanimous vote.

5. Approval of the Collective Commission Minutes.

Council approved a packet of Commission minutes comprised of

- Commission on Faculty Affairs January 22, 1999, presented by Chair Richard Bambach

The following minutes were withdrawn:

- Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies February 3, 1998, presented by Chair Jim Burger

A request for clarification regarding a statement in the minutes that states: "The GSA chose not to support the Tech Central project." Minutes were withdrawn and Chair Burger will clarify this statement and resubmit the minutes for voting at the April 5 meeting of University Council. A concern regarding quorum at this meeting was raised. As stated on other occasions, a quorum is to be addressed by the chair before the meeting begins, otherwise is not relevant.

6. Announcements

Overview of 1999 Higher Education Budget Request Minnis Ridenour, Executive Vice President

Minnis Ridenour distributed a handout entitled, "Overview of 1999 Higher Education Budget Request." In review of this handout, Mr. Ridenour noted that the information speaks to the total higher education budget, statewide budget, our operating and capital outlay budget, and tuition and fee schedules for next year.

The current biennium, 1998-2000, \$910 million was put forth as our goal for all of higher education -- \$400 million for operating expenses, \$60 million for student financial aid, and \$450 million for capital. In the first year of the biennium, 1998, we received \$587 million against this goal. As we started this biennium, we requested funds that were short in the second year of the biennium and requested priority one State Council capital planning monies and shortfalls in capital appropriations. Our request as we started the year was \$221.3 million. The Governor included in his budget to the General Assembly \$46.2 million for higher education. This left a remaining need for legislative amendments of \$162.5. Conference Committee recommended the General Assembly approve \$71.3 million additional funding beyond the Governor's budget. From the Governor and General Assembly, we received a total of \$117.5 million. The 20% tuition rollback, \$75.7 million, for students nets 0 with \$75.7 million in taxpayer money coming into higher education for tuition rollback. Some items not in our amendments for higher education include \$3.8 million for

matching scholars program, professorships, etc. This makes the total amount coming into higher education \$121.3 million. In terms of the Governor's Initiatives, what we received from the Governor, we had a shortfall in our ability to collect non-general funds (such as unfunded scholarships), the Governor included an offset of \$1.4 million. This does not provide new money, but had this not been included in our budget we would have had a \$1.4 million shortfall in our ability to spend.

The Governor also included the tuition rollback, \$11.3 million. We received funding for work in computer science/computer engineering/information technology \$977,000. The total amount for all of our initiatives in agency 208 is \$2.8 million of new money. Agency 229, we received \$100,000 in operating for Plan to Serve Virginia Agriculture, Human and Natural Resources. We received \$759,000 in additional scholarship and loan monies for in-state students. \$100,000 was received for minority scholarships for all colleges, with the exception of engineering and business. We ended up with \$3.76 million in new money coming into our budget.

In capital outlay, the Governor included \$1.9 million to cover a shortfall in Advanced Communications Information Technology Building of \$1.9 million. Energy-savings projects and chillers to extend our system throughout campus because of construction is \$1.1 million. \$500,000 was picked up to continue planning on upper quad conversion of old dorms for faculty and staff offices in accordance of our integrated space plan. We received \$2.2 million in support of reserve maintenance. This is on top of about \$9 million we already have in our budget to take care of the infrastructure of the university. Before this fund was implemented at the state level, we had to pay this out of our operating budget. \$8.4 million in non-general funds to convert Shanks and Shultz on the upper quad to faculty offices. We have \$16 million non-general for integrated space plan, we picked up \$8.4 in the next year. \$3.9 million for the dairy science facility, for a total of \$18 million. Hampton Roads AREC emergency project was funded at \$1.3 million. \$456,000 (\$200,000 in General Fund) to continue planning work on agriculture forestry building for a total of \$1.8. Grand total of capital outlay of \$19.8 (taking out non-general of \$11.1).

Regarding salaries there is a 5.8 percent salary increase for teaching and research faculty, 3.3 percent to 4 percent for administrative professional, and classified will receive 4 percent plus a 2.5 for those who "meet expectations." Mr. Ridenour responded to a concern regarding raises for administrative faculty and teaching and research faculty differential. Mr. Ridenour stated that this is a funding source issue, but that we can internally set the percentage level for faculty and administrative faculty, as long as the increase does not exceed our consolidated salary averages. Faculty and administrative faculty operate on a merit system. This is a policy decision for us. Classified percentages are set by the state at 4 percent plus 2.5 for those who "meet expectations."

The tuition and fee schedule incorporates the 20 percent rollback in tuition. This saved in tuition for in-state undergraduate students \$708 (down from \$3,500 to \$2,792). This incorporates fee increases of \$23 for comprehensive, \$132 for room and board. Net change for in-state student will be minus \$553 per year. Out of state undergraduate students are expected by the state to pay 100 percent of the instructional cost. This will incorporate salary changes and utility changes. The total package will go up \$455. No increase for graduate in-state student, as they will not receive rollback. In-state graduate students increase will be \$23 for comprehensive fee. Non-resident graduate students will see an increase of \$198 plus \$23 for total of \$221. Off-campus students no increase, out of state increase is \$198 -- they do not pay the comprehensive fee because they do not receive the benefits. Veterinary Medicine overall increase is 3 percent. Mr. Ridenour confirmed a statement made that out of state graduate students will still be subsidized by out-of-state undergraduate students. Regarding tuition rollback, Mr. Ridenour responded that we do not lose money regarding the rollback; we get a dollar for dollar return. This does not add money to higher education.

Mr. Ridenour explained that the 79.5 new positions is a mixture of new positions and moving monies relative to previously existing positions. 49.5 of positions were converted to graduate teaching positions to fully cover the number of graduate teaching assistants we had to place and will involve very little money. 10 positions address technology job vacancies.

Dwight Shelton and Minnis Ridenour will be glad to answer questions.

Announcements - Paul Torgersen

Dr. Torgersen reported that the last several weeks in Richmond was largely spent securing support from the Conference Committee. There was not a lot of discretionary money available. We received approximately \$3.7 million in additional funding, plus some capital projects including a major capital project for the renovation of the dairy facilities.

Dr. Torgersen commented on the success of the women's basketball team and the possibility of hosting a four-team tournament. Support for the team has been good.

The next meeting of University Council will be the first Monday in April.

7. Discussion

Update on Cross-Cutting Initiatives Peggy Meszaros, Senior Vice President and Provost

Provost Peggy Meszaros gave an overview of where we are with the Cross-Cutting Initiatives. Our accomplishments this past year were absolutely outstanding. Dr. Meszaros thanked everyone for making this a good year for the university.

Dr. Meszaros' commented on Strategic Direction 3.6 which has to do with encouraging interdisciplinary collaboration within the university to create knowledge that addresses the needs of society, at the same time increasing strategic partnerships in K-12 schools, other colleges and universities, businesses, industries, state and local governments to find solution to problems. Dr. Meszaros pointed out that cross-cutting initiatives are only one portion of the strategic direction. Every college and administrative unit on campus had some significant new partnerships and strategic alliances.

Context and rationale -- Each of the seven cross-cutting initiatives' efforts are chaired by a faculty member, the committees are primarily faculty members, and each committee has a person assigned from university development and communications. This gives a broader look at connecting to sources and communicating our strengths. Groups have been in place for about a year and a half. Progress to date includes: 1) case statements, 2) gap analysis to look at our strengths, who our competitors are, and determine what is the gap. This gives us some recommended strategies to be at least at our competitors' level. Information has been completed and is on our web site. Committee members for each of the cross-cutting initiatives is listed. Information regarding individual group recommendations based on where we are, where our competitors are, what we need to do to keep our momentum moving toward the world class level is available.

