University Council Minutes, September 19, 1994

Dr. Paul E. Torgersen called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

Present: P. Torgersen, E. F. Carlisle, L. Peters, K. O'Rourke (for C. Steger), R. Smoot, T. Goodale, E. Blythe, G. Russell, P. Liverpool, A. Swiger, P. Edwards, B. Bates, H. Bonham (for R. Sorensen), W. Worner, P. Meszaros, D. Kenney (for J. Eustis), P. Eyre, E. Holford, M. O'Neill, D. Creamer, J. Merola, R. Badinelli, R. Reneau (for J. Johnson), B. Heath-Camp, C. Polan, T. Sherman, R. Dyck, L. Shumsky, G. Brown, R. Bambach, W. Greenberg, E. Kornegay, H. Marand (for N. Castagnoli), R. Daniel, K. Kubin, J. Hoerner, W. Knocke, K. Martin, R. Lewis, J. Williams-Green, B. Misra, S. Wheeler, S. McCloskey, B. Sayre, G. Coleman, B. Rowland, J. Perrelli, R. Smith, S. Ginther, A. Ruth Valdez Cardenas, C. Soong.

Guests: L. Moore, Governance Task Force; Pat Hyer, Provost's Office; B. Harper, Governance Task Force, B. Burleson, Spectrum.

Dr. Torgersen welcomed everyone to University Council's first meeting of the 1994-95 academic year. He asked Dr. Hap Bonham to express appreciation to Dean Sorenson for allowing Council to use 1045 Pamplin for its meetings.

1. Adoption of Agenda

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

2. Approval of Council Minutes of May 2, 1994

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the May 2, 1994 University Council meeting were voted on (and approved) electronically. They will now be sent to the Governance Information System on the GOPHER for public access.

3. First Reading, Commission on Faculty Affairs, Resolution 1993-94F, Sexual Harassment Policy Revision.

Dr. Pat Hyer presented Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 1993-94F, Sexual Harassment Policy Revision. Dr. Hyer explained that this resolution is designed to revise the existing policy. Reasons for the revision are: 1) bringing our policy into federal compliance while retaining the substance of what is considered 'sexual harassment' here at Virginia Tech; 2) responding to the request of Dr. James D. McComas, former president of Virginia Tech, who requested strengthening of the section on consensual relationships; and 3) strengthening the section on supervisors/employers' responsibility for keeping the working environment free from sexual harassment. The revision process was carried out by the EO/AA Committee, a widely representative group of faculty, staff, and students. The revised policy was then reviewed closely by the host Commission on Faculty Affairs.

Dr. Hyer noted that the revised policy now states that consensual relationships between faculty and the students whom they supervise or evaluate, and consensual relationships between employers/supervisors and employees, are prohibited by University policy. Dr. Hyer mentioned that the University of Virginia's policy prohibits all relationships between faculty and students. Virginia Tech, on the other hand, takes the position through this revision that it is a breach of our ethical responsibility as faculty members to be involved in consensual relationships with any students whom we supervise or who are in our classes. The Commission on Faculty Affairs agrees wholeheartedly and believes this type of situation parallels the prohibitions against such relationships between doctors and patients and therapists and patients. In prohibiting such relationships, the university community takes the position that it is the responsibility of faculty members and supervisors who find themselves in such relationships to remove

themselves from any activity or evaluation that rewards or penalizes the student or employee. A sexual harassment complaint develops when a third party complains about favoritism that might be given or perceived as a result of that relationship, or in cases where that relationship sours and is then later determined not to have been consensual. The faculty/student relationship can never be considered on equal footing.

Administrators and supervisors have responsibilities, both under this policy and under federal law, for creating an environment free of sexual harassment. This environment can be accomplished by investigating complaints immediately, promptly, and effectively once brought to the supervisor's attention, either directly or indirectly. Everyone on the campus who is in an administrative or supervisory capacity has a responsibility to implement this policy; it is not just the responsibility of the EO/AA Office.

The revised sexual harassment policy lists examples of disciplinary actions that should be taken when an investigation requires a written statement from the complainant; a formal investigation by the EO/AA Office; and when there is cause to believe that the complaint has valid basis.

When graduate students teach classes or work with students, they will be treated as faculty for purposes of this policy and also must not be involved in consensual relationships with students. They are liable under the sexual harassment policy for any sexual harassment they might perpetuate. Appropriate behavior is discussed in GTA training.

Dr. Hyer pointed out that there could be situations where the accused would not be notified until the end of the academic session because the student feared retaliation in the form of a bad grade.

Dr. Konrad Kubin felt that not notifying the accused for possibly a whole semester would be unacceptable.

Dr. Hyer explained that in the circumstances addressed by the revision, we are responsible both for guarding the rights of the individual who felt he or she had been discriminated against under the sexual harassment policy, as well as for the rights of the accused. She explained that if in fact the accusation proceeded to the formal process, the accused would be advised immediately.

In conclusion, Dr. Hyer noted that whenever a formal complaint is filed, a name has to be signed and the formal complaint is shared immediately with the accused. At that time, the accused is informed as to the identity of the accuser.

4. Second Reading, Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Resolution 93-94B, Late Drop Policy Revision.

Dr. Joe Merola presented Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Resolution 93-94B, Late Drop Policy Revision for second reading and vote. Dr. Merola revisited the history of this resolution since several months had lapsed from its first reading. He explained that the Commission, along with many others in the campus community, felt that the present policy needed further refinement so that graduate students and faculty could better understand those conditions under which the Graduate School could look favorably upon a request to drop a course without a grade penalty. Dr. Merola described the following specific circumstances that could allow the Graduate Dean or the Dean's designee to late drop a class: 1) a change in the plan of study resulting in the advisor, or department/division head judging that the course is no longer appropriate; 2) number of class sessions missed due to severe illness or injury (documented by Health Services/or a family physician); 3) student called home because of life threatening illness in immediate family (supported by written documentation); 4) incorrect registration for semester due to a verifiable

error; 5) other extenuating circumstances as deemed appropriate by the Graduate Dean.

After some discussion, a motion was made and seconded to accept this resolution. The resolution passed with the stipulation that in the case of the plan of study, the members of the student's advisory committee would have important input.

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

* Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs, March 29 and April 19, 1994.
* Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, July 13 and August 10, 1994.
* Commission on Faculty Affairs, April 1, April 15, and April 29, 1994.
* Commission on Research, April 13, 1994.
* Commission on Undergraduate Studies, April 11 and April 25, 1994.
* Commission on University Support, April 5, 1994.

6. For Information

Minutes from the Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning of March 18, March 30, April 13, May 18, June 29, and August 31, 1994.

Dr. Torgersen introduced Mr. Bruce Harper, the Systems Analyst assigned to work with the Governance Task Force, and asked him to give a brief report on the progress made to date regarding an electronic rather than a paper-based operation for distribution of University Council business/information.

Mr. Harper responded that the challenge in this necessary transition is to refine a system that meets the needs of a variety of operating platforms, yet distributes material throughout the campus community. He noted that similar "glitches" - i.e. overloading mailers; script commands printing out on MAC programs - are occurring with other, non-Council, projects as well, and that he and other analysts will continue to work to solve these difficulties and to streamline the process. He closed by offering his assistance to any member of Council who wishes to contact him at BHARPER@vt.edu, or by phone at 1-4360.

Dr. Larry Moore reminded Council of reasons for moving to an electronic environment. In past years, we have distributed thousands of copies of Univ. council minutes and commission minutes on paper. By putting this information electronically into the system, it makes it available to every member of the university community so they can readily review governance activity.

Dr. Moore also reported that the Bylaws have been prepared and we have met with several commission chairs to review the number and status (standing vs. operating) of a number of committees. When the Task Force began in 1988, he was challenged by the president to make committees small. When the Task Force studied the recommendations from the commissions regarding committee structures however, it looked as if a full 1/3 of the university would be in committee meetings unless changes were recommended.

The Task Force has yet to meet with several commissions about the number and size of their standing committees, and it hopes to have the final document within two to four weeks.

For this academic year, Dr. Moore noted, we will be working under the rules of the current Bylaws so that any standing university committees which are now in existence will continue to July 1, 1995. For those commissions that have proposed a new standing committee, it can function as a subcommittee of the commission for this year only, and on July 1 of next year will become a standing committee of the university governance system.

