

## The Commission on University Support

### Minutes of the Meeting

September 20, 1994, 1:00pm,  
Burruss Hall 400

Attending were Erving Blythe, Scott Casino, Patrick Donohoe, Robert Dunay, Evelyn Graybeal, Richard Lovegrove, Paul Metz, Hugh Munson, Kim O'Rourke (for Dean Steger), Carl Polan (chair), G. Russell, Ray Smoot, and Neal Vines.

The meeting was called to order by Carl Polan and those present introduced themselves.

#### Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the May 10, 1994 meeting were distributed to new members and time was given for a brief review. Patrick Donohoe moved the correction of the spelling of Peter Karp's name and the correction of "Parking and Issues Committee" to "Policy and Issues." The minutes were approved as corrected.

#### Announcements:

Carl Polan announced that the committee would continue to handle as much of its communications as possible electronically. The minutes will be circulated by electronic mail and will be considered approved if no corrections are received by the chair before the next meeting.

The charge to the commission was distributed and Carl Polan briefly discussed the commissions responsibilities and the committees that report to it:

"To study, formulate, and recommend to University Council policies and procedures related to support of the three missions of the University. Areas for consideration include: accounting, budget administration, purchasing, computing, communications and publications, physical facilities, parking and transportation, corporations and auxiliaries, Development Office, Institutional Research, Liaison with the Virginia Tech Foundation, the Alumni Association, and other related matters."

#### Committee Assignments

Arrangements are being made, pursuant to recommendations from last year, for a member of the commission to serve as a voting member on each reporting committee. The following members have expressed their willingness to serve:

Hugh Munson on the Building Committee.  
Eric Hallerman on the Communications Committee,  
Patrick Donohoe on the Parking/Transportation Committee

In addition, the chair intends to ask David Russell to serve on the Computer Committee.

It was moved and seconded that these representatives be approved. The motion passed unanimously.

The chair informed the commission of a meeting he will attend on September 23, 1994 to review the commission's representation on the various committees in an attempt to be sure that expertise matches assignments as closely as possible.

#### Committee Reports:

No approvals of last year's final committee reports have yet been received by the chair.

#### 1994-95 Meetings:

This academic year's meetings have been scheduled in 400 Burruss Hall from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. on the following Tuesdays:

October 4, 1994

November 1, 1994

December 6, 1994

January 3, 1995

February 7, 1995

March 7, 1995

April 4, 1995

May 2, 1995

#### Areas of Interest:

The chair reviewed key issues identified last year, including concerns over the quality of classroom space and the design of the various entrances to the university. He suggested that the university architect be invited to review the university's overall plans and perhaps to discuss these or other issues. He then solicited input from the commission.

Ray Smoot indicated that some follow up on the classroom issues took place during the summer. Responsibilities for classrooms are divided among several organizations and the general sense of the group seems to be that while we receive many comments on our attractive campus, many of our facilities are not very attractive on the inside. Quite a bit happened over the summer to address those needs. He volunteered to invite representatives to attend and discuss this issue at the October meeting. The offer was accepted.

#### Other Business:

Paul Metz asked how close the university is to the visible stages of the capital campaign and whether or not the commission might be a useful vehicle for disseminating information

Kim O'Rourke responded that the public kick-off of the campaign is scheduled for September 16, 1995 at the Hotel Roanoke, about a year from now. Plans for departmental needs and requests are still being developed and will be included in case statements to be submitted by the Deans. She indicated that Dean Steger likely would be available for the November meeting, if the commission so wished.

Mr. Munson asked what the commission might do with the information it receives from such meetings. The chair indicated that we may choose to make recommendations concerning any issues or concerns that might arise.

Patrick Donohoe volunteered to invite Peter Karp to come talk about the campus master plan and how it might encompass some of the issues mentioned.

Polan asked Erv Blythe for a brief update on the faculty development program. Erv Blythe described two programs, one designed for the faculty (driven largely out of the Provost's office) and the other for administrative staff, with Information Systems' being the service arm for the programs as part of its Phase II restructuring efforts.

On the staff side, the focus is to create a new office computing environment that will be compatible with the newer university systems that will be coming on line over the next few years.