Two campus meetings are set up this month to look at those recommendations and make final decision on which recommendations will be

implemented. A Saturday open meeting was held about a month ago inviting each department head on campus to identify two faculty members, who preferably had not been involved in any one of the seven work groups, to come for an orientation where each cross-cutting initiative chair did a brief presentation. Everyone had an opportunity to choose two concurrent sessions to learn more about an issue or a committee of particular interest. 150-160 faculty were in attendance. Larry Hincker displayed videos on some of the cross-cutting initiative areas and he also demonstrated the web site created for the initiatives. We are now at the final step of reviewing the recommendations and making final decisions. Recommendations range from one group wanting to form a council to bring the groups together to other recommendations which include additional new faculty positions and a new building. It is hoped that some closure to at least the initial set of recommendations can be made this month.

The cross-cutting initiative areas will become a vehicle for formulating some of the budget initiatives as we go into the next biennium. We think there are opportunities for private funding. Charles Steger and Development are looking at a strategy we might call a "corporate fellow," where we could identify someone retiring from a business/industry position who might work with us. They would work with us in a particular area and help connect us more clearly to open corporate doors where we need to make our needs known that would bring the private dollars. And also to look at how we might connect to some increased federal funding. Areas where there might be some leveraging to be done would be with the president's budget. If we position some of our world class initiatives correctly, we may have a chance to tap into federal funds at a greater rate than we are now.

The area identified as the one most likely to continue to grow is NIH. We currently have \$3.5 million and this could grow if we are with the right kinds of alliances and if we could be successful in tapping into NIH. In every area of BioSciences and Biotechnology, there are potentials for increased funding. In Computing, Information and Communications Technology there are possibilities for major dollars. Rita Caldwell has done a piece on NSF funding and the biocomplexity and IT squared and all new areas that are merging. In Environmental Sciences and Energy Systems, as well as Materials, there are numerous areas of great potential for federal funding. In Food, Nutrition and Health there is an opportunity to build on the health piece. Everyone sees connections beyond the cross-cutting initiatives. For instance, the health area clearly connects to the biosciences and biotechnology and perhaps other areas. There are also funding possibilities in Learning Communities and Transportation. This is a quick look at possible new federal funding.

In summary, when we looked at benchmarking with all universities as we put our strategic plan and academic agenda together, we determined there were some protocol strategic steps we needed to take. They are: 1) establishing cross-cutting initiatives to build on the strengths we have in a more focused way, 2) developing ACITC as a thrust to leverage in the communication, information technology area, 3) there has been an approval of targeting some Pratt Funds in Engineering for new initiatives, 4) developing of Center for Environmental Applications of Remote Sensing (CEARS) in Forestry, 5) cooperation in Immunology between Veterinary Medicine and VCU, 6) we began the ASPIRES Program three years ago for our institutional investment in the research enterprise that enables faculty to have the seed funds to build their expertise and go for larger grants, 7) we have done some investing in visualization in Architecture and Urban Studies, 8) we have been supporting summer faculty research grants in business, and 9) developing the Carilion initiative joint with UVA.

The cross-cutting initiatives help us maintain our Research One ranking and we hope help us build on the strengths that we have as we move into the next century, fully realizing we cannot be all things to all people. One way to advance at a research university is to identify those areas where we are already world class and look at how we can build them further. The accomplishment report talks more broadly on the collaborations and partnerships across campus, all of which can certainly qualify for additional resources. These seven cross-cutting initiatives are determined strategy on our part to say here is where we need world class strength and here is where we think the future is going. It is clear that in the president's budget, the federal funding is moving in this same direction.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/s/ws

Virginia Tech Governance Information

URL: </uc9899/ucm99-03-01.html>

University Council Minutes

April 5, 1999

Present: Bob Bates, Erv Blythe, Greg Brown, David Ostroth (for Landrum Cross), Ben Dixon, Peter Eyre, Eileen Hitchingham, Roberta Minish (for Janet Johnson), Paul Knox, Peggy Meszaros, Carole Nickerson, Len Peters, Minnis Ridenour, Jean Eversole (for Ray Smoot), Rich Sorensen, Charles Steger, Bill Stephenson, Andy Swiger, Tom Tillar, Paul Torgersen, Richard Bambach, Jim Burger, Madonna Mendoza, Cindy Harrison, Pat Hyer (for Charles Lytton), Robert Tracy, Muzzo Uysal, Nicolaus Tideman, Terry Swecker, Wayne Durham, Skip Fuhrman, Deborah Mayo, Paul Metz, Kevin Pelzer, George Simmons (for Bob Benoit), David de Wolf, Bernard Feldman, Joann Boles (for Rosemary Goss), Frank Gwazdauskas, Sam Hicks, John Randolph, John Seiler, Donna Cassell, Pete Martens, Nancy Phillips, Ben Poe, Joel Donahue, Aashish Jain, Jeffrey Sutton (for Paul Wagner), Jody Olson, Duncan Neasham, Natalie Wilson, Sean Blackburn

Absent: Elyzabeth Holford, Norm Marriott, Eliza Tse, Jamaa Bickley-King, Anita Haney, Curtis Lynch, Peggy Rasnick, Kathleen Knight,

Guests: Laurie Coble, Ronald Daniel, David Ford

1. Call to Order

Dr. Peggy Meszaros called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and announced that a quorum was present.

2. Adoption of Agenda

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

3. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of March 1, 1999

Dr. Meszaros noted that the minutes from the March 1, 1999, University Council meeting have been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System on the WEB. (/)

4. First Reading

Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs
Resolution 1998-99B
Resolution Regarding Modification of Family Sick Leave Policy

Pat Hyer presented this resolution on behalf Chair Charles Lytton. Dr. Hyer explained that this resolution is designed to: 1) extend number of days that may be charged to sick leave for faculty members from six days to ten days when caring for an ill family member or death and funeral; 2) remove the cap on number of days that can be used per incident, with a maximum of ten days per year. This resolution has been approved by the Commission on Faculty Affairs A concern was raised regarding a point of clarification in the third "Whereas" which currently reads "extension of the period from six ..." The suggestion is to change "period" to "increase of the yearly limit." As an additional point of clarification, Dr. Hyer confirmed that we are not increasing the number of days of sick leave.

Commission on Faculty Affairs
Resolution 1998-99A
Resolution Modifying Assignment of Duties to Faculty Members

Chair Richard Bambach submitted this resolution for approval. This resolution does not change anybody's responsibilities. Faculty assigned to unusual assignments should be consulted prior to these duties being assigned.

Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies
Resolution 1998-99D
Resolution Regarding Renaming and Restructuring of the Master of Urban Affairs to Master of Public and International Affairs

Chair Jim Burger submitted this resolution for approval. Chair Burger then asked John Randolph to share information with Council regarding this resolution. Dr. Randolph commented that this will have great benefits for students in graduate programs in the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning. Enrollment in the graduate program, Masters of Urban Affairs, has been declining, but at the same time there is a real opportunity through the school for public and international affairs to develop a new curriculum, a Master of Public and International Affairs. This will offer opportunities for students interested in the international perspectives. This will serve a dual role related to collaborative processes and globalization with a real opportunity to draft students. The new curriculum would reduce the number of credit hours from existing curriculum 48 to 36 credit hours. The 48-hour degree was a constraint to students coming into that degree program. As the curriculum develops on campus, this will give an opportunity to market this curriculum in Northern Virginia. There are only a few students in the program. Those scheduled to graduate spring of next year will have the option of graduating in either degree program. In response to a question regarding the impact of the name change, Dr. Randolph explained that with four degree programs, it is difficult to find a department name that captures all degree programs.

Commission on Student Affairs
Resolution 1998-99A
Resolution Regarding the Membership of the Commission on Student Affairs

Vice Chair Sean Blackburn distributed a handout with the full recommendation by the Commission. Prompted by student concern over the membership of the Commission, an ad hoc committee was appointed to study the membership. The ad hoc committee spent fall and early spring working on this issue. Overall the Commission will lose one representative. Instead of a representative from each of the sophomore, junior and senior classes the resolution calls for one representative from the class system. It is recommended that the position of extramural sports federation be removed. It is also recommended representatives from the Black Student Alliance (BSA) (1) and the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Alliance (LGBTGA) (1) be added.