A brief discussion about electronic voting methods ensued, with the consensus being that we will proceed as described in the information packet provided to Council and dated September 5, 1994, and evaluate as the year progresses.

Dr. Robert Bates reported to Council regarding the Provost search, presenting a chronology beginning with Dr. Torgersen's announcement in late April that Dr. Carlisle would step down as Provost and return to the faculty as the Lavery Professor, and noting that in May, Dr. Torgersen announced the composition of the search committee. A second meeting was held in May to review and revise the position description; it was decided at that time to define the role of Provost as now, with some very minor modifications. At that time, Dr. Torgersen asked the committee to mindfully represent the entire university community. The position was advertised over the summer in various publications and in August the committee met, set a timeline, formed subcommittees, and began the review of credentials.

Dr. Bates noted that there are 130 nominations and applications, and the first review of the short list has been accomplished. The subcommittee on application enhancement has been busy attempting to yield more from the nomination pool. On September 8 the committee presented the first short-list of applicants, 24 people, that it wishes to learn more about. The committee encourages additional nominations. The Spectrum has frequent updates regarding the Provost search, and people may communicate with Dr. Bates or Laurie Martinson (who is providing administrative support for the search) by e-mail. The Search Committee has a very aggressive time line, having aimed to complete the search by early December, if at all possible.

Dr. Torgersen commended the committee, and Dr. Bates in particular, for their work.

7. Announcements

President Torgersen announced that he has been invited to speak to the Faculty Senate. He also noted that the latter part of the week would bring several large events involving alumni and donors: the West Virginia football game and a day of meetings culminating in a pre-campaign kick-off dinner. These events mark the beginning of what we hope will be the official kickoff a year from now.

Dr. Torgersen noted that he is off campus a good deal because that is where he is needed; visiting legislators, speaking, and the campaign have continued to take him out of town more than he would like. The result is that he is less available for the many requests for his time. Requests are running so high that his office must turn down three out of four.

Dr. Torgersen also mentioned that we have received a request from the Governor to submit by mid-October plans for accommodating a 2, 4, and 6% budget reduction, and that we will put together a response because we are obligated to do so. On Wednesday, 4:00 p.m., Dr. Carlisle and Mr. Ridenour will be hosting a meeting largely for administrators, deans, directors, and department heads. Dr. Torgersen hopes that we will not have to undertake further budget reductions, and thinks the restructuring plan that the university has submitted is a significant achievement and would be very disappointed if that restructuring is compromised because of additional budget reductions. He noted that we are already receiving favorable comments from people in State Council that our restructuring plan, largely orchestrated by Dr. Carlisle, is being very well received. It will be difficult if we have to implement further reductions.

Finally, Dr. Torgersen commented on his enjoyable experience with Virginia Tech's football team, traveling to the recent game in Boston.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, October 3, 1994

Dr. Paul E. Torgersen called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

Present: P. Torgersen, E. F. Carlisle, C. Nickerson, K. O'Rourke (for C. Steger), R. Smoot, T. Goodale, M. Williams (for E. Blythe), P. Liverpool, A. Swiger, P. Edwards, H. Bonham (for R. Sorensen), L. Harris (for W. Worner), J. Osborne (for F. W. Stephenson), L. Richardson (for J. Eustis), E. Holford, M. O'Neill, F. Phillips, D. Creamer, J. Merola, R. Badinelli, H. Tze (for J. Johnson), J. McKenna, B. Heath-Camp, C. Polan, T. Sherman, P. Shires, R. Dyck, G. Brown, R. Bambach, E. Kornegay, N. Castagnoli, R. Daniel, K. Kubin, J. Hoerner, W. Knocke, C. Carrig, C. Stott (for K. Martin), R. Lewis, S. Wheeler, S. McCloskey, B. Rowland, J. Perrelli, R. Smith, S. Ginther, A. Ruth Valdez Cardenas.

Guests: P. Hyer, Provost's Office; S. Brooker-Gross, Provost's Office; L. Moore, Governance Task Force; B. Harper, Governance Task Force; B. Burleson, Spectrum.

Dr. Paul E. Torgersen convened the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

1. Adoption of Agenda

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

2. Approval of Council Minutes of September 19, 1994

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the September 19, 1994 University Council meeting were voted on (and approved) electronically. They will now be sent to the Governance Information System on the GOPHER for public access.

3. First Reading, Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 94-95A, Revision of the Constitution of the Virginia Tech Honor System.

Dr. Betty Heath-Camp introduced herself to University Council as chair of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies. She introduced Dr. Tom Hunt, faculty advisor, and Eric Burnette, Chief Justice, who presented the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 94-95A, Revision of the Constitution of the Virginia Tech Honor System. Dr. Hunt and Mr. Burnette explained that the revision of the Virginia Tech Honor System constitution is designed to (1) provide language that reflects how the system in fact operates and (2) to address the current time constraints.

Dr. Hunt and Mr. Burnette explained that the proposed revisions, procedural rather than substantive, will streamline the process. This improvement could be accomplished by removing one level of bureaucracy, the investigatory panel where cases are frequently delayed. The new process will allow cases to go directly through the Associate Justice, to the case coordinator for investigation, back to the associate justice, and then on to the judicial panel where guilt or innocence is decided. Mr. Burnette explained that this new process could take as little as six weeks, compared to a whole semester under the current policy.

Mr. Burnette cleared up a misconception, stating that it never

was an offense not to report an offense, except in the case of cadets. He also shared that the Review Board deals with approximately 100-120 cases per year.

Dr. Torgersen recognized the indebtedness of the University to Dr. Hunt for all of his time and effort given to the Honor System.

4. Second Reading, Commission on Faculty Affairs, Resolution 1993-94F, Sexual Harassment Policy Revision.

Dr. Pat Hyer asked Dr. Elyzabeth Holford, Director of EO/AA, to bring Council up to date on the Sexual Harassment Policy Revision. Dr. Holford explained that she had taken the opportunity to communicate with every member on the Commission for Staff Affairs, and that all commissions had been given ample opportunity to address the language of the proposed policy as well as the opportunity for feedback and input.

Dr. Holford addressed several of the most frequently raised questions. She explained that even though the new section on administrative and supervisory responsibilities was new to our policy, it was not new to the law and that we are merely restating the current federal law. Dr. Holford noted that whether or not the university puts this section in writing, these responsibilities already exist for administrators and supervisors.

Dr. Holford also discussed the section on consensual relations. She said the most frequent misconception is that there is a ban on all relationships between faculty and students or between supervisors and their staff; that is not what the policy says. What the policy suggests is that certain ethical considerations are presented when relationships such as these exist and where they can lead to a violation of the sexual harassment policy. The new policy suggests that one must remove oneself from a supervisory situation when such a relationships exists.

Dr. Holford explained that the advantage of the revision is that it is a more fair and clearly written policy. It requires that at any time a record of investigation is kept, the alleged harasser will be notified. It also provides penalties that appropriately fit what has actually occurred.

Dr. Holford further noted that there would be training for administrators and supervisors as well as for all members of the University community. The people on the front line, supervisors and administrators, would be the first ones trained.

Dr. Holford also addressed situations where information has been shared in confidence. She indicated that if the information is conveyed to an administrator or supervisor, while they are acting in that role, the policy very clear states that the administrator or supervisor must respond to the matter.

Dr. Hyer moved for a vote on this resolution. The resolution passed.

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

* Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs, August 30, 1994.
* Commission on Faculty Affairs, May 13, 1994.
* Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, April 20, 1994
* Commission on Research, April 27, 1994.

*   Commission on Undergraduate Studies, September 26, 1994.
*   Commission on University Support, May 10, 1994.

6. For Information

Dr. Torgersen asked Provost E. F. Carlisle to discuss the College of Education's restructuring plan.

Dr. Carlisle explained that the College of Education has prepared a plan to deal with their budget situation, their reduction in force, and a plan to deal with the programs they would like to continue in the future.