On the faculty side, Information Systems provides workstations and training, or in some cases some funding support for colleges to participate in the programs. The idea is that over a 3 or 4 year period faculty will recycle the technology they have and received updated equipment and training. Last year's initial efforts focused on departments that traditionally have not had much access to computing and networking technology. Over the next year or so that will even out and toward the 3rd and 4th years we likely will be serving mainly those areas that did not participate in the first year, areas that have actually been ahead of the rest of the university. The programs have been well received on campus and off. They have had good support from the State Council of Higher Education and members of the general assembly recently were on campus to look at results and talk to faculty. The visibility has been good and very helpful to our funding efforts.

The chair commented that faculty with whom he has spoken have been enthusiastic. The program was described as "electrifying the faculty."

Blythe concluded by saying that the challenge will be to customize the program to meet the needs of those faculty who are really advanced and to create the expectation that the university has a responsibility for a continuing annual investment in the faculty through the technology and training they need.

Patrick Donohoe asked for a new listing of members and the chair agreed to make it available as soon as possible.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

# The Commission on University Support

Minutes of the Meeting  
October 4, 1994 1:00pm  
Burruss Hall 400

Attending: Robert Bates, Scott Casino, Patrick Donohoe, Robert Dunay, Marvin Foushee (for Jim Wolfe), Patrick Gallagher, Evelyn Graybeal, Spencer Hall, Eric Hallerman, Richard Lovegrove, Paul Metz, Hugh Munson, Kim O'Rourke (for Dean Steger), Carl Polan (chair), G. Russell, Bill Sanders (for Erving Blythe), Ray Smoot, and Neal Vines.  
Guests: Tom Head, John Moore

## Approval of September Minutes

Minutes of the September meeting were not submitted for approval due to the lateness of their distribution. They will be presented for approval at the next meeting.

## Approval of Reporting Committee Minutes

No minutes have been received from any of the reporting committees.

The chair briefly mentioned efforts underway to ensure that people with appropriate expertise are serving on the various committees and that the committee structure is as streamlined as possible for greatest efficiency. The effort may take a significant part of the current year.

The Parking and Transportation Committee met September 26, 1994 and the minutes of the June meeting have been forwarded electronically to the Commission chair.

The schedule of future commission meetings was reviewed briefly.

## Presentation on Classroom Quality

Ray Smoot began by remarking that most visitors to the university comment positively on our campus and its general beauty, but that if they were to look more closely inside buildings and examine classrooms, they often see a different picture. We have various people now involved in efforts to upgrade and improve our classrooms, both in function and aesthetics. We are looking for funding from various sources for this work, \$250,000 was invested this year by the provost, The College of Engineering invested \$25,000 last year and is investing \$10,000 this year to work on their classrooms, and Information Systems is redirecting \$250,000 to improve access to instructional technology.

Ray Smoot introduced Marvin Foushee from the Registrar's Office, who circulated a chart of the general assignment classrooms managed by the Registrar's office, which works closely with academic departments to handle the scheduling of the classrooms. A major thrust is underway to upgrade these classrooms, specifically the air conditioning, lighting, and other factors that contribute both to comfort and to an enhanced learning environment. Discussions have been held with both faculty and students to get input.

Part of the upgrades involve technology items and the technical support that they require. Such support is also needed in some of the larger auditorium spaces so that faculty will not have to be

concerned with the details of operating the equipment. All the classrooms now have TV monitors and at least an overhead projector (capable of driving an LCD panel for computing display) and screen.

Most of the Physical Plant work must be done during the summer when fewer students are on campus; however, this makes for an intensive construction schedule. Mr. Foushee showed a series of slides illustrating some of the construction projects and improvements to campus classrooms including auditorium spaces in Davidson, Whittemore, and Smyth Halls, the new computer labs in Williams and McBryde (joint efforts with Educational Technologies), and classrooms in Holden and Randolph Halls. Much more has been done on a smaller scale, but a considerable amount remains to be done. In fact, he expects such improvements and maintenance to become an ongoing part of the University's commitment to instructional facility improvement.