Concerns on behalf of GSA were shared by GSA Representative Joel Donahue, which included solicited opinions from members of GSA that were on CSA, outgoing and incoming vice president of GSA, and the secretary of GSA. Concerns shared are: 1) feel classes should not be

excluded and noted that class officers are elected and represent whole classes; 2) concern regarding organization representatives on CSA to which Mr. Blackburn responded that only University chartered organizations can be represented on CSA and those to be added through the resolution are University chartered organizations; 3) many organizations are not represented on CSA; again Mr. Blackburn emphasized that only University chartered organizations are represented on CSA; 4) questioned whether minorities are given preferred privileges and whether they should be represented in other organizations; 5) there is a concern that CSA is becoming fractured by representation of many small groups of special interest and not representing the general view of campus; 6) the Black Graduate Association represents a higher percentage of black students on campus than the Black Student Alliance yet is not represented on CSA. Mr. Blackburn responded GSA and CSA will work together to give representation on behalf of the Black Graduate Association through one of the GSA representatives; 7) Speaker and Vice Speaker of GSA should be changed to President and Vice President.

It was noted from the floor that the GSA representative on CSA had voted to approve the resolution.

Mr. Blackburn explained that CSA built off the recommendations made three or four years ago by CSA and set up a standard and criteria for student organizations. Student organizations must be registered as University chartered student organizations. To be considered, an organization must meet two of the following criteria: 1) represent a major constituency or a significant minority population; 2) serve as a major governance or programming body; and 3) act as an umbrella organization representing other groups and student organizations. All University chartered organizations were reviewed and studied with consideration given to goals, who was represented by what group, who SGA represented and who they did not. BSA and LGBTA are not represented by any other group. There was a lot of discussion in the Commission regarding the elimination of individual class representation. CSA voted that one person should be able to represent all three classes. It is recommended that all three classes meet at the beginning of the year, establish communications and shared goals for their representation, and choose a representative to sit on the Commission. With the recommended membership, CSA will be more efficient.

Dr. Meszaros suggested that Mr. Blackburn and Council Member Joel Donahue talk to be sure that all concerns are heard and there is a way to address them.

A question was raised as to why additional members simply could not just be added. Mr. Blackburn responded that CSA is one of the largest Commissions and it is felt that they need to keep the roster to a workable and efficient number.

Clarification in the resolution "#24. Council of Academic" was requested.

Mr. Blackburn explained that the "The President of the Black Organizations Council" is the minority representative and the "Black Student Alliance" is primarily a programming body dealing with minority programming. These are two separate organizations doing two separate tasks.

Mr. Blackburn responded to a concern regarding lack of representation from any religious groups. There are no University chartered organizations for this kind of program. If any group is a registered University chartered organization and wants to be considered for membership in CSA, an ad hoc committee will be appointed to look into the request.

Ms. Carole Nickerson responded to a request for clarification on the Constitution as it relates to membership. Ms. Nickerson explained that the aim was and is for shared governance to be as inclusive as possible. Membership lies in the Bylaws for the specific purpose of allowing amendments to the makeup of various bodies as the institution or its business evolves. CSA is not making an inappropriate request. The most likely source of any Bylaw change would be from a Commission concerning its own roster.

Mr. Blackburn responded to a request for clarification of the term "significant." There are no numbers associated with the consideration, but "significant" means that they are definitely a minority and enough of a minority for consideration. This is the judgement of the Commission. The National Panhellenic Council (represent the traditional black fraternities and sororities) asked to be considered but were denied because they have the majority of the seats on the Black Organizations Council (BOC) and therefore would be represented through BOC.

Mr. Blackburn will follow up with appropriate people to assure their questions are answered.

Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies
Resolution 1998-99A
Resolution Regarding Revision to Academic Eligibility Policy Presidential Policy Memorandum 167

Chair Bob Tracy submitted this resolution. He noted that this is the first of several resolutions coming out of ad hoc policy review committees. The outcome is to revise Presidential Policy Memorandum 167 to change the requirements for students who are in academic difficulty and for returning students. Dr. John White, chair of the ad hoc committee, addressed this resolution. Dr. White commented that Policy 167 included probation and suspension, academic penalties, and academic review as a consequence of academic difficulty. This resolution removes academic review from the policy. Students, advisors, and administrators at the college, university, and departmental level did not comprehend what academic review really means. It is very difficult to enforce and difficult to have students buy into it as they buy into probation and suspension. Academic review was added to the original resolution two years ago because of a fear that there would be a major loss of students through the new policy. This did not happen and extensive research has been done to assure that this will not happen under this revised policy. Some procedures and policies have been changed that overcome the concerns regarding a major loss of students. Students responded to the increase in academic requirements from 1.5 to 2.0, and thus there were fewer students who did not meet the academic eligibility requirements. For these reasons, the request is to return to a more simplified version of the academic eligibility policy that maintains basically probation and suspension as the consequences for poor academic performance. In response to a question regarding backdating this resolution to the summer of 1997, Dr. White noted that this is to keep us from having three policies in place at the same time.

Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies
Resolution 1998-99B
Resolution on American History

Chair Bob Tracy submitted this resolution and moved to waive first reading so this resolution can go to the Board of Visitors at their April 26 meeting (information packets go to BOV members before the next Council meeting). This resolution is addressing a resolution of the State Legislature which mandates the Board of Visitors engage their respective universities and colleges in the state in the issue of how these institutions want to deal with the issue of American History literacy. The resolution has unanimously passed the University Core Curriculum Committee and the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies and has been very thoroughly evaluated by both faculty and administration.

Ms. Carole Nickerson shared with Council Members that in order to waive first reading a vote of 3/4 of those members present is required; thus this motion will require an affirmative vote of 39 members to waive first reading. If first reading were waived, any changes would have to be handled as friendly amendments during second reading. There was concern expressed that this is unnecessarily being put on the fast track.

Dr. Richard Bambach shared Faculty Affairs' role in this resolution. After legislative action, the Board of Visitors shared urgency in taking care of this issue. Careful consideration was given by all bodies that normally conduct curriculum review. This is a reasonable way to handle this issue and satisfy concerns of the Board Members.

Dr. Bob Bates, who was present at the Academic Affairs Committee meeting where faculty leadership talked about curriculum design and how we address issues, noted that this was a rich opportunity for members of the Academic Affairs sub-committee to understand the academic issues of this university. Board of Visitors members are quite impressed that so many viewpoints are considered before action is taken. A presentation was given to the BOV and they understood this as a reasonable approach. Considerable work was done with the History Department as well as with the Core Curriculum Committee. Issues of resources, delivery, academic content and the way we meet the requirement have all been considered. This proposed process allows students who have had a strong course to get a broadened appreciation of history and for others who need the experience in history to get it. For many this may already be part of their core curriculum.

Concern was expressed about focus outside the academy that influence curriculum inside the academy and precaution should be taken. Information was also shared regarding how this issue is being handled at other universities and colleges in the Commonwealth and few are rushing forward like Virginia Tech.

A second to the motion was made and a vote was taken. Waiving of first reading was defeated with only 16 affirmative votes.

Further discussion noted that this resolution has a fairly strong endorsement from the Board about using this approach. It provides a broad spectrum of interpretation about entrance requirements and how students can satisfy these requirements. The three leadership positions within the Core Committee, the faculty senate president, and others, reviewed this before it was presented to the Board.

The course taught will be an Area 3 US History course, not a high school level course. Regarding incoming international students, because this is an Area 3 course, students can test out of it. Following discussion regarding additional students and additional resources, Dr. Meszaros commented that resources have already been allocated for the development of the on-line course. The on-line course will not have to duplicate the 1115 and 1116 sequence. Whether or not this course would be for credit has not been determined at this time to give some flexibility. Agricultural technology students will not be affected. Clarification was requested on the following statement: "That all entering students at Virginia Tech who score at or above specified standards through the university governance system," probably should read "established by the university governance system." A comment was made that a course being taught in high school should not keep us from teaching a course from a perspective that assumes no background.