Dr. Carlisle noted that originally the schedule called for the restructuring plan to go before the Board of Visitors at the February, 1995 meeting, but it would be of considerable benefit to the College of Education if the BOV were able to act on that plan at their November meeting. In order to take the plan to the BOV in November, the Advisory Council on Budgeting and Planning would present a resolution to University Council for both its first and second reading at the October 17 meeting. At that time, University Council will decide whether to adress both readings at the same time.

The process for review also calls for an ad hoc committee, appointed by the president, to review the plan subsequent to the Advisory Council on Budgeting & Planning. The ad hoc committee will look at some particular faculty issues and provide a separate review from the Budget & Planning Advisory Council and the University Council. Any concerns on the part of the ad hoc committee will be shared with President Torgersen before the BOV meeting/presentation.

Dr. Torgersen suggested that any members interested in having the restructuring plan subsequent to the October 17 meeting contact Ms. Lowe. He commented that if there are objections from Council members, regarding the call for first and second readings together, we would not proceed.

7. Announcements

Dr. Torgersen shared with Council members that the news from the Governor's Office regarding our restructuring plan is good. He said the plan has been well received and but that we will still have to submit the 2, 4, 6% budget reduction plan. We then must address the task of recapturing some of the budget amendments that we received last year. Dr. Torgersen feels there is still work to be done in the legislative arena.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, October 17, 1994

Dr. E. F. Carlisle called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

Present: E. F. Carlisle, C. Nickerson, M. Ridenour, L. Peters, C. Steger, R. Smoot, T. Goodale, E. Blythe, G. Russell, A. Swiger, P. Edwards, R. Sorensen, W. Worner, P. Eyre, E. Holford, M. O'Neill, D. Creamer, J. Merola, R. Badinelli, H. Tze (for J. Johnson), J. McKenna, B. Heath-Camp, C. Polan, T. Sherman, R. Dyck, R. Bambach, R. Daniel, K. Kubin, J. Hoerner, L. Richardson, K. Martin, J. Williams-Green, S. Wheeler, S. McCloskey, B. Sayre, A. Ruth Valdez Cardenas, S. Cowan.

Guests: P. Hyer, Provost's Office; T. Hunt, Undergraduate Honor System; E. Burnett, Undergraduate Honor System, J. Ashby (for B. Burleson) Spectrum.

1. Adoption of Agenda

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

2. Approval of Council Minutes of October 3, 1994

Dr. Carlisle noted that the minutes from the October 3, 1994 University Council meeting were voted on (and approved) electronically. They will now be sent to the Governance Information System on the GOPHER for public access.

3. First Reading, Resolution Concerning the College of Education Restructuring Plan.

Dr. E. Fred Carlisle presented the Resolution Concerning the College of Education Restructuring Plan. Dr. Carlisle explained that the Advisory Council on Budget and Planning was requesting a first and second reading in order to facilitate an earlier presentation to the Board of Visitors. Dr. Carlisle explained that once University Council and the specially-appointed ad hoc committee approved the restructuring plan, it could be presented to the BOV at the November meeting rather than the earlier proposed February 1995 meeting. An early presentation would be most helpful to the College of Education.

Dr. Carlisle summarized the process used by the Advisory Council on Budget and Planning in determining this resolution. He explained that after a series of meetings, during which time the Advisory Council discussed the College of Education plan at length, thought about it with some care, and had ample time to reflect on it, and the Advisory Council agreed to a final amendment of the initial resolution presented to it by the College of Education. Dr. Carlisle reminded Council members that this Advisory Council had been expanded for purposes of this kind of discussion and that the Chairs of the Commissions on Faculty Affairs, Staff Affairs, Undergraduate Studies and Policies, and Graduate Studies and Policies were also in attendance. Dr. Carlisle also made special mention of the section in the resolution which spoke to the commendation of the College of Education leadership, faculty, staff, and students for the creative, constructive, and rapid response to a most difficult set of enforced planning parameters.

Dr. Carlisle invited Dr. Wayne Worner, interim dean of the

College of Education, to give a brief history of the restructuring plan. He also invited the commission chairs who participated in the deliberations to comment on the character of those discussions. Dr. Creamer, chair of the Commission on Faculty Affairs, pointed out that although CFA did unanimously endorse the plan, powerful statements were made by CFA members that their approval of the plan did not mean that the plan had no negative consequences on the university. CFA felt there would be a major effect on the overall university; that many faculty won't be with us once this plan has been implemented (whether voluntarily or involuntarily); and that the plan may have effects on the tenure process and the way in which faculty do business. Dr. Creamer pointed out that CFA also commended the process for having been fair to the faculty, with large and meaningful levels of participation; the result is that the faculty, in large measure if not totally, support the restructuring plan.

Dr. Joseph Merola, chair of the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, pointed out that CGS&P had only one objection to the reorganization plan. It was the understanding of the commission that, as Dean Worner explained, the Adult Education Program was slated for removal not because of quality issues but because it no longer fit within the new focus of the College of Education. When CGS&P reviewed the original restructuring plan there was a section specifically addressing privatizing that particular program. At that time, the CGS&P Commission came up with two conclusions: 1) perhaps this is a program worth saving even if it doesn't fit into the College of Education's mission, because it probably still fits into the broader mission of the university and particularly our mission as a land-grant university serving the entire Commonwealth; 2) privatization raised too many issues concerning academic quality and academic standards. Dr. Merola observed that in the new resolution the privatization concerns were addressed, but CGS&P wonders whether the Adult Education program will find a home elsewhere in the university.

Dr. Betty Heath-Camp, chair of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, pointed out that CUS&P's discussion centered around two major concerns: 1) moving to a five-year program for some programs; and 2) the issue of students being informed as to whether they are committing to a four or five-year program.
The Commission feels that the concerns were adequately addressed for the time being considering the COE proposal is a plan to restructure the college and that many questions are unanswered at this time.

Since the chair of the Commission on Staff Affairs was not in attendance, Dr. Carlisle asked Mr. John Ashby, editor of Spectrum and member of CSA, to speak on the Commission's behalf. Mr. Ashby noted that CSA was strongly in favor of the restructuring plan and was most pleased to note the participation of the College of Education's staff members in the process.

Dr. Richard Bambach expressed concern over removing the adult education program and wondered if there was any new information concerning it. Dr. Worner explained that it was his intent, after today's meeting, to write a memo to the Provost indicating that the College of Education has not closed the adult education program, but that absent a rescue of the program, the college would move to close the program following Board of Visitors action on the plan.

Dr. Carlisle asked for a motion to waive first reading and proceed to second reading. A three-fourths positive vote of all present members was achieved and the motion passed. At that time an endorsement of said resolution was placed on the floor and the motion passed.

4. Second Reading, Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 94-95A, Revision of the Constitution of the Virginia Tech Honor System.

Dr. Betty Heath-Camp presented the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 94-95A, Revision of the Constitution of the Virginia Tech Honor System. The motion passed.

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

* Commission on Research, September 14, 1994.
* Commission on University Support, September 20, 1994.

6. For Information

Due to Dr. Robert Bates' absence, Dr. Carlisle presented a brief report on the Provost's Search. The search committee met on October 6 to continue refining the pool of applicants and to consider recent nominations and applications. At that time, the committee discussed additional information provided in candidate statements and reference letters; reworked the short-list by dropping some applicants and adding others; and planned the next meeting on October 20 to further refine the short-list of candidates. Spectrum will continue to carry updated information in their issues.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, November 7, 1994

Dr. Paul E. Torgersen called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Present: P. Torgersen, E. F. Carlisle, C. Nickerson, A. Spencer (for M. Ridenour), J. Eaton (for L. Peters), C. Steger, R. Smoot, B. Pendergrass (for T. Goodale), E. Blythe, G. Russell, P. Edwards, R. Sorensen, W. Worner, E. Holford, D. Stetler (for B. Bates), B. Stephenson, D. Creamer, J. Merola, H. Tze (for J. Johnson), J. McKenna, B. Heath-Camp, C. Polan, T. Sherman, L. Shumsky, G. Brown, R. Bambach, E. Kornegay, N. Castagnoli, R. Daniel, K. Kubin, W. Knocke, P. Scanlon, C. Carrig, K. Martin, R. Lewis, B. Misra, S. Wheeler, S. McCloskey, B. Sayre, G. Coleman, J. Perrelli, R. Smith, S. Ginther, A. Ruth Valdez Cardenas, S. Moorefield (for C. Soong).