Tom Head opened his comments by describing Educational Technology's efforts to find ways to improve the teaching/learning process. He distributed copies of graphs showing progress against goals for the general assignment classrooms. He also had available copies of a booklet about the Instructional Development Initiative and the computer oriented faculty development workshops. The training helps faculty identify and make known their instructional needs, many of which involve computers. About 250 computers have been installed in labs since May, 1993, and 50 more systems will go into newly renovated labs by Christmas, 1994. He emphasized that these renovated labs are open to all students

Spencer Hall provided a list showing the total cost of projects (about \$300,000) and their progress to date. Reserved Maintenance funds have been the source of some funding, but the state requirements make it clear that the funds can only be used for maintenance, so they have been combined with other funds to help complete the projects.

Marvin Foushee said that an advisory committee of faculty and others have largely determined the priorities of the projects taking into account both the condition of the space itself and the number of students that will be served. Tom Head added that initial efforts focused on core curriculum subjects (like English and Math) that have high enrollments.

The point was made, in response to questions, that investments thus far have been made in classrooms that are generally assigned by registrar, not in those spaces assigned by individual departments, though any proposal from departments will be entertained.

Bob Bates pointed out that many departmental spaces are outfitted as labs dedicated to specific activities and that such space does not lend itself well to multiple purposes, so that will always be a difficult problem. However, 80 of the 165 general assignment classes are in buildings occupied by the College of Arts and Sciences, which clearly could not do the renovations if there were an expectation that college funds were required. Thus, the progress made so far are having a positive impact on teaching conditions for individual departments.

In response to a question by Paul Metz about classroom utilization, Ray Smoot pointed to the state's refusal to fund additional new construction until our space utilization (by state standards that look at use until 10:00pm each day) improves considerably. Marvin Foushee indicated that general assignment classes are used to about 80% capacity until 5:00pm, but are not well used (or not reported as being used) during the evening hours.

The chair asked the presenters if they saw any related specific activities in which the commission should be involved.

A brief general discussion identified numerous factors (e.g. faculty and student activity schedules, class preparation time, availability of courses, extracurricular activities, non-instructional use, and space sharing with departments) that bear on how space is utilized and how the state perceives the space situation.

Tom Head pointed out a natural conflict between efforts to make changes in spaces and the need simultaneously to meet ongoing needs for those spaces. Problems of security and maintenance for new equipment and space also exist.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 PM.

## The Commission on University Support

### Minutes of the Meeting

November 1, 1994 1:00pm

Burruss Hall 400

Attending: Carl Polan, Jim Armstrong, Eric Hallerman, Patrick Donohoe, Patrick Gallagher, Hugh Munson, Evelyn Graybeal, Scott Casino, Richard Lovegrove, Ray Smoot, Spencer Hall, Kathryn Kane (for Robert Bates), Marvin Foushee (for Jim Wolfe), G.E. Russell, Charles Steger, Paul Metz, David Russell, Robert Dunay  
Guests: none

### Approval of the September and October Minutes

Minutes of the September and October meeting were approved pending no substantive changes brought forth to the chair from members of the Commission.

### Vice Chair

The Chair indicated that the selection of the Vice Chair will be on the agenda for the meeting in December. Any faculty or staff member who will serve during the 95-96 session is eligible.

### Approval of Reporting Committee Minutes

Building Committee: Hugh Munson reported that the Building Committee has not met. Ray Smoot (Building Committee Chair) stated that there have been no policy issues in regards to the Building Committee. Most of the work is done in the various Building Sub-committees.

Computer Committee: David Russell stated that the Computer Committee has not met.

Communication Resources Committee: Eric Hallerman stated that the Committee had met and gave a brief report of their last meeting.

Parking/Transportation Committee: Patrick Donohoe stated that the last meeting was in September and had nothing to report. The next meeting is scheduled for November.

### Capital Campaign Plan

Charles Steger, Vice President of Development and University Relations, gave a presentation to the Commission on Virginia Tech's Capital Campaign Plan. He stated that in 1994, \$29.2 million had been raised. The sources of gifts come from several areas including: corporations, faculty, staff, friends, parents and alumni. 97% of the gifts given to the University are restricted to areas within the University such as the Corp of Cadets, the College of Engineering and other Colleges. 2.7% of the gifts are unrestricted and are used for programs such as Founders Day. The uses of the gifts include the following:

Current Operations	38.22%
Endowment	30.72%
Capital Facilities	16.23%
Sponsored Programs	14.83%

Ray Smoot commented that the University would, "raise almost twice of what

we would raise without the campaign". Charles Steger stated that the Fall 95 Campaign's goal is to raise \$45 to 50 million not the current \$25 to 30 million per year. The goals for the campaign will be set by the Board of Visitors this spring. The goals include raising \$250 million of which \$125 million would be permanent endowments.