It was suggested that at second reading of this resolution someone should discuss for five minutes or less the following topics: 1) description of the process by which this is already being considered, 2) what is the range of discretion and consequences of fast action, politically, 3) its merits.

Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies

Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies

Joint Resolution 1998-99A

Joint Resolution Regarding the Name Change of the College of Forestry and Wildlife Resources to the College of Natural Resources

Chair Jim Burger, on behalf of Bob Tracy-Chair of Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies and on behalf of Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, submitted this resolution for first reading and that this change take place the summer of 1999 upon the approval of the Board of Visitors.

Dean Greg Brown distributed a handout that included the rationale for the proposed name change to College of Natural Resources. The administrative team and faculty were first approached two years ago regarding a name change of the college. A faculty task force conducted surveys externally and internally (surveys included students and faculty in the college, college deans, alumni, employers of students). This was discussed with the college advisory board a year ago and again last week with at least one component of the advisory board at the annual meeting. Proposal with 14 rationale statements was presented to the Provost last fall. Senator Madison Marye and Delegate Jim Shuler's office are aware of this. Dean Brown has discussed this with Delegate Earl Dickinson. They have mixed feelings, but are not resistant. They are concerned about how the change will be interpreted by constituents throughout the state. Two associations in the state that represent the industry have received input.

Review of the handout on rationale:

1. Profile of where the name of Natural Resources is used across the state.
2. Concern about losing identity. It will not change current option structure, degree name, what will appear on transcripts or diplomas.
3. Broad array of activities and disciplines are covered in the college. In addition to those mentioned by the departments there is also a natural resources recreation program in the forestry department; marketing programs and timber engineering are covered in wood science.
4. Name change would not impact any accreditation or certification processes.
5. There is currently a declining enrollment at the undergraduate level (graduate enrollment is stable). Programs that have added environmental studies/sciences to their program and programs that have changed to natural resources names have initially seen increased enrollment applications.
6. What is proposed is consistent and parallel with the NASULGC structure.
7. Under Cooperative Extension our programs work under the agriculture and natural resources arena. A major component of the natural resources arena.
8. Confusion is created by the current name. Often the title is reduced to the "College of Forestry" and other programs in the college feel they

are not reflected by the college's name.

9. "Natural resources" is currently used in some programs.
10. Other names have been suggested. Reasons for not using these names was given.
11. In the past, the forest industry has been a major opponent to names such as natural resources, environmental resources, etc. Many of the major forestry industries are now looking for "natural resource managers." They are looking for people to manage the land base, which includes not only the timber, but also wildlife, fisheries, esthetics, outdoor recreation, watersheds, etc.

75% to 80% of the college faculty support the name change.

Dr. Richard Bambach raised a concern regarding Geological Sciences, which deals with mineral and water resources, and noted that the Department of Mining Engineering and Engineering also deals with mineral resources, Civil and Environmental Engineering deals with water resources, CALS and Arts and Sciences may deal with renewable resources. The College of Forestry and Wildlife Resources does not deal with non-renewable energy resources and deals only peripherally with water resources. He noted on behalf of his department that renaming the college would be incorrect, and the motion should be withdrawn until consultation with other departments. The name change would not represent the college correctly. It would not represent where many things in natural resources are concentrated in this university.

Others noted that we already have a number of departments whose mission and course content are not mutually exclusive, and that it is important for the name to reflect the departments in the college, which has a cross section of discipline. The proposed name is consistent with similar changes across the country.

5. On-going Business

Approval of the Collective Commission Minutes.

Council approved a packet of Commission minutes comprised of:

- o Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs, January 21, 1999

Pat Hyer submitted minutes on behalf of Chair Charles Lytton Concern was expressed that a quorum was not present. In response, it was noted that no votes took place during this meeting.

- o Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs, February 18, 1999

Pat Hyer submitted minutes on behalf of Chair Charles Lytton

- o Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, January 13, 1999
- o Commission on Faculty Affairs, February 12, 1999

It was noted that discussion regarding CFA Resolution 1998-99A started At this meeting.

- o Commission on Faculty Affairs, February 26, 1999
- o Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies (Resubmitted), February 3, 1999
- o Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, February 17, 1999
- o Commission on Outreach, February 23, 1999

Note: A correction to these minutes will be noted in future minutes of this Commission.

- o Commission on Research, November 11, 1998
- o Commission on Research, January 13, 1999
- o Commission on Research, January 27, 1999
- o Commission on Student Affairs, February 18, 1999
- o Commission on Student Affairs, March 4, 1999
- o Commission on Student Affairs, March 18, 1999
- o Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, February 8, 1999
- o Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, February 22, 1999

6. For Information Only

Minutes of University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning, February 10, 1999 and March 4, 1999

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/sws

Virginia Tech Governance Information

URL: [/uc9899/ucm99-04-05.html](#)

University Council Minutes

April 19, 1999

Present: Bob Bates, Ron Daniel (for Erv Blythe), Greg Brown, Landrum Cross, Ben Dixon, Eileen Hitchingham, Mary Ann Lewis (for Janet Johnson), Max Stephenson (for Paul Knox), Peggy Meszaros, Carole Nickerson, Len Peters, Lisa Wilkes (for Minnis Ridenour), Hap Bonham (for Rich Sorensen), Charles Steger, Rodd Hall (for Bill Stephenson), Andy Swiger, Tom Tillar, Paul Torgersen, Richard Bambach, Jim Burger, Madonna Mendoza, Pat Hyer (for Charles Lytton), Robert Tracy, Muzzo Uysal, Nicolaus Tideman, Terry Swecker, Wayne Durham, Skip Fuhrman, Paul Metz, Kevin Pelzer, George Simmons (for Bob Benoit), David de Wolf, Bernard Feldman, Frank Gwazdauskas, Sam Hicks, John Randolph, John Seiler, Jamaa Bickley-King, Nancy Phillips, Ben Poe, Peggy Rasnick, Joel Donahue, Paul Wagner, Drew Lichtenberger (for Jody Olson), Duncan Neasham, Jovette Gadson (for Kathleen Knight), Natalie Wilson, Sean Blackburn

Absent: Peter Eyre, Elyzabeth Holford, Ray Smoot, Cindy Harrison, Norm Marriott, Deborah Mayo, Eliza Tse, Rosemary Goss, Donna Cassell, Anita Haney, Curtis Lynch, Pete Martens, Aashish Jain,

Guests: Danny Axsom, Bill Claus, Laurie Coble, David Ford, Bert Moyer, Norrine Bailey Spencer, John White, Ian Zack

1. Call to Order

Dr. Paul Torgersen called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and announced that a quorum was present.

2. Adoption of Agenda

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

3. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of April 5, 1999

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the April 5, 1999, University Council meeting have been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System on the WEB. (/)

4. New Business

First Reading

Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies

Resolution 1998-99E

Resolution Regarding Residency for Doctoral Degrees

Chair Jim Burger presented this resolution for first reading and introduced Marty Day who gave an overview. The Commission was asked to consider standing residency policies for doctorate degrees, especially in wide growth programs at non-Blacksburg locations, and growth of non-academic career opportunities for doctorates. The sub-committee of the Commission concluded that the residency requirement as it stands remains appropriate in light of recent changes. SACS mandates residency for doctorate degrees. Summary conclusions of a major study conducted in 1995 by National Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine concerning the importance of maintaining breadth and making sure doctorates were exposed to people working in a wide range of areas in their related disciplines were considered. The sub-committee's approach is not to change the existing policy regarding residency very much, but to make the process of granting degree program permission for students to satisfy residency in a non-Blacksburg location more deliberate. The Graduate School already has permission to grant off-campus programs the right to let their students establish residency other than Blacksburg locations. This has been made more deliberate by asking that those programs make a case by addressing purposes of residency and how they relate in their particular program. The attachment to the resolution itemizes a number of specific purposes of residency. The committee asked that if a program wants permission to let its students satisfy residency somewhere else, that they address those specific issues and how students in their program can satisfy those issues even if not through the traditional Blacksburg residency. It also provides some mechanism for review of such permission. One aspect of the existing residency requirement is that during the term the graduate student is applying toward their residency requirement, they cannot work more than 20 hours a week in a job unrelated to their academic program. This may be a particular item of interest for someone already employed in a professional lab and trying to complete a doctorate at the same time. A provision has been provided to grant exemptions provided both advisor and employer agree this is an appropriate arrangement, and that a large amount of employee time is approved to be spent on doctorate research, and provide for intellectual properties issues that might be implied by that arrangement. The University cannot relinquish any of its intellectual property rights associated with the graduate students' theses and is a legal issue that would have to be resolved in advance.