Guests: B. Burleson, Spectrum; R. Rios, Compliance Officer for EO/AA Office.

1. Adoption of Agenda

Dr. Torgersen asked for an amendment to the agenda in order to present new business regarding the replacement of Dr. Buddy Russell. A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda with the amendment. The motion passed.

2. Approval of Council Minutes of October 17, 1994

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the October 17, 1994 University Council meeting were voted on (and approved) electronically. They will now be sent to the Governance Information System on the GOPHER for public access.

3. First Reading,

a. First Reading, Commission on Undergraduate Studies Resolution 94-95B, Graduation Requirement Policy.

Dr. Betty Heath-Camp introduced Commission on Undergraduate Studies Resolution 94-95B, Graduate Requirement Policy. Dr. Heath-Camp explained that the resolution requires the graduation checklist be submitted, through the college, the fourth week of the semester, two years prior to the student's graduation date. The Commission feels that this will be of benefit to students. Dr. Robert Hendricks, chairman of the committee that reviewed the current graduation requirements, will be present to answer questions at the December 5th University Council meeting when this resolution is brought forth for second reading and vote.

b. Search Committee to Replace Dr. Buddy Russell

Dr. Torgersen informed Council that Dr. George E. "Buddy" has elected to step down as Vice President of the Alumni Relations effective late February. Dr. Torgersen alerted Council that it is time to appoint a search committee to replace Dr. Russell and that there is a contradiction between the Alumni Association's methods for selecting a vice president and the procedure outlined in the University Faculty Handbook. Dr. Torgersen explained that the Faculty Handbook states that when a vacancy occurs regarding the

senior vice president, provosts, and vice presidents, the University Council serves as an advisory body to the President by identifying qualified candidates, etc. The President, in consultation with University Council, may appoint a search committee whose members will primarily be from Council.

In order to explain the contradiction in "searching" procedures, Dr. Torgersen and Dr. Russell provided a brief history of the Alumni Association. The Alumni Association began providing services to the University community in 1875 and became incorporated in 1924. During most of its association with the university, the Alumni Association was, and is, separate with its own Board of Directors. Dr. Russell was selected to serve as vice president for Alumni Relations before the Association entered into the present relationship with the university. The agreement between the Alumni Board and the University allowed the Alumni Association to continue as a corporation under the statutes of Virginia, but also allowed its staff to come under the state system.

Dr. Torgersen emphasized the importance of the Alumni Association, explaining that Virginia Tech has an enormous network of alumni, many of whom are linked to the university. Though many faculty don't see this group on a day-to-day business, they do come to campus with great regularity, are very enthusiastic, and act as a support group.

The Alumni Association's procedure for appointing the replacement for Dr. Russell says: "candidates will be identified with final appointment to be made by the President - the Alumni Board will be fully represented and actively involved in searches for the vice presidential position."

In order to comply with the Alumni Association's desire to select their own individual as they have done in the past, Dr. Torgersen would like to have several university community representatives join approximately six representatives submitted by the Alumni Association. Clearly, the majority would be on the Association's side.

Dr. Torgersen asked Council members for comments, criticisms, or expressions of concerns. He explained that the Alumni Association wants to proceed expeditiously with the search and has asked him to appoint a search committee quickly. Dr. Larry Shumsky, president of Faculty Senate, suggested that since a set of procedures was specified in the Faculty Handbook, it might be wise to follow those procedures, thereby eliminating possible issues regarding improper procedures. Dr. Shumsky suggested that a committee be appointed to review the recommendations of a subcommittee staffed according to Dr. Torgersen's original suggestion. Dr. Richard Sorensen, dean of the College of Business, suggested that several members of University Council be on the other committee so that an opportunity for dialogue and interaction could occur early in the process - maybe have two people on from this group to give it some joint responsibilities and then have them report to the small sub-committee. Dr. Torgersen concurred with Dr. Shumsky and Dr. Sorensen's suggestions, and will proceed accordingly.

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

* Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs, September 28, 1994
* Commission on Faculty Affairs, September 23 and October 14, 1994
* Commission on Graduate Studies, October 5, 1994
* Commission on Public Service and Extension, September 16, 1994
* Commission on Research, September 28 and October 12, 1994
* Commission on Student Affairs, March 31, April 7, and April 21, 1994
* Commission on Undergraduate Studies, October 10, 1994
* Commission on University Support, October 4, 1994.

6. Questions and Answers

Dr. Ervin T. Kornegay, faculty member from the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, asked for an update regarding the Board of Visitors resolution (August 1994) relative to the reduction in force. Dr. Kornegay explained that as a representative of the executive committee of his college, he became aware that members of the faculty had received no information on this subject and were unaware of this resolution. Dr. Kornegay continued to explain the need for the faculty to be made aware of this resolution and how it is being handled. Dr. Torgersen explained that the Board of Visitors feels the notification time of five years during a reduction in force is quite excessive. However, rather than simply act on this issue themselves, they are asking for a recommendation from the faculty and the president.

This issue has been deferred that to the Commission on Faculty Affairs for their review. Don Creamer, chairman of CFA, updated Council by explaining that CFA has been discussing this issue at every one of its meetings and is scheduled to continue the discussion for the remainder of the semester. Dr. Creamer explained that CFA is meeting each week instead of once a month because they feel that this is a very important matter and one with considerable potential controversy. The CFA is proceeding on both issues - dismissal for cause and the five-years notification when a RIF is in progress. Dr. Creamer alerted Council that a draft resolution is close to finalization and will be presented to the Faculty Senate for a broader discussion on Tuesday, November 14, 1994. He assured members that the CFA is carefully studying AAUP policies on the same matters and has gathered data from similar institutions. Dr. Creamer, in responding to a question raised by Dr. Kornegay, said that CFA would assume the responsibility for distributing a factual message regarding this issue to the faculty.

The meeting adjourned at 3:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, January 16, 1995

Dr. Paul E. Torgersen called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Present: P. Torgersen, P. Meszaros, C. Nickerson, M. Ridenour, L. Peters, C. Steger, T. Goodale, G. Russell, L. Swiger, P. Edwards, B. Bates, R. Sorensen, W. Worner, B. Stephenson, G. Brown, E. Holford, E. Hitchingham, P. Eyre, M. O'Neill, F. Phillips, D. Creamer, J. Merola, R. Badinelli, H. Tze (for J. Johnson), J. McKenna, B. Heath-Camp, C. Polan, R. Dyck, L. Shumsky, G. Brown, E. Kornegay, N. Castagnoli, R. Daniel, K. Kubin, J. Hoerner, W. Knocke, C. Carrig, V. Fu, K. Burke, J. Williams-Green, B. Misra, S. McCloskey, B. Sayre, G. Coleman, C. Soong.

Guests: D. Shelton, Budget Office; N. Eisler, Spectrum

Dr. Paul Torgersen made a short address to Council before his departure to Richmond, explaining that he wanted to update Council members on the environment in Richmond and to reassure everyone that he and his staff are working diligently to convince legislators to support budget amendments to secure restoration of the $18 million the Governor has cut. Dr. Torgersen informed Council that all higher education will suffer some cuts in the Governor's budget reduction plan, and that the primary focus for Virginia Tech is the cuts to our Cooperative Extension and research areas.

Dr. Torgersen explained that the Governor has taken a stand that government needs to be reduced in size, become less intrusive in the affairs of people on a day-by-day basis, and reduce taxes. He said that the Governor, his staff, and some Republican legislators have agreed that these are basically non-negotiable issues; in the past there has been some give and take, but this Governor's agenda does not call for much compromise.

Dr. Torgersen announced that Mr. Minnis Ridenour, Executive Vice President, would chair the regular business meeting and that at the conclusion of the meeting, Mr. Ridenour and Mr. Dwight Shelton, Interim Budget Director, would present Virginia Tech's plans to restore funding from the Governor's budget proposal.

1. Adoption of Agenda

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

2. Approval of Council Minutes of November 7, 1994

Mr. Ridenour noted that the minutes from the November 7, 1994 University Council meeting were voted on (and approved) electronically. They will now be sent to the Governance Information System on the GOPHER for public access.