The Campaign was started in July of 91 that included a planning phase to July 92. The "Quiet Phase" of commitments started at that time and is continuing. The end of the Campaign is targeted for April of 98 with a celebration and the end of accounting will take place in June of that year.

Charles Steger continued with a comment that 90% of the money came from 10% of the people (the rule of thirds) and are looking at over 20,000 possible prospects for gift giving. All information regarding possible prospects is kept strictly confidential.

At the end of the presentation, Jim Armstrong raised the question if there was a fear of less money from the state with more money coming in from the campaign. Charles Steger's response was, "We have no choice.". The campaign needs to continue in order for Virginia Tech to remain successful as a University.

In other business, at the end of the meeting the Chair raised a previous issue about the possibility of creating a new university committee that would address environment and energy concerns. This issue apparently had been raised by a guest, Richard Hirsch, at a Commission meeting last year. The Chair asked, "Where does this fit in University governance?". After a brief discussion no action was taken. A public hearing had been set for that evening concerning an addition to the Coal Fire Boiler Heating Plant. Spencer Hall, Assistant Vice President for Facilities, added that the new Coal Fire Boiler is a "new state of the art boiler" and Virginia Tech has met all the requirements for the new boiler. After the new boiler is in operation the old boiler will be decommissioned. Ray Smoot commented that the preference is to burn natural gas but would cost the university several million dollars a year over and above the cost of coal. Coal is the predominant fuel.

There was no other new business.

The meeting adjourned at 2:10 pm.



# The Commission on University Support

## Minutes of the Meeting

January 3, 1995, 1:00 p.m.,  
Burruss Hall 400

Attending: Bob Bates, Patrick Donohoe, Robert Dunay, Spencer Hall, Eric Hallerman, Peter Karp, Richard Lovegrove, Paul Metz, Kim O'Rourke (for Charles Steger), Carl Polan (chair), Bill Sanders (for Erv Blythe), and Ray Smoot.

The chair called the meeting to order and reviewed the agenda .

The minutes of the October and November meetings were approved.

Minutes were approved from the September meetings of the Communications Resources Committee and the Parking and Transportation Committee.

### PRESENTATION ON THE UNIVERSITY MASTER PLAN by Peter Karp:

We must have a current master plan lodged with the state government in Richmond, without which we are not allowed to put any building on our property.

The firm of Sasaki Associates, Inc. from Watertown, MA was hired last year to help with the formation and update of our plan. Six other firms provided additional assistance.

The master plan has seven goals: Design Guides for Architecture and Landscape, Land Planning and Site Selection Criteria, Transportation and Parking Strategy, Arrival/Entry Gateways, Definition of Perimeter, The Land use Master Plan for Kentland Farm, and a Utilities Review. The final version of the plan will exist in electronic format and be available on-line. When printed it will be about three quarters of an inch thick with fold-out drawings.

The Corporate Research Center is not university property and so is not shown on the university drawings, but the CRC does have its own master plan.

The campus is essentially built on two ridges with the drill field area as a natural drainage area between the two. Development has traditionally clustered around those ridges, a trend that is expected to continue.

A significant proposal from the consultants would involve the reforestation of much of the university's present turf grass and mowed areas, both to improve the quality of the land for the surrounding hardwood trees and to reduce maintenance costs. The first area affected likely will be some of the land surrounding the College of Veterinary Medicine. Selected spots in the residence hall areas may be handled the same way. The drill field itself may get some selective plantings around the perimeter, both trees and flowering shrubs. Continued renovation around the duck pond and the president's house will continue.

Road improvements also are included. One of the earliest projects would realign Spring Road between Cassell Coliseum and the Rector Field House so that it meets Southgate at Tech Center Drive. Further changes will make West Campus Drive more of a service road than the thoroughfare it is today. The road around the Duck Pond will be rerouted through part of the present golf course so that the duck

pond area may be optimized for bike and pedestrian traffic. Some of the golf course will have to be relocated.