In response to a question as to whether this includes GRA activity, John Eaton commented that it could be either.

Programs that have already established off-campus residency need not apply again.

David de Wolf distributed information summarizing the present policy requiring at least 24 credit hours for residency. Off-campus residency requires prior approval from the Graduate School and that approval is for designated extended campus programs. Approval will not be granted if students work more than 20 hours per week. Engineering objects to the proposed policy being more stringent. Now requests must be made in writing to the Dean of the Graduate School, which will advocate withdrawal and prior approval as deemed necessary. An exception to the 20 hour workweek limitation will be contemplated; on the other hand the employer will certify that no more than 20 hours is spent on the job. These are self contradictory statements. There is a need to make the process more flexible. In point four there is some confusion between the goals of individual academic programs, which are stated generically, and the list of nine very specific ways to meet the goals. Dr. de Wolf suggested that this resolution be sent back to CGS&P with a request to soften programmatic information.

Marty Day clarified that the resolution has nine items that are purposes for residency, things Blacksburg or non-Blacksburg residency intends to accomplish. There is a longer non-official document that expresses possible ways to accomplish this. Dr. de Wolf does not feel it is unclear, but feels it is unnecessarily overly specific.

Marty Day recommended that the resolution go forward to a second reading.

Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies
Resolution 1998-99F
Resolution Regarding Transfer Credit for Master's Degrees

Marty Day presented this resolution for first reading and noted that there is a statement in the existing catalog that allows up to 50% of the courses in the program of study to be transferred from a list of Virginia schools. This review was brought about by one incident of someone trying to abuse this policy by doubling it up with the standard or default allowances for transfer credit by claiming 50% from Virginia schools, and in case of a masters degree, an additional six hours. As a general policy for master's degrees, allowing 50% of the courses on a program of study to be transferred is not appropriate for all programs. There was concern about allowing this to stand as a general policy that everyone in every program had access to. At the doctoral level the default policy allows 42 of 90 hours to be transferred. With 50% of 90 being 45, this is only a three-hour difference between the Virginia school policy and the default policy. This resolution would be to rescind the Virginia school rule and replace it by a provision for granting selectively permission to transfer up to 50% from specific programs. There is a grandfather clause for programs already using the Virginia school rule in some significant way.

David de Wolf distributed information expressing concern that an existing regulation is being made more strict at a time when greater flexibility is needed to help off campus programs. Dr. de Wolf commented that individual departments are in the best position to judge individual requests for inclusion of non-Virginia Tech courses. With demands from off campus for more flexibility, it is important to incorporate this flexibility to avoid losing students to other schools. Dr. de Wolf suggested CGS&P remove the introduction of programmatic permission to restrict the policy change to extension of more transfer credits for courses, rather than to be less flexible.

Dr. Day said that the proposal is to rescind the rule that allows 50% of courses on a master's degree to be transferred from Virginia institutions and replace that with program by program approval of up to 50% transfer credit for masters.

Marty Day recommended that this resolution go forward for second reading.

John Eaton noted that programs currently bringing in 50% of student hours would be grandfathered under this clause. It gives programs an opportunity to re-evaluate whether they wish to continue to accept many Virginia schools or establish a set of schools from which they will accept transfer courses. While it may have the appearance of being more rigorous, the program and not the Graduate School would make it more rigorous.

Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies
Resolution 1998-99G
Resolution Regarding Changing Advisory Committee Membership

Chair Jim Burger presented this resolution for first reading. The present policy states that if there is going to be a change in a student's committee membership, it requires approval of all committee members both new and old. It was felt that the following sentence should be added: "In the case that one or more members does not approve the change in the membership of the advisory committee, an appeal may be made by either the student or a faculty member to a department graduate committee. The graduate committee will make a recommendation for action to the Department Head and the Dean of the Graduate School." This provides a level of oversight.

Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies
Resolution 1998-99C
Resolution to Revise Presidential Policy Memorandum No. 69 Freshman Rule Policy

Chair Bob Tracy presented this resolution for first reading. On behalf of the committee, Max Stephenson noted that students should accept maximum degree of responsibility for their own learning path, but also noted that problems happen in individual student's lives beyond their first year. The committee tried to systematize the incentive for students accepting the responsibility for the classes they undertook and recognize the reality that individuals might encounter problems after their first collegiate year. An opportunity has been extended to use a total of six hours after the regular drop deadline at some point in the university career. Taking advantage of this is the student's responsibility. After consulting with an advisor and with approval of the academic dean, the decision to drop in this way is irrevocable. It is an opportunity to drop a course, not to withdraw retroactively after a course. This allows individuals some latitude toward specific instances that might develop in their academic careers while at the same time preventing individuals from misusing this system. A "W" will appear on the transcript under the proposed policy indicating that the student took advantage of this option, but does not suggest the student withdrew passing or failing. In response to a question Dr. Stephenson confirmed that under the current policy, if a student receives an "F" the "F" can be deleted - under the proposed rule a decision has to be made to drop the course before the actual "F" grade is entered. A grade has to be "D+" or lower to activate the Freshman Rule. A question was raised about why, if under the current policy a student has a chance to restart if they fail a class, it is considered preferable to allow a senior to withdraw from a course. A follow-up comment was made that the Freshman Rule requires somebody to fail before they can get out of a course and this proposed change is a good idea.

In a response to a comment regarding the similarity of the Freshman Rule and granting an incomplete because of illness or family problems policy, Dr. Stephenson commented that there is a wide range of circumstances and more than one way depending on the situation to assist students.

In the existing rule the transcript will show the grade, but it will not be calculated in the QCA. With the proposed change, there will be a "W" without an explanation as to why they it was activated.

Another concern is it appears this is geared toward students who should already be established academically and does not help freshmen.

Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies
Resolution 1998-99D
Resolution to Revise Presidential Policy Memorandum No. 72 Credit Granted Other Than That Obtained in Traditional Enrollment At Virginia Tech

Chair Bob Tracy submitted this resolution for first reading. Norrine Bailey Spencer, chair of ad hoc review, addressed this resolution. Committee members include representatives from the Provost's Office, Registrar's Office, faculty from four colleges, undergraduate student, and a person from New River Community College. Out of 22 peer institutions surveyed 16 responded. Things that have happened since the existing policy was replaced in 1986 are: "State Policy on Transfer in 1991, Perry-Sorensen Report in 1995, and University Task Force on Community College Transfers in 1996. All of these groups had legislation and suggestions that impacted the old policy in 1986 which had never been changed. This

document makes changes in the following ways: simplifies and reduces a lot of the limits that currently exist and acknowledges certain basics such as: must transfer from a regionally accredited school, must have a "C" or better, SACS requires a minimum of 25% of credits be from Virginia Tech, State Policy on Transfer requests at most 50% of the work from a two-year school, our university policy dictates a maximum of 18 of last 45 hours can be taken somewhere else. It takes away limits that were previously on A/P coursework, I/B coursework and correspondence courses. It gives authority to the dean's office of the student to make exceptions and also calls for a centralized evaluation of transfer.