3. First Reading,

a. Commission on Student Affairs Resolution 1994-95A: Student Evaluations of Teaching Professionals.

Dr. Jim McKenna introduced Commission on Student Affairs Resolution 1994-95A, Student Evaluations of Teaching Professionals. Dr. McKenna explained that the resolution

came about because concerned students would like to have more input into the faculty evaluation process. He explained that the students feel the document works well now but could be more effective with opportunities for additional comments.

Several faculty members expressed concern at the wording of the resolution as well as the implied time table for the implementation of the new forms. Dr. McKenna assured Council members that the students are aware that they need to work with the appropriate areas in developing and implementing the new form.

A motion was made and seconded to refer this resolution back to the originating commission along with a request that the Commission on Student Affairs work with the Commissions on Faculty Affairs and Undergraduate Studies and Policies. The motion passed.

b. Commission on Student Affairs Resolution 1994-95B: Revision of Academic Calendar.

Dr. Jim McKenna introduced Commission on Student Affairs Resolution 1994-95B, Revision of Academic Calendar. Dr. McKenna explained that this resolution came about from the students' desire to avoid the Monday start-up of classes which causes them a tremendous amount of difficulty.

A motion was made and seconded to refer this resolution back to the originating commission along with a request that the Commission on Student Affairs work with the appropriate commissions. The motion passed.

4. Second Reading, Commission on Undergraduate Studies Resolution 94-95B, Graduation Requirement Policy.

Dr. Betty Heath-Camp presented the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 94-95B, Graduation Requirement Policy for second reading. The motion passed.

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

* Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs, October 26, 1994.
* Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, October 12, 1994.
* Commission on Faculty Affairs, October 28, November 4, November 11, December 2, and December 9, 1994.
* Commission on Graduate Studies, October 19, 1994.
* Commission on Public Service and Extension, October 14 and November 14, 1994.
* Commission on Student Affairs, September 22, October 20, November 3, and November 17, 1994.
* Commission on Undergraduate Studies, October 24, 1994.
* Commission on University Support, November 1, 1994.

6. For Information

Mr. Ridenour and Mr. Shelton passed out three handouts outlining the budget situation at Virginia Tech. These handouts consisted of "Impact of Governors FY95-96 Budget Proposal, " "1995 Legislative Amendments," and "Virginia Tech - Cumulation of General Fund Reductions -- 1990 through 1996." Mr. Ridenour and Mr. Shelton explained in detail the substance

of the handouts.

7. Questions and Answers

A question was raised regarding our optimism about securing restored funds. Mr. Ridenour expressed optimism that some monies will be restored to our budget.

Another concern was expressed and question raised regarding the loss of jobs and personnel, and which University policies will need to be enforced . Mr. Ridenour responded that Rounds 5 and 6 of the budget reductions together exceed all four previous rounds in research and extension, and that if we are not successful in getting the money restored, we are going to have to make some very tough personnel decisions. These decisions will mean certain policies at the university may have to be addressed. Mr. Ridenour assured Council that work will continue to make the General Assembly and the Governor's Office understand the impact of these reductions and the kinds of actions that will be required if we do not get the money restored.

Mr. Ridenour responded to other questions by stating that we have been asked (by the Governor's Office) to implement two major state policies: one is a control on travel and the other is a control on positions. Mr. Ridenour alerted Council that the Governor is serious about reducing the size of state government but that he has not yet asked for the monies associated with those positions to be returned to the state. Therefore the dollars freed up from these two controls could possibly be used to fund additional salary increases, etc.

A question was raised regarding our success in requesting approval of frozen positions. Mr. Ridenour informed Council that Virginia Tech had just received a note stating that the governor has reaffirmed his commitment to control and reduce positions, and stating that Richmond is going to take a very serious look at every position that comes through the system, calling on us to be even more restrictive in our review than we have been. So far the only positions approved are those identified with emergency needs of the university. Mr. Ridenour assured Council members that we are looking at ways to identify the movement of some functions from E&G status to other status, such as auxiliaries or other funding sources, and through that procedure we may be able to justify to the state a reduction of the controls on us. The state has now recognized that with sponsored programs there is an obligation to fill those positions if a sponsored program is accepted. Despite this freedom with sponsored programs, auxiliaries such as dining halls, Squires Student Center, and Donaldson Brown Center, are under the same kind of constraints as our academic programs

Dr. Peter Eyre, dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine, shared with Council members the fact that some of the budget numbers might actually be quite understated. He explained that if the federal government is successful in restructuring and downsizing the U.S. Dept of Agriculture, we may lose some of our traditional federal appropriations. Mr. Ridenour concurred with Dr. Eyre on this issue.

At the conclusion of the Question & Answer segment, Mr. Ridenour updated Council on a situation that everyone will soon be experiencing. He explained that the University will soon mandate a one percent reversion to cover the shortfall

generated by our current lack of out-of-state students. Mr. Ridenour explained that within the current budget, a decision has just been made, working through the deans and vice presidents and the Advisory Council on Budgeting & Planning, regarding the one percent reversion. Currently, out-of-state students, under the State Appropriations Act, are required to pay 100 percent of their instructional costs. Therefore, as our budget goes up or down, students pay according to that adjustment. Mr. Ridenour noted that we had budgeted for roughly $1.7 million on the front end for tuition and fee changes, but that we have had a further erosion of about $1.7 million, for a total of $3.4 million. Consequently, we have made the decision that we will have an additional one percent reversion within the university to cover that shortfall.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, February 6, 1995

Dr. Peggy E. Meszaros, substituting for Dr. Paul E. Torgersen who was in Richmond, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Present: P. Meszaros, C. Nickerson, A. Spencer (for M. Ridenour), L. Peters, K. O'Rourke (for C. Steger), T. Goodale, P. Edwards, B. Bates, R. Sorensen, W. Worner, J. Osborne (for B. Stephenson), E. Holford, P. Eyre, J. Johnson, M. O'Neill, W. Sasser (for F. Phillips), D. Creamer, J. Merola, R. Badinelli, B. Heath-Camp, C. Polan, R. Dyck, G. Brown, E. Kornegay, N. Castagnoli, R. Daniel, W. Knocke, C. Carrig, V. Fu, K. Burke, J. Williams-Green, S. Wheeler, S. McCloskey, B. Sayre.

Guests: L. Moore, Governance Task Force; B. Harper, Governance Task Force; N. Eisler, Spectrum

1. Adoption of Agenda

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

2. Approval of Council Minutes of January 16, 1995

Dr. Meszaros noted that the minutes from the January 16, 1995 University Council meeting were voted on (and approved) electronically. They will now be sent to the Governance Information System on the GOPHER for public access.

3. First Reading,

a. Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 1994-95A, Dismissal for Cause.

Dr. Don Creamer presented the Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 1994-95A, Dismissal for Cause. Dr. Creamer explained that this resolution is designed to address a Board of Visitor's resolution "Reconsideration of Faculty Personnel Policies" presented to Dr. Torgersen at the beginning of the academic year. The Board of Visitors directed Dr. Torgersen to ask the Commission on Faculty Affairs (CFA) to consider the current personnel policy dealing with involuntary separation. Dr. Creamer explained that CFA did not disagree with the Board of Visitor's concerns. It appears that the current policy suggested something other than what was originally intended.

Dr. Creamer explained that although CFA was dealing with several objectionable issues within the current policy, they were ready to present the "Dismissal for Cause" section. Dr. Creamer pointed out that the new policy carefully parallels the AAUP guidelines by providing a definition for gross misconduct which correlates with the AAUP definition of moral turpitude. He explained that under the new guidelines gross misconduct must be found by a faculty committee appointed by the Provost and in these instances, dismissal would be immediate. However, in cases where the outcome is something less than gross misconduct, but serious behavior still needs to be dealt with, tenured faculty would be granted up to a year's salary or notice and untenured faculty up to three months.

Dr. Creamer responded to several questions from the floor; discussion will continue at second reading.

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

* Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, November 9 and December 14, 1994.
* Commission on Faculty Affairs, December 16, 1994.
* Commission on Graduate Studies, November 16, 1994.
* Commission on Research, December 14, 1994.
* Commission on Undergraduate Studies, October 24, 1994.