The numerous other planned projects include a new student health and fitness center, additional dormitories, possible parking structures at the Donaldson Brown Center and on Stanger street, and a new chemistry building. All projects will be approached with careful attention to the trade-off between open access to areas and the density of development. There will be a clear intent to preserve the quads and other attractive outside spaces.

For entries and gateways, a look back at our history may serve us well. The main entrance to campus used to be at the foot of main street, where Main now intersects with the mall. Something should be restored there, perhaps in conjunction with a new performing arts center. Perhaps part of the project will be the proposed Information and Technology Center building, spanning the mall and attached to the Newman Library, that might provide both a gateway and a forecourt to the war memorial. Though none of these buildings has yet been designed, block models can be seen in the office of the University Architect.

Within a few weeks, Peter Karp expects to have the final version of the plan back from the consultants.

When asked for his opinion of the appropriateness of the recently completed renovation of Squires, Karp indicated that he felt the project was appropriate given the intended use of the building, but that there are some problems, particularly with parking.

In response to a question about the approval process for the plan, Karp indicated that the Commonwealth of Virginia must approve the plan, as must the Board of Visitors. However, the document is by no means cast in stone. The plan is a vision taken at this point in time and changes must be expected as circumstances dictate.

Yes, there will be some hokie stone on the new student health and fitness center to be built near the field house. By combining it with our recreation/fitness needs we were able to move the student health building project ahead by several years. A brick transitional building/area also will be placed there which will ease the blend with Litton Reaves and the other brick buildings nearby.

What kind of input has been received from the campus and others? The Building Committee (which has broad representation), Public Health and Safety, The Director of Planning, the College of Architecture, the Town of Blacksburg, Montgomery county, the New River Planning Authority, and others, all have been involved. Consultants have been coming to campus once a month and to meet with the President, the Executive Vice President, the Provost, the Vice President for Finance, and the Building Committee, and to spend time working on specific tasks. At least four of the meetings were advertised and open to the public. We also maintained an e-mail address that drew a significant number of comments.

#### COMMISSION REPORTS:

Eric Hallerman reported that the Communications Resources Committee met in October and November during which representatives from Newman Library reported about networking projects, the virtual library, the First Search service, and the Scholarly Communications Project. In addition, a decision was made to contact both the Library and the Computing Committee about the availability of training programs for students, faculty, and staff. A draft statement encouraging improved network access for faculty

has been revised and will be further discussed. The Mail Subcommittee discussed electronic mail, particularly issues of proper use and privacy. A major question is whether or not our e-mail is subject to the same legal considerations as print mail.

Susan Olivier talked to the committee about the possible need for establishing guidelines for the university's on-line information servers like World Wide Web and gopher. University Relations has been asked to look into this and its bearing on the issue of the university's image.

Ray Smoot pointed out that e-mail, its use, and its confidentiality are very sensitive issues. Bill Sanders, who has been handling acceptable use concerns for the Computing Center, commented on the great difficulties of navigating among issues like censorship, freedom of speech, and the university's responsibility to insure the rightful use of the equipment and resources entrusted to it. He expressed a willingness to present to the subcommittee any information it might find useful concerning our current acceptable use statement and how it is being applied.

Judy Lilly will attend a future meeting to discuss off-campus network access for all students. An across-the-board access fee or some other new funding mechanism may need to be a part of that effort.

Patrick Donohoe reported that the Parking and Transportation Committee has proposed distributing its minutes by e-mail to speed up distribution. The last set of minutes did go out by e-mail. Significant recent actions involved: 1)- responding to a letter from Paxton Marshall regarding safety on West Campus drive near Wallace hall where we have had problems at the crosswalks near the top of the rise. Dr. Torgersen responded to him that the committee will be looking into it. 2)- The number of student leader parking permits has grown to about twenty and will be reduced back to twelve. 3)- About 1900 people took advantage of the payroll deduction option for fall parking permits and the program is considered a success. More people are expected to use it in the future. 4)- Lighting in the Owens and Media Building parking lots has proved to be inadequate. The bulb wattage will be raised from 75 to 150 watts in that area. 5)- There is a nationwide electronic bulletin board for parking: cpark-l@psuvm.psu.edu. 6)- Carpooling has resurfaced as an issue and will be looked into at a later date. The next meeting of the committee will be January 25.