Independent Resolution
Resolution Regarding Faculty, Staff and Student Parking

Frank Gwazdauskas, representative from College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, submitted this resolution for first reading. This resolution is the result of a letter received from the Athletic Director dated March 31 regarding a parking charge of \$25 for season pass or \$5 per game for athletic events. The fees are to be used for athletic scholarships. There is a concern that faculty and staff will be paying twice for parking. A question was raised concerning students off-campus having to pay a parking fee to come to athletic events. Would other groups be able to charge a parking fee at events they sponsor? Of approximately 1300 season faculty/staff ticket holders for football, 400-430 are individual households. The revenues generated would be less than \$11,000.

David de Wolf stated that by virtue of Article 12, Section 2, Number 3, which states that "Any member of University Council may place an item on the agenda but following the procedures for aforesaid article." It points out "That under normal operating procedures policy recommendations and decisions are reviewed by the appropriate commissions and then submitted to University Council." Sturgis recommends that motions in general be delegated to the appropriate committees or commissions before they come to a meeting even if an individual member has a right to propose it. Dr. de Wolf commented that in this case there is no particular reason for this motion to come before University Council before it goes to the Commission on University Support. A motion was made to refer this back to the Commission on University Support. There was no second.

Laurie Coble reported that the Transportation and Parking Committee -- composed of faculty, staff and student -- is a sub-committee of the Commission on University Support. The parking plan for the Athletic Department did go to this committee for their briefing. This policy was neither approved nor disapproved by the committee. Ms. Coble reported that there will be designated lots reserved for athletic events where this fee will apply and there are also lots available to faculty, staff and students not wishing to attend games but coming to campus. If there is a parking hangtag, there is no way to distinguish between those on campus to work versus those going to games.

Out of 11,800 available parking spaces, Athletics has requested 7,800 paved parking spaces. They will also use an additional 2,200 spaces in the grass area. The commuter spaces set aside in the cage will also be used.

Concern was expressed that if this resolution does not go forward, it will be late fall before anything can be done.

Joel Donahue recommended the resolution read as follows: "Therefore be it resolved that Faculty, Staff and Students be exempt from additional payment for parking on campus during athletic events above the charges for vehicle registration now and in the future, as has been the practice."

Ms. Coble explained that the proposal for athletics was approved by administration and it was viewed as a proposal that was appropriate. This will involve approximately six days per year and Athletics will be responsible for covering all direct expenses associated with this program plus returning to the university a portion of the debt service it cost VT to build the parking lots. It would be assisting the university in repaying the debt.

Richard Bambach feels there is no harm in charging those who do not have university parking stickers, but is strongly opposed to charging faculty, staff and students who already pay a parking fee to pay again for these events.

Dr. Torgersen commented that parking facilities cannot be paid for with state funds and there is a continual upgrade and expansion of parking. Parking fees as an operational necessity, are legitimately established by administration and not by the university governance system.

Consideration should be given to how this policy affects job duties.

This resolution will go forward for second reading.

5. On-Going Business

Second Reading

Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs
Resolution 1998-99B
Resolution Regarding Modification of Family Sick Leave Policy

Pat Hyer submitted this resolution on behalf Chair Charles Lytton for second reading. Dr. Hyer explained that this resolution is designed to: 1) extend number of days that may be charged to sick leave for faculty members from six days to ten days per calendar year when caring for an ill family member or death and funeral; 2) remove the limitation on number of days per incident, with a maximum of ten days per year.

A motion was made and seconded to approve this resolution and was approved by University Council by unanimous vote.

Commission on Faculty Affairs
Resolution 1998-99A
Resolution Modifying Assignment of Duties to Faculty Members

Chair Richard Bambach submitted this resolution for second reading. This resolution does not change the administrative responsibilities. Faculty assigned to unusual assignments should be consulted prior to these duties being assigned.

A motion was made and seconded to approve this resolution and was approved by University Council by unanimous vote.

Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies
Resolution 1998-99D
Resolution Regarding Renaming and Restructuring of the Master of Urban Affairs to Master of Public and International Affairs

Chair Jim Burger submitted this resolution for second reading.

With no further comment or questions, a motion was made and seconded to approve this resolution and was approved by University Council by unanimous vote.

Commission on Student Affairs
Resolution 1998-99A
Resolution Regarding the Membership of the Commission on Student Affairs

Chair Madonna Mendoza submitted this resolution for second reading. Vice Chair Sean Blackburn summarized the issues and actions leading to this resolution. Student concern over the membership of the Commission prompted the appointment of an ad hoc committee to study the membership. The ad hoc committee studied the process and procedures necessary to insure that everyone involved in the discussions had considered all the issues. Conceptual guidelines were established to help the committee and future commission members study these issues. Currently there are about 500 organizations, and there has to be a way to monitor membership. The committee reviewed current organizations that sit on CSA, talked with candidates and held interviews, reviewed the various constitutions and at length discussed all issues. The resolution reflects the changes necessary to properly represent the students. Diversity and welcoming climate are key goals for students and representation at Virginia Tech.

Dr. Landrum Cross shared that students view this as an important gateway into the decision making process for the university. Dr. Cross feels this most recent proposal is one of the more thoughtful processes the Commission has gone through, carefully considering all the criteria, and it came down to subjective judgement of what is appropriate.

Dr. Torgersen noted that this resolution requires a majority vote of the total Council membership.

There is concern that GSA has low representation. It was noted that three out of four GSA representatives on CSA voted in favor of this resolution.

It is important that chartered organizations be represented on CSA because they are not represented by SGA. Black Graduate Student Organization will sit on CSA for one year to see if this is something they need to pursue.

Dave Ostroth addressed the organization structure. Registered organizations must submit a registration form with names, agree not to be an agent of the university, and have a minimal legal relationship with the university.

University Student Life Programs have both student and faculty/staff involvement and are treated as departments of the university, with final say from university officers (Corps and honor system).

University chartered student organizations have close ties to the university, receive student activity money, have paid advisors who generally are part of student affairs staff. This group included SGA, GSA (student organizations) programming organizations like VTU and BSA, umbrella groups, Council of International Student Organizations, Greek Councils, Black Organizations Council, Residence Hall Federation, Classes and LGBTA. The use of this category as the criteria for membership on CSA is logical because these groups have a stronger relationship to the university. They are generally large or important in terms of their function connected to the university, and generally represent substantial interest of the students.

Ben Dixon pointed out we should not overlook a major point made by this resolution regarding greater efficiency and equity within the Commission. It is clear they were thoughtful and produced a resolution with a consensus. We have to understand they are trying to implement a position at this university with respect to equity and diversity.

Dr. Torgersen noted that 32 affirmative votes are needed. A motion was made and seconded to approve this resolution and was approved by University Council by a majority vote of total membership.

Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies
Resolution 1998-99A
Resolution Regarding Revision to Academic Eligibility Policy Presidential Policy Memorandum 167

Chair Bob Tracy submitted this resolution for second reading. Dr. John White, chair of the ad hoc committee, called for questions.

With no further comments a motion was made and seconded to approve this resolution and was approved by University Council by unanimous vote.

Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies
Resolution 1998-99B
Resolution on American History

Chair Bob Tracy submitted this resolution for second reading. In response to a question regarding international students, Dr. Tracy noted that this is an enabling legislation with details to be worked out. This resolution authorized the university to go forward with developing a detailed plan.

Dr. Tracy gave an overview of how this resolution came about.

- o 1998 - Passage of Joint House-Senate Resolution 346 which instructed Boards of Visitors to engage colleges and universities in discussion of American History literacy.
- o 1998 - SCHEV and the Governor instruct Boards to take the Resolution seriously.
- o August-November 1998 - Virginia Tech administration and Academic Affairs Committee of the BOV began to discuss the issue.
- o November 1998 BOV meeting, the Board requested that the university further respond at the February meeting.
- o Meetings to address the Board's concerns were held and included: Bill Claus, Chair, UCCC; Bill Cox, Chair, General Education Course

Approval Subcommittee; Leon Geyer, Chair, General Education Planning Subcommittee; Bob Parsons, Chair, General Education Assessment Subcommittee; bob Tracy, Chair, CUSP; Kerry Redican, President, Faculty Senate; Dick Bambach, Vice-president, Faculty Senate; Ron Daniel, Associate Provost for Undergraduate programs; Bob Bates, Dean of Arts and Sciences; Bert Moyer, Chair, History Department.