6. Announcements

Dr. Larry Moore informed Council members that the Governance Task Force will present a new set of Bylaws at the February 20 meeting. He explained that a draft has already been presented to commission chairs, deans, and other administrators, and he invited Council members to visit with him after the meeting to discuss concerns, conflicts, etc. Members will receive a hard-copy mailing of these materials prior to the next Council meeting.

Dr. Meszaros informed Council that a report from Richmond would be shared widely across campus very soon. She explained that according to the report it looks as if we are not in as good a financial position as we would like, but the situation is not quite as disastrous as feared, particularly as it affects the experiment stations and extension.

Dr. Meszaros updated Council regarding her first few days in the role of Provost. She shared with members that she had already received approximately 1,700 responses to her World-Wide Web message of greeting, and that she felt very good about the kind of networking that had been started with people who have a truly vested, caring interest in the university. Dr. Meszaros said that she hopes to continue ongoing communications with the campus community. She feels that at a university priding itself on technology, it is only fitting that we use technology to communicate with each other and she will continue to experiment with this process. Dr. Meszaros invited council members to share advice and thoughts as she uses the next few weeks in a listening mode to hear people's concerns and ideas. She expressed eagerness that everyone who wishes a "seat at the table" would be represented as we build this model land grant university of the 21st century.

The meeting adjourned at 3:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, February 20, 1995

Present: P. Torgersen, P. Meszaros, C. Nickerson, M. Ridenour, L. Peters, K. O'Rourke (for C. Steger), R. Smoot, T. Goodale, J. Eustis (for E. Blythe), B. Russell, L. Swiger, P. Edwards, R. Sorensen, W. Worner, J. Osborne (for B. Stephenson), E. Holford, J. Johnson, E. Hitchingham, M. O'Neil, F. Phillips, D. Creamer, J. Merola, C. Tze, B. Heath-Camp, C. Polan, T. Sherman, R. Dyck, L. Shumsky, G. Brown, W. Greenberg, E. Kornegay, R. Daniel, K. Kubin, J. Hoerner, W. Knocke, C. Carrig, V. Fu, L. Richardson, L. Mayton (for K. Burke), B. Misra, S. Wheeler, S. McCloskey, B. Sayre, G. Coleman, A. Antwi-Agyei..

Guests: L. Moore, Governance Task Force; B. Harper, Governance Task Force; N. Eisler, Spectrum; P. Hyer, Provost's office; N. Spencer, CAPFA Rep.

1. Adoption of Agenda

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

2. Approval of Council Minutes of February 6, 1995

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the February 6, 1995 University Council meeting were voted on (and approved) electronically. They will now be sent to the Governance Information System on the GOPHER for public access.

3. First Reading,

a. First Reading, Commission on Research Resolution 94-95A, Research Faculty Title Series.

Dr. Janet Johnson presented the Commission on Research Resolution 94-95A, Research Faculty Title Series. Dr. Johnson explained that this resolution has been passed by the Commission on Research and the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies and that it has been endorsed by Commission on Faculty Affairs

She further explained that the resolution is designed to create an opportunity for research faculty by providing a research faculty series that mirrors the normal tenure-track faculty series, i.e., assistant research professor, associate research professor, and research professor. Dr. Johnson pointed out that these appointments are normally short-term appointments, largely supported by external funding. She also pointed out that this resolution increased the research faculty positions from five to eight and that in accordance with the concerns of the Commission on Faculty Affairs, all eight titles would be examined after two years.

Dr. Larry Shumsky, president of the Faculty Senate, expressed concern that the manner in which the resolution is currently written could prove troublesome. He felt that the resolution should be rewritten or restructured after being presented to the Commission on Faculty Affairs for close examination. Issues of concern were expressed by others

regarding the termination of a faculty member's two-year appointment while in the Ph.D. mentoring process.

Dr. Joe Merola, Chair of the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies, assured Council members that, according to current policy, each department should have procedures in place regarding protecting students' interests, whether dealing with a research faculty member or a faculty member who might be denied tenure, be relocating, etc. Dr. Merola further stated that he did not believe the research faculty series was any more prone to abuse or misuse than the current positions within the research series.

Dr. Don Creamer, Chair of the Commission on Faculty Affairs, pointed out that at CFA it was suggested that research faculty might be invited to serve as co-chairs on graduate committees, thus eliminating certain problems.

Dr. Torgersen assured Council members that there would be more time for discussion at the next meeting when the resolution is presented for second reading and vote.

b. First Reading, Commission on Research and Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Resolution 94-95B, Conflict of Interest.

Dr. Joe Merola presented the Commission on Research and Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Resolution 94-95B, Conflict of Interest. Dr. Merola explained that this resolution is particularly important because it responds to a request by the National Science Foundation directing any agency with 50 employers or more to have in place a specific conflict of interest policy. Dr. Merola distributed a flow chart to Council members to further depict the conflict of interest procedures.

By way of background, Dr. Merola explained that Dr. Len Peters commissioned the Academic Integrity Committee, a joint committee made up of both the Commission on Graduate Studies & Policies and the Commission on Research, and co chaired by Dr. Joe Merola and Dr. Janet Johnson, to write this resolution. After being deliberated by the Academic Integrity Committee, the resolution then moved separately through both contributing commissions and is now consistent with both national and state guidelines.

c. First Reading, New Bylaws.

Dr. Larry Moore, Chair of the President's Task Force on Governance, presented the New Bylaws. Dr. Torgersen commended Dr. Moore for his leadership on such a large and long-term project, and for the excellence of the finished product.

Dr. Moore explained the nature of the changes needed to make the Bylaws current. He told Council members that the Task Force felt they should only recommend as standing committees those which have a university-wide focus, and that in order to accomplish this, the Task Force had interacted with all the commissions and current standing committees. After receiving suggestions for a potential 22 committees, with as many as 24-25 members per committee, the Task Force combined several committees, and is now prepared to recommend the approval of 14 standing

university committees. Dr. Moore noted that the composition of some of the committees had changed significantly to meet current needs and that there are cases where not every constituency group need be included in the membership. He explained that in those cases, the new membership rosters would be comprised of men and women with the necessary expertise to adequately represent the university community as well as to conduct the specific business of the committee, i.e., in the case of Intellectual Property.

Dr. Moore then presented an alternative proposal from the Faculty Senate: "When Administrative/Professional Faculty selected from general administration, academic support, student affairs, or Extension/public service are indicated for Commission membership, then at any one time no more than one-third of these representatives shall be Administrative Faculty." Dr. Moore explained that the alternate proposal was a result of concern on the part of Dr. Shumsky who felt that in order to preserve the delicate balance of the governance structure, administrative faculty membership should be limited. Dr. Shumsky expressed strong sentiment that regardless of what they were called, many of the administrative faculty did, in fact, have administrative positions and would reflect an administrative point of view.

Ms. Marty O'Neil, chairperson of the Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs, responded that there were administrative faculty who felt disenfranchised because they were not eligible to be representatives on commissions and councils. Ms. O'Neil pointed out that most of the AP faculty are extension professionals located across the state but that eligibility should be available to all the administrative faculty should they choose to accept a nomination. She also pointed out that the mechanics of doing an election by mail would be a logistical nightmare if the new proposal was accepted, requiring ballots to be voted one at a time.

Dr. Norrine Spencer, Associate Dean, also spoke out in defense of the present CAPFA representation. She pointed out that CAPFA is not asking for more seats to be added to commissions or committees but rather asking for complete and shared representation. Dr. Spencer pointed out that only 20 percent of the professional and administrative faculty of 600+ members are administrative.

Dr. Moore readdressed this issue by saying that the Task Force wondered why 20 percent of this particular group should be denied the right to participate in shared governance.

Dr. Moore explained that this proposal had not been routed through the Task Force and would therefore have to be voted upon as a separate issue.

Dr. Moore distributed several new corrections to the Bylaws. He also distributed an information sheet reflecting constitutional cosmetic changes that were required to enact the new Bylaws. He noted that one of the changes calls for vacancies in unexpired terms to be filled by relevant bodies rather than full term methods of filling a vacancy. Dr. Moore explained that since these constitutional changes were mostly editorial corrections, the Task Force recommended

acceptance by consensus, thus saving a presentation to the Board of Visitors.