#### Election of Vice Chair

Dr. Polan identified the 5 qualified individuals now serving on the Commission and who will be available next year. Any of them can be elected vice chair now to serve as chair next year. Patrick Donohoe nominated Paul Metz; Spencer Hall seconded. After some discussion of the responsibilities associated with the position of chair, the nominations were closed and Paul Metz was elected vice chair by acclamation.

The spring meetings of the Commission on University Support will be February 7, March 7, April 4, and May 2.

No other business was presented.

The meeting adjourned at 2:13 p.m.

# The Commission on University Support

## Minutes of the Meeting

March 7, 1995, 1:00 p.m.,  
Burruss Hall 400

Present: Robert Dunay, Evelyn Graybeal, Julia King (for Patrick Donohoe), Richard Lovegrove, Paul Metz, Marvin Foushee, Bill Sanders (for Erv Blythe), Neal Vines

Guest: Eileen Hitchingham

The meeting was called to order by Paul Metz, Vice Chair.

Metz reviewed the status of minutes that have been submitted by the various committees that report to the commission. Minutes from several meetings of the University Communications Resources Committee (9/27, 10/25, and 11/29) appear to have been received electronically, but others appear to be missing, perhaps those from the meeting of 1/31/95, which most members of the commission indicated they had not received. Paul Metz agreed to check on the missing minutes but all other minutes were accepted.

Paul Metz then reported that the Communications Resources Committee also has forwarded some appendices concerning (1) electronic mail and (2) access to electronic information, the latter resulting from significant discussion concerning acquisition by the library of various electronic databases and resources that are not available over the campus network. By way of information, he underscored the library's understanding and support of the committee's concerns, then quickly identified three general problem areas that significantly affect the present availability of electronic resources on the campus network:

(1) technological issues: For example, when we have permission to network, how do we translate information and software that arrives in one electronic format so that it will operate properly in another format required for network distribution.

(2) contractual limitations: For example, if our contract calls for "instructional use only," how can we place it on the network, yet still be sure that it won't be used for other purposes?

(3) cost: Some services that are highly affordable in a stand-alone format are extremely expensive when licensed for a network environment, making it difficult or impossible to justify the additional expense in the context of other budgetary commitments.

Dr. Metz then introduced Dr. Eileen Hitchingham, Director of the University Libraries.

Dr. Hitchingham: I welcome the opportunity to come and discuss with you trends and future directions in the University Libraries.

What do most people think libraries are like? Many imagine a calm peaceful spot at the heart of campus, but given the dramatic changes going on in information these days, the library is more like a raft on whitewater.

We have multiple libraries at Virginia Tech. In addition to the Newman Library, we have Art and Architecture, Geology, Veterinary Medicine, and the Northern Virginia facility that supports our graduate programs in that part of the state.

Our staff? As of our June 1993 report to the ARL, we had 292 FTE. About 19% of those were faculty or professional employees, 41% were classified staff, and like most libraries we rely heavily on student employees who comprise about 39% of those FTEs.

In the same report we cited a collection of about 1.8 million volumes, not including documents, microforms, and other formats. In addition, we reported 17,000 purchased serial publications and about 2000 other serials that arrive without charge from organizations of various types.

We budget more for materials than other comparable institutions, about 53% of our total. The norm at other locations would be between 34% and 38%. Tech spends only about 41% of its budget on faculty/staff and 6% on operating expenses. Most peer institutions spend 53%-55% on faculty and staff and about a third or a little more on materials.

It would be nice if we could read the future more clearly. Libraries often talk about 5-year plans, but in this environment a 2- or 3-year plan better reflects the realities. We needed flexibility to be able to make best guesses about frequent change, to be able to take advantage of opportunities as they come along. These rules probably apply to higher education as a whole, and not only to the Library.

At the same time, there are some trends that apply both here and at other academic libraries. Most libraries traditionally have a Ptolemaic view of themselves at the center of the academic endeavor, a central point of focus for surrounding scholars. The perception is part and parcel of a great investiture in the concept of library as "place." But today we see increasing acceptance of a Copernican view with the scholar at the center surrounded by various resources among which is the library offering a variety of services.