- o Early 1999 - The previous group met with University Core Curriculum Committee to develop a plan to deal with U.S. History concerns of the Board. Plan receives approval of UCCC.
- o February 1999 - Plan presented to Academic Affairs Committee of BOV and to full BOV with favorable reaction. BOV requested detailed planning and implementation.
- o March 1999 - Full resolution developed to provide for graduation requirement of demonstrated proficiency in American History, passed unanimously by UCCC and CUSP.
- o April 5, 1999 - First reading to University Council.

In response to a suggestion that the BOV help to obtain resources, it was noted that it is unrealistic to ask the Board to go to the state for resources and that part of the appropriation process is an appropriation to handle the academic program. This becomes an internal decision.

Are there other policies that say an on-line course will be offered, if not why is that specific to this resolution? Dr. Bates responded that he does not have information regarding on-line courses in other departments.

Concern was expressed as to why this possibility should be privileged over, for example, required courses in economics, science studies or world history, all of which are arguably indispensable to an understanding of the 21st century. Bert Moyer explained that only history holds this young and unusually diverse nation together and is our common denominator. History courses today are very rich in history about minorities and women, and strong in areas other than traditional stereotypical domain of history that is social sciences and humanities. History courses at Virginia Tech give good coverage of developments in science and technology.

From a student's perspective, Virginia Tech students are limited as productive citizens if they do not have the basic fundamental knowledge. A 20th century course will be a benefit to all students.

Richard Bambach noted that we have requirements for science literacy in some areas of humanities, and some in social sciences. Students have a poor understanding of history and time sequence. This will not add six hours to the student's curriculum. This is only for students who do not have a reasonable understanding at entrance.

A comment was made that there would be more positive response if this resolution came through the Core Curriculum and not the legislature to the BOV. Is there any evidence that Virginia Tech graduates in the core curriculum they took were or are unsuccessful or non-competitive? Does this so-called failure have anything to do with American History? Our core curriculum is successful. The response was that it has come from the Core Curriculum Committee to honor the request of the BOV. Once a matter passes from the BOV to us it is an internal matter. This requirement is intended to be part of the students' normal program if this requirement was not met in high school. Credit for this course would go toward graduation. Concern was expressed that if this is part of instead of in addition to, it is taking away courses that students may feel are more valuable than American History. This would be similar to taking a foreign language in high school and not having to repeat it in college. Students will know in high school that they will need a certain amount of American History. "In addition to" or "as a part of" is a detail that has to be worked out and will go through university governance.

This is a broad resolution that allows us to go through all discussions, various interest points, and all has to go back through the governance process. This is an interaction with the BOV that assures them that we know how to work through these and we will come up with an acceptable process at the end. The BOV can go back to the state and report that we have a good procedure, well thought out, has been through shared governance, this is a conclusion that best serves the student body at this institution. This will be at university level.

It was suggested that world history and geography might be better suit our student for being prepared to compete in global economy. It was then noted that the core curriculum requires people in area seven to take a course like global issues. We are covering the global situation, but are not covering U.S. History.

Dr. Axsom, as a guest at this meeting, raised a number of concerns, including that politics are involved and it is fast tracked; that the plan was put before the BOV initially before shown to Core Curriculum Committee where second reading was waived; that support has not been unanimous. He also noted that Faculty Senate chose not to endorse this at the March meeting, and that an attempt to mandate this before legislature failed. His view is that BOV concern about the core more generally was diffused at the last meeting, which leads one to believe that a principled response to U.S. History might be treated similarly. He is concerned with the micro-management outside the academy. Questions regarding principle are 1) What is the larger goal the resolution will address? 2) What are ways in which the current core and the Virginia Tech experience address the larger goal of citizenship? 3) Are we lacking in this regard? If so, what is the evidence? 4) Where is the evidence that U.S. History will further this goal? 5) Is the requirement of specific courses a wise approach? He suggested that this be sent back to the Core Curriculum Committee and the principle be addressed more fully.

The response was that the Core Curriculum Committee started discussing this at their spring meetings last year before the request came forward from the BOV, History Department brought in a group of American historians for advice and Ron Daniel has been involved. Ron Daniel shared information from the National Assessment of Educational Progress 1994 that indicates a trending downward for elementary and high school students. All implementation details will come through the governance system.

Dr. Torgersen noted that the General Assembly wants the BOV to consider a history requirement. Our Board is following this suggestion.

A correction was suggested to the statement that reads: "That all entering students at Virginia Tech who score at or above specific standards through the university governance system, " should read as follows: "That all entering students at Virginia Tech who score at or above specific standards, approved through the university governance system, "

This resolution passed with a vote of 22 in favor, 21 opposed.

Chair Jim Burger submitted this resolution for second reading. Dean Greg Brown explained that one goal is to have an umbrella title that will encompass programs in the college. If Forestry is singled out that implies that there is something that does not fit under the "natural resources" umbrella. Richard Bambach is opposed to this resolution because it does not include the mineral resources, water resources or non-renewable energy resources. This is a partial grouping of natural resources. Since there is not a plan to move geological sciences to the "College of Natural Resources," this title is the wrong term for that college. There was concern expressed that extra responsibility is placed on biology and other departments doing research in natural resource areas to call attention to what is being done in these departments rather than what is going on in the "College of Natural Resources."

It was noted that this does not change department names and students wanting to go into the field of mineral, energy and biological resources, know where they are going. The emerging development of colleges across the country attaching the label of natural resources makes it appropriate to rename this college program.

Dean Brown commented that there are 18 departments, schools, or colleges currently carrying the title natural resources and he is not aware of problems concerning student confusion.

This resolution passed with a vote of 26 in favor and 11 opposed.

Approval of the Collective Commission Minutes. Council approved a packet of Commission minutes comprised of:

- Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, March 17, 1999
- Commission on Outreach, March 30, 1999. Note: 13 of 23 members were present.
- Commission on Student Affairs, April 1, 1999
- Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, March 22, 1999

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/sws

Virginia Tech Governance Information

URL: </uc9899/ucm99-04-19.html>

University Council Minutes

May 3, 1999

Present: Michael Williams (for Erv Blythe), Greg Brown, Landrum Cross, Ben Dixon, Peter Eyre, Eileen Hitchingham, Elyzabeth Holford, Janet Johnson, Paul Knox, David Ford (for Peggy Meszaros), Carole Nickerson, John Eaton (for Len Peters), Minnis Ridenour, Ray Smoot, Rich Sorensen, Charles Steger, Bill Stephenson, Andy Swiger, Tom Tillar, Paul Torgersen, Richard Bambach, Jim Burger, Madonna Mendoza, Cindy Harrison, Pat Hyer (for Charles Lytton), Robert Tracy, Nicolaus Tideman, Wayne Durham, Deborah Mayo, Bruce Obenhaus (for Paul Metz), Kevin Pelzer, Bob Benoit, David de Wolf, Bernard Feldman, Joann Boles (for Rosemary Goss), Frank Gwazdauskas, Sam Hicks, John Randolph, John Seiler, Anita Haney, Curtis Lynch, Pete Martens, Nancy Phillips, Ben Poe, Peggy Rasnick, Joel Donahue, Jody Olson, Duncan Neasham, Aaron McCly (for Kathleen Knight), Drew Lichtenberger (for Natalie Wilson), Sean Blackburn, Jeffrey Sutton (for Paul Wagner)

Absent: Bob Bates, Muzzo Uysal, Terry Swecker, Skip Fuhman, Norm Marriott, Eliza Tse, Jamaa Bickley-King, Donna Cassell, Aashish Jain

Guests: Laurie Coble, Steve Mouras, Norrine Bailey Spencer

1. Call to Order

Dr. Paul Torgersen called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and announced this would be the last meeting of the academic year. A quorum was present.