Dr. Torgersen observed that further discussion would ensue at the next meeting when the New Bylaws are presented for second reading and vote.

4. Second Reading, Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 1994-95A, Dismissal for Cause.

Dr. Don Creamer presented the Commission on Faculty Affairs Resolution 1994-95A, Dismissal for Cause for second reading and vote.

After a brief discussion, the resolution passed.

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

* Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, January 11, 1995.

* Commission on Faculty Affairs, January 20 and February 3, 1995.

* Commission on Graduate Studies, January 18, 1995.

* Commission on Research, January 25, 1995.

* Commission on Student Affairs, January 19, 1995.

* Commission on Undergraduate Studies, January 23, 1995.

* Commission on University Support, January 3, 1995.

6. For information

Dr. Torgersen updated Council members on the budget issues. He pointed out that a great deal of time and effort were spent in trying to secure restoration of the Extension budget, and explained that the mission of Extension has come into question on many occasions with some legislators being supportive and some critical, and that we have reached the point in our relations with the General Assembly and the Governor and his staff where we need to examine the purpose of Extension and some of its activities. Moving quickly to re-examine the Extension issues will make things much easier during the legislative session next year.

Dean Andy Swiger expressed appreciation to the university for its support during the budget crisis. He recognized the courage portrayed on the part of delegates and senators regarding higher education.

Dr. Torgersen concurred with Dean Swiger and said that the Business Higher Education Council, consisting of university presidents plus approximately three dozen business and industry leaders across the Commonwealth, under the chairmanship of Til Hazel, came out very strongly in support of higher education. Dr. Torgersen noted that these members testified on behalf of higher education before the Senate and the House Appropriations Committee despite the fact that most of them are of the same party affiliation as the Governor. Dr. Torgersen also pointed out that the three former governors who wrote a letter criticizing potential cuts in higher education were also very helpful.

Dr. Torgersen updated Council members on the Metro mediation issue and the final outcome.

7. Announcements

* Dr. Torgersen announced to Council that a majority of Council members must be present at the March 6 meeting in order to vote New Bylaws. Therefore, please send a substitute if you are unable to attend.

* Dr. Torgersen also announced that in order to ensure that all '94-'95 Council business is concluded by the final meeting of May 1, the last date for accepting new resolutions for first reading is April 17.

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, March 6, 1995

Present: P. Torgersen, P. Meszaros, C. Nickerson, A. Spencer (for M. Ridenour), L. Peters, C. Steger, J. Eversole (for R. Smoot), T. Goodale, M. Williams (for E. Blythe), T. Tillar (for B. Russell), L. Swiger, R. Dunay (for P. Edwards), D. Stetler (for B. Bates), R. Sorensen, S. Crumwell (for W. Worner), B. Stephenson, G. Brown, P. Eyre, E. Holford, J. Johnson, E. Hitchingham, M. O'Neill, J. Merola, R. Badinelli, C. Tze, J. McKenna, B. Heath-Camp, P. Metz (for C. Polan), T. Sherman, R. Dyck, L. Shumsky, G. Brown, E. Kornegay, N. Castagnoli, R. Daniel, K. Kubin, W. Knocke, V. Fu, L. Richardson, K. Burke, J. Williams-Green, B. Misra, S. Wheeler, G. Coleman, A. Agyabeng, J. Rutherford, S. Ginther, S. Lowe, A. Martin, C. Lemnios.

Guests: L. Moore, Governance Task Force; N. Spencer, CAPFA Rep.

1. Adoption of Agenda

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

2. Approval of Council Minutes of February 20, 1995

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the February 20, 1995 University Council meeting were voted on (and approved) electronically. They will now be sent to the Governance Information System on the GOPHER for public access.

3. First Reading, Commission on Graduate Studies & Policies Resolution 1994-95A, Amendments to Policy Memo 126.

Dr. Joseph Merola presented the Commission on Graduate Studies & Policies Resolution 1994-95A, Amendments to Policy Memo 126. Dr. Merola pointed out that Policy Memorandum 126 was approved in 1992 in an attempt to assure that all on-campus graduate programs provided copies of their graduate program policies and procedures to the Graduate School. He explained that upon reviewing the administering of Policy 126, it became clear to one of the Commission on Graduate Studies' committees that enforcement of the current language was going to be difficult, if not impossible. This discovery prompted the new resolution to include a statement indicating that the conduct of the graduate programs is primarily an academic matter and is the direct concern and responsibility of the faculty. Dr. Merola also pointed out that the EO/AA nondiscrimination statement should appear in all graduate procedures. He stated that the major change aiding the administrative enforcement of this policy is that the Commissions on Graduate Studies and Policies and the Graduate School will review individual program statements and assess their implementation as part of the regular five-year departmental evaluations, and that all departments will maintain a current copy of their policy statements at the Graduate School.

4. Second Reading, Commission on Research Resolution 94-95A, Research Faculty Title Series.

Dr. Janet Johnston updated Council on this resolution, presented for first reading at the February 20th meeting, by

saying that the Commission on Research feels that the creation of a research faculty title series will increase scholarly activity, intellectual capital, and provide certain appropriate individuals with the title of "professor," accurately reflecting their accomplishments and putting them in a much better position to compete for funding. She reiterated that each department will make its own decision regarding graduate student advising or co-advising.

Several items of concern were expressed by members of Council, with Dr. Larry Shumsky specifically noting potential problems that in his view necessitated referring the resolution back to CFA for reconsideration of that group's endorsement.

In an effort to allay these concerns, Dr. Johnson and Dr. Merola assured Council members that the proposed resolution has been presented to the Commission on Research and the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies for lengthy debate. It has also been presented to the Commission on Faculty Affairs for two readings. In addition, articles were written in Spectrum concerning the deliberations in the respective commissions. Drs. Johnson and Merola felt that the proposed resolution has received fair and deliberative hearings. They explained that the one concern of CFA has been addressed by amending the resolution to include the examination of titles every two years. Dr. Merola reminded that these positions are always supported by sponsored funds or sponsored programs. In most cases, the research professor would be the principal investigator on the research project.

Dr. Merola assured Council members that although there had been no sampling of national practice, there are a number of peer institutions that currently award this type of title; hence, this is not a new concept.

After further discussion, a motion was made to refer this resolution to the Commission on Faculty Affairs for further deliberations. The motion passed.

5. Second Reading, Commission on Research and Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies Resolution 94-95B, Conflict of Interest.

Dr. Joe Merola moved for a vote on this resolution. The resolution passed.

6. Second Reading, New Bylaws.

Dr. Larry Moore, chairman of the Governance Task Force, distributed several new amendments to the New Bylaws, resulting from various group requests or position deletions within the university.

Responding to a question regarding the merging of the Computer Committee and the Communications Resources Committee into one new committee, Dr. Moore explained that input from the Commission on University Support to the Task Force suggested it would be advantageous to have one committee made up of those with expertise in the field who could represent matters of interest to the whole university. Dr. Moore explained that the new committee is structured after the Intellectual Properties Committee which has operated quite successfully for several years.

Mr. Seth Ginther, president of the Student Government

Association, addressed Council suggesting that membership on the Commission on Student Affairs be amended to allow student eligibility for election to the role of chairperson. Mr. Ginther explained that since CSA is mainly composed of students representing major organizations on campus, a student chairperson, knowledgeable about student issues and concerns, might be able to lead the commission effectively. Discussion showed that the matter had not been raised with CSA. After further discussion, Dr. Torgersen called for a motion and vote on Mr. Ginther's amendment; the motion failed. Dr. Torgersen suggested that Mr. Ginther present his idea to CSA for deliberation and possibly bring it to Council at a later date with a more compelling argument and CSA support.

Dr. Charles Steger, vice president of University Development, raised a concern about having two voting members on the Athletic Committee who are not under the purview of the University governance structure. Dr. Moore explained that the Athletic Committee has been operating with this membership for several years and there has been no problem. He explained that when the original constitution was adopted in 1991, the concept was to award voting privileges to all members serving on committees, councils, or commissions.

Dr. Moore asked for a motion on the New Bylaws. The Bylaws passed.

Dr. Moore also presented an outline of corrections and clarifications to the Constitution which University Council voted to accept.