Increasingly, we hear the question: "Why the book?". We hear the assertion that everything today is electronic. Well, the fact is that the book is survivable. It is more the journals that are changing. In such questions, we must be able to discern the difference between what is technically possible and what is practically doable. We have to properly weigh these characteristics.

Our areas of concern over the short term?

Collection Development: Issues of collection have become very complex as information comes in more forms requiring different mechanisms of delivery. For example, the VIVA project in Virginia is trying to bring networked information resources to the citizens of the commonwealth. What does such an effort mean for our collection? Also, the rising price of journal subscriptions is constantly changing and affects the way we look at collection.

Resource Delivery: Some things indeed are both technologically possible and practically doable. What can we do and how is the university best served in the delivery of resources?

Collection management: 37,000 volumes are added each year. Where do we put them? How can we store them? What things should we have and how do we collaborate with other state institutions as to who holds what. How can we share resources?

Database Organization and Access: More and more databases are available electronically, but how do we make them accessible and usable?

Information Services: We more often speak of Reference Services, but maybe the term Information Services more clearly defines our need to touch resources everywhere--on the shelf, on the network, among our colleagues.

Information skill development: One of the things our students can take out into life are simply information skills. They need to know how to learn and how to find information.

This is an exciting time in the libraries, and we must have a team of people who can work well in whitewater, since we never will be able to go back to what may seem a more peaceful, serene operating environment.

Questions and discussion followed Dr. Hitchingham's presentation.

Neal Vines: What types of information might be outside the realm of the library?

Hitchingham: We need to provide access to the most resources for the most people in the most efficient way possible. So, there are tradeoffs. Under those circumstances, certain types of material are more likely to be collected.

Paul Metz: Thousands of books are acquired around campus each year by departments and centers. That has always been the case and these efforts have paralleled those of the library. Lots of this is a judgment call. We usually look for material in any format that is both academically relevant and can be generalized to more than one constituency. The more potential users of a item, the better the return on the library's investment to buy and house the material. The library also may invest in some materials that are housed with special interests, but still are made available to others.

Vines: Working over the years with Internet access for various agencies, I see lots of information that a single agency or other entity might put together and which they want to distribute. How might the university library serve as a catalyst, helpful in organizing such data? Or do we even have a role in pinpointing pockets of information and helping to make them more broadly available?

Hitchingham: Anything is possible and some university libraries are involved in that kind of activity, but it can be hard to do. For example, how do you separate "good" information from "bad" information?. Some institutions have a liaison function from the library to departments that tries to find out what kinds of information really are useful. Some places would prefer that it be done centrally. There are lots of approaches.

Vines: Most folks have no idea about what's involved, the kinds of things that libraries have been doing for centuries.

Hitchingham: The University of Texas envisions a very broad structure of information in their geographic area. The Blacksburg Electronic Village does a similar thing here. Conceptually, those sort of efforts make sense.

Evelyn Graybeal: Right idea, but difficult to do given the amounts of staff time and effort that are required versus what we have available.

Metz: In electronic publishing we have taken some aggressive actions going back several years. We publish electronic versions of several journals and make others available. But there is a paradox in

selecting materials: we try hard not to label things (e.g. good, bad, true, false) but we absolutely do try to choose books and materials based on some sense of the quality and value of the information and its source. Now, some of our librarians are doing World Wide Web home pages for their disciplines. When we do that we have to make a decision about where we get our data and information; and how accessible do we make things. For example, do we place an item up front in the top menu, or down deep where it's more difficult to find. Based on what we think is important we make these foreground/background sorts of decision.

Graybeal: In making our decisions we also want to play to our strengths by reading what the university is emphasizing so that we work toward those articulated goals.

Hitchingham: Not everyone can be happy.

Metz: That's right. In fact, former president McComas once chuckled loudly when I referred in a similar situation to "the equal distribution of discontent."

Marvin Foushee: What about the new storage facility?

Hitchingham: Yes. It is a dense storage facility, 29 feet high with shelving all the way up. We will store materials by size and barcode it back for location and most efficient use. The library committee will be taking a field trip out there. We might want to have the commission go out also, after April 1. We have to move 250,000 items from CHEDS with relatively little additional funding. This is a juggling task that we hope to pull off invisibly. If we don't, you'll probably hear about it. The same theme applies, though. What's the best use of this space versus other collections? How do we make those decisions?