2. Adoption of Agenda

A motion passed to adopt the agenda.

3. Announcement of approval and posting of Council Minutes of April 19, 1999

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the April 19, 1999, University Council meeting have been voted on and approved electronically. Once voted upon, University Council minutes can be publicly accessed on the Governance Information System on the WEB. (/)

4. On-Going Business

Second Reading

Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies
Resolution 1998-99E
Resolution Regarding Residency for Doctoral Degrees

Chair Jim Burger made a motion that CGS&P be allowed to withdraw this resolution for the purpose of clarification of wording and bring back to Council in the fall. The motion passed.

Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies
Resolution 1998-99F
Resolution Regarding Transfer Credit for Master's Degrees

Chair Jim Burger moved that Council approve the resolution Regarding Transfer Credit for Master's Degrees. The motion was seconded. Marty Day distributed a handout and addressed concerns of Council members. The resolution will remove the policy currently in place that allows 50% of courses in a program of study to be transferred from Virginia schools. Reason is that at the Ph.D. level 50% of the 90 hours is 45, the default transfer allowance for all Ph.Ds is 42. At the master's level the Commission felt a 50% allowance of transfer credit is too high as the general policy - the policy that would apply to all students. This resolution would selectively grant permission to specific programs to allow students in those programs to transfer up to 50% of the courses on their program of study for programs for which this is appropriate. This would allow programs to design more specific guidelines. This resolution will remove the restriction on transfer credit limitation on Virginia schools and allow more than 20% of transfer credit to come from non-Virginia institutions. This resolution does not put the Graduate School in the position of judging individual requests for transfer on individual programs of study - this is the role of advisory committees. The Graduate School does have a role in setting baseline and default standards that should apply to the majority of programs, but with enough flexibility to adjust them to accommodate the specific needs of individual programs. There is a grandfather clause that will allow programs using the 50% allowance to continue without interruption. For a new program, request of transfer credit of more than 20% can and should accompany the proposal to institute the program and will go through the governance system. There will be no waiting period beyond the already existing waiting period to institute a new program. In conclusion, there is a new restriction - 50% transfer credit from Virginia schools will not be available to every graduate student on campus. The change is to prevent abuse while allowing programs that have a legitimate reason to use 50% transfer credit. Dr. de Wolf made a friendly amendment to refer this resolution back to CGS&P for modification. This was seconded. It was noted that the College of Engineering is responsible for the majority of courses in off-campus sites.

It was also noted that every program that has been using the existing rules allows the Graduate School to accept the programs' history into a written request to continue with the 50% allowance. In response to a concern regarding the impact on future degrees, it was noted that programs can ask that the same restriction be removed as part of the proposal. This resolution asks new programs to consider accepting additional coursework for programmatic reasons and not for individual exception. The motion to refer the resolution back to the Commission was defeated. The original motion to approve this resolution was passed.

Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies
Resolution 1998-99G
Resolution Regarding Changing Advisory Committee Membership

Chair Jim Burger moved that Council approve this Resolution Regarding Changing Advisory Committee Membership. The present policy states that if there is going to be a change in a student's committee membership, it requires approval of all committee members both new and old. This resolution adds to this: "In the case that one or more members does not approve the change in the membership of the advisory committee, an appeal may be made by either the student or a faculty member to a department graduate committee. The graduate committee will make a

recommendation for action to the Department Head and the Dean of the Graduate School." This is a simple appeal process. Resolution passed unanimously.

Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies
Resolution 1998-99C
Resolution to Revise Presidential Policy Memorandum No. 69 Freshman Rule Policy

Chair Bob Tracy moved that Council approve the Resolution to Revise Presidential Policy Memorandum No. 69 Freshman Rule Policy. Motion was seconded. Concern was expressed that this is a disadvantage to freshmen. Freshmen not doing well in a class are encouraged to do well on a final exam and this resolution puts freshmen at a disadvantage if they do not do well on the final exam. Students sometimes do not have a test during the first six weeks and do not know how well they are doing. Freshmen are overwhelmed and it is difficult knowing all policies. Academic advising cannot always tell students what to do. The Freshman Rule is a last chance solution for students who try and are not doing well, since they can drop the course and it will not hurt them so much. We should require freshmen coming in to meet a higher standard. By the time students are upper class, they should have a better feel for the courses. Others noted that the current Freshman Rule is a disservice to students because of the way it appears on the transcript. Freshmen are forced to get a bad grade to get out of it. This resolution is to provide a consistent incentive to assume responsibility for one's curriculum throughout one's academic career. In response to a question about problems in regard to graduation with last minute data coming through until the end of classes, it was noted that there will not be a negative effect unless the student is opting to reduce the number of credits below 120 or whatever is appropriate for their major or college. The resolution passed.

Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies
Resolution 1998-99D
Resolution to Revise Presidential Policy Memorandum No. 72 Credit Granted Other Than That Obtained in Traditional Enrollment At Virginia Tech

Chair Bob Tracy moved that Council approve the Resolution to Revise Presidential Policy Memorandum No. 72. There being no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

Independent Resolution
Resolution Regarding Faculty, Staff and Student Parking

Frank Gwazdauskas asked for discussion prior to motion being offered. Dr. Gwazdauskas noted that: 1) Transportation and Parking Committee did not approve or disapprove this increase in parking assessment for athletic events. 2) Why do faculty, staff and students have to pay twice for parking? 3) 6,102 spaces have been approved for athletics on football game days; this number accounts for approximately 20,000 season ticket holders at a rate of 30%. What happens to the rest of the 35,000 tickets possibly up to 10,500 additional people on campus? 4) Do students have to pay for parking if they come on campus for a football game? 5) With only around \$10,000 in additional revenue generated, it would be a good gesture not to charge faculty, staff and students to park. 6) Would others be able to charge for parking for other events? 7) What happens to faculty and staff members that are Hokie Club members now that voluntarily contribute to the athletic fund for scholarship activities?

Executive Vice President Minnis Ridenour summarized the plan. There are four basic objectives to be considered: 1) The Athletic Parking Plan is an attempt to charge actual users of the parking facilities at athletic events. There are more people on campus for football games than any other event. 2) Appropriate parking would be provided and monitored for faculty, staff and students who are on campus for other than football games. 3) This plan will help to control the cost of faculty, staff and student parking fees. 4) Provides athletic scholarships. Mr. Ridenour noted that the rationale was to spread operating costs across the real users of the facilities. Hokie Club members will also pay to park.

A Council member suggested it would be more appropriate to cover this cost through an increase in ticket prices and voluntary donations. A concern was expressed that this parking fee would be a hidden cost and would not be good for the university. Faculty senate members are opposed to paying this fee. Dr. de Wolf made a motion to refer this resolution back to the appropriate commission/committee for approval. Concern was expressed over lack of communication regarding this decision, and the fact that it had not been formally taken through the governance system. In response to a question regarding persons with hang tags parking in lots not designated for football parking, Mr. Ridenour responded that there is no way to monitor if a person is going to work or a ballgame.

Mr. Ridenour noted that in light of this discussion, his view is that Council should pass the resolution. Several members commented that the issue should be restudied and returned through the governance system. Others specified that they want to be sure there is a moratorium on additional event-related parking fees for faculty, staff and students until or unless this matter returns through the governance system.

Dr. Torgersen summarized the motion and noted that this resolution functions as a moratorium since it calls for no additional payment above the charges for vehicle registration for parking on campus for faculty, staff and students during athletic events. The resolution passed unanimously.

Approval of the Collective Commission Minutes

Council approved a packet of Commission minutes comprised of:

- Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty March 18, 1999
- Commission on Faculty Affairs March 31, 1999
- Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies April 7, 1999
- Commission on Student Affairs April 15, 1999
- Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies April 12, 1999
- Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies April 26, 1999

5. For Information Only

Minutes of University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning of April 7, 1999.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/sws

Virginia Tech Governance Information

URL: </uc9899/ucm99-05-03.html>