Robert Dunay: How do you view the present state of our facilities?

Hitchingham: The sense of place is a bit more lacking here than at some other institutions. We have an attractive building, but were I a student, I'd be some confused as to where to go and where to find things. There may or may not be things we can do to address that problem, but it's a major concern for me.

No other business was brought forward.

Paul Metz reminded the commission of the meetings on April 4 and May 2. The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

The Commission on University Support

Minutes of the Meeting

April 4, 1995, 1:00 p.m.,  
Burruss Hall 400

Present: Patrick Donohoe, Marvin Foushee (for Jim Wolfe), Spencer Hall, Carl Polan (chair), Bill Sanders (for Erv Blythe)

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Polan who expressed concern at the lower than normal attendance. This was partially explained by meeting of the upper Administrators concerning WTA.

The minutes of the March 7, 1995 meeting were accepted.

Patrick Donohoe reviewed the activity report from the Transportation and Parking Committee, pointing out particularly that the new engineering building would result in a loss of 200 parking spaces in that location.

He also mentioned that Penn State is experimenting with reduced parking fees for individuals whose vehicles are used for car pools. Since Virginia Tech's situation is similar to that of Penn State, our institution will be watching that experiment with interest.

Dr. Polan then presented information about the structure of the Commission for the 1995-96 year and reviewed briefly each position and whether or not the incumbents were still available to serve for the next academic year. Paul Metz, vice-chair, has indicated that he likely will not be available to serve as chair next year and Dr. Polan will solicit for a volunteers from among the members eligible for that position.

For next year the Computing Committee and the Communications Resources Committee will be combined into a single "Computing and Communications Resources Committee" to be chaired by Vice President Erv Blythe who also will serve as that committee's representative to the Commission. The "Transportation and Parking Committee" and "Building Committee" will continue to stand.

In summarizing of the current year, Dr. Polan pointed out that the Commission has received a number of valuable informational reports but few that required significant action. His greatest concern between now and the next meeting will be to review and solidify the Commission membership for next year.

Patrick Donohoe mentioned that the Transportation and Parking Committee still has another meeting scheduled for this year after which he plans to forward any outstanding minutes to the chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:43 p.m.



The Commission on University Support

Minutes of the Meeting,  
May 2, 1995, 1:00 p.m.,  
Burruss Hall 400

Present: Patrick Donohoe, Robert Dunay, Jean Eversole (for Ray Smoot),  
Spencer Hall, Paul Metz, Carl Polan, Bill Sanders (for Erv Blythe)

The meeting was called to order by the chair.

Patrick Donohoe expressed concern at a second consecutive meeting with relatively low attendance.

Acceptance of Minutes:

The chair indicated that he had received no suggestions for corrections to the minutes of the April 4, 1995 commission meeting. The minutes were accepted.

Minutes of the March 27, 1995 Transportation and Parking Committee meeting were accepted.

Minutes of the February 28, 1995 and April 4, 1995 meetings of the University Communications Resources Committee were accepted.

1995-96 Chairperson:

Dr. Polan indicated that the search for eligible members to serve as commission chairperson for 1995-96 has been narrowed to two candidates but discussions are still underway concerning their availability. The chair suggested that the commission approach one or both of the candidates about their willingness to take the chair on a temporary basis for the summer even as discussions continue.. The consensus of attendees was that this seemed the only option for the moment and Dr. Polan will proceed to make the request(s).

Patrick Donohoe reported briefly on the April 25, 1995 meeting of the Transportation and Parking Committee indicating that details of the following discussion topics will be available in the forthcoming minutes:

- the change of the committee's name from "Parking/Transportation" to "Transportation and Parking"
- the idea of pro-rated parking fees based somehow on personal income
- better publicity for the popular payroll deduction option for parking fees
- carpooling and related issues (pro and con)
- the proposed relocation of the bus stop at Southgate Center
- bicycle safety at the intersection of Tom's Creek and Price's Fork Roads
- bicycle registration

Other Business

The committee members expressed their appreciation to Carl Polan, outgoing chair, for his tenure on the commission and especially for his efforts as chair during the 1994-95 year.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.