Dr. Shumsky raised for future consideration the relationship between the University's governance system and administrative decision making. He noted instances where some faculty have felt that several administrative decisions might better have gone through the governance system first. Dr. Torgersen responded that in the example given, the administrator was doing his job, which was to make the decision at hand. Drs. Torgersen and Shumsky agreed to continue the conversation informally.

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

* Commission on Faculty Affairs, February 9, 1995.

* Commission on Graduate Studies, February 1, 1995.

Dr. Merola alerted Council members that approval of these minutes would also be an endorsement of the new Master's Degree in Agriculture Education.

* Commission on Research, February 8, 1995.

* Commission on Student Affairs, February 2, 1995.

8. For Information

Minutes of University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning, January 11, 1995.

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, April 3, 1995

Present: P. Meszaros, C. Nickerson, L. Martinson (for M. Ridenour), E. Holford, T. Goodale, J. Johnson, K. Burke, L. Shumsky, B. Misra, D. Creamer, M. O'Neill, J. Williams-Green, B. Heath-Camp, J. Eustis (for E. Blythe), C. Polan, A. Swiger, P. Scanlon, W. Sasser (for S. McConnell), D. Stetler (for B. Bates), T. Tillar, A. McDaniel, J. Eaton (for L. Peters), R. Sorensen, F. Phillips, E. Hitchingham, T. Sherman, E. Tze, K. Kubin, E. Kornegay, S. Wheeler, S. McCloskey, B. Dick, A. Agyabeng, J. Hoerner

Guests: N. Eisler, Spectrum.

Dr. Peggy Meszaros chaired the meeting while President Torgersen attended another meeting special interest to the University.

1. Adoption of Agenda

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

2. Approval of Council Minutes of March 6, 1995

Dr. Meszaros noted that the minutes from the March 6, 1995 University Council meeting were voted on (and approved) electronically. They will now be sent to the Governance Information System on the GOPHER for public access.

3. First Reading, Commission on Student Affairs Resolution 1994-95C, New Student Member Assigned to Commission on Student Affairs.

Dr. Tom Goodale, Vice President for Student Affairs, substituted for Dr. Jim McKenna by presenting the Commission on Student Affairs Resolution 1994-95C, New Student Assigned to Commission on Student Affairs. Dr. Goodale explained that the resolution proposes automatic placement of the Board of Visitors' undergraduate student representative on the Commission on Student Affairs. He noted that this proposal was unanimously adopted by CSA.

4. First Reading, Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies 1994-95C, Resolution on Religious Holidays.

Dr. Betty Heath-Camp introduced Dr. Alan McDaniel, chair of the Committee on Academic Support, who presented the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1994-95C, Resolution on Religious Holidays. Dr. McDaniel explained that the Commission on Student Affairs presented a resolution to University Council in the Spring of 1993 asking for religious holiday modifications to the university calendar. At that time the resolution was referred to the Committee on Academic Support, a committee charged with issues relative to the academic calendar. After seriously considering certain limitations, the Committee on Academic Support now presents this resolution, designed to improve the communications process, but recognizing that all academic issues relating to religious observances still rest between the faculty and their students.

5. Second Reading, Commission on Graduate Studies & Policies Resolution 1994-95A, Amendments to Policy Memo 126.

Dr. Janet Johnson presented the Commission on Graduate Studies & Policies Resolution 1994-95A, Amendments to Policy Memo 126 for second reading. The motion passed.

6. Second Reading, Commission on Research Resolution 94-95A, Research Faculty Title Series.

Dr. Janet Johnston presented the Commission on Research Resolution 94-95A, Research Faculty Title Series for second reading. Dr. Johnson explained that this resolution was returning from a referral to the Commission on Faculty Affairs where it was discussed and endorsed a second time. The motion passed with a vote of 20 affirmative votes and eight negative votes.

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

Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs, February 21, 1995.

Commission on Faculty Affairs, February 23, 1995.

The CFA Minutes of February 23 were approved but with a concern/question raised by one University Council member regarding whether or not a quorum is required to substantiate an affirmative vote. It was noted that a quorum was not present, but that nothing substantative was voted on at the meeting in question.

Commission on Graduate Studies, February 15, 1995.

Commission on Research, February 22, 1995.

Commission on Student Affairs, February 16, 1995.

Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, February 13 and February 27, 1995.

Commission on University Support, March 7, 1995.

8. For Information

Minutes of University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning, February 16, 1995.

Announcements

Dr. Meszaros reminded Council members that the deadline for new business relative to the 1994-95 academic year is April 17.

Question/Answer Forum

Dr. Meszaros assured Council members that she would be in direct contact with the deans regarding the Workforce Transition Act by mid-week. She also informed Council members that a budget forum (regarding the budget shortfall) will be presented to the university community on Monday, April 10, at 4:00 p.m. at the Donaldson Brown Continuing Education Center. She encouraged everyone to attend this forum where accurate information will be distributed regarding the budget

situation and compounding events that led to the shortfall.

The meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, April 17, 1995

Present: P. Torgersen, P. Meszaros, C. Nickerson, A. Spencer (for M. Ridenour), L. Peters, C. Steger, R. Smoot, T. Goodale, L. Swiger, P. Edwards, D. Stetler (for B. Bates), R. Sorensen, S. Crumwell (for W. Worner), G. Brown, R. Purdy (for J. Johnson), P. Eyre, E. Holford, F. Phillips, J. Merola, B. Heath-Camp, C. Polan, T. Sherman, P. Shires, R. Dyck, L. Shumsky, G. Brown, R. Daniel, K. Kubin, W. Knocke, C. Carrig, L. Richardson, K. Burke, B. Misra, S. Wheeler

Guests: A. McDaniel, Commission on Academic Support; N. Eisler, Spectrum.

1. Adoption of Agenda

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

2. Approval of Council Minutes of April 3, 1995

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the April 3, 1995 University Council meeting were voted on (and approved) electronically. They will now be sent to the Governance Information System on the GOPHER for public access.

3. First Reading, Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1994-95D, Resolutions on Modifications to the Freshman Rule.

Dr. Betty Heath-Camp, explaining that the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1994-95D, Resolutions on Modifications to the Freshman Rule, originated within the Commission's subcommittee on Academic Policies, called on Dr. Ron Daniels, chair of the subcommittee, for the presentation. Dr. Daniels explained that because transfer students and freshmen students with advanced standing have as difficult as adjustment period as more typically credited freshmen students, this resolution offers broadened eligibility for using the freshman rule.

4. First Reading, Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1994-95E, Resolution to Lift Ban on College-Level Examination Program.

Dr. Betty Heath-Camp once again deferred to Dr. Daniels, who explained that this resolution is designed to lift the current ban on college-level examination programs (CLEP) and allow departments and curriculum committees to use the CLEP results. He further explained that Dr. Susan Brooker-Gross had performed an in-depth study with certain affected departments and that the responses indicate that the majority of departments are willing to use the CLEP results. In any case, it will be an option available to the departments. Dr. Daniels explained that there is a fairly extensive list of peer institutions that do use the exam results; Virginia Tech serves as an administering site only.

5. First Reading, Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1994-95F, Resolutions to Modify the Obsolete Credit Rule.

Again, Dr. Betty Heath-Camp deferred to Dr. Daniels who explained that the resolution is designed to modify the obsolete credit rule. The new resolution will give academic deans the discretion/opportunity of assessing courses that are at least five years old when a student is

returning to Virginia Tech after an absence of at least five years. The resolution suggests that upon written request of the student, the appropriate academic dean shall treat the student's record as that of a transfer student.

6. First Reading, Commission on Classified Staff Affairs Resolution 1994-95A, Policy for Classified Staff Teaching Courses.

Dr. Fred Phillips presented the Commission on Classified Staff Affairs Resolution 1994-95A, Policy for Classified Staff Teaching Courses. Dr. Phillips explained that this resolution originated from the Commission on Classified Staff Affairs in conjunction with University administration and is designed to produce guidelines for the employment of classified staff members who teach courses at the university. Ms. Ann Spencer, Associate Vice President for Personnel and Administrative Services, assured Council members that the new policy is designed to apply only to those classified staff who have been asked to teach outside of their normal duties/responsibilities and that approval of the resolution will bring us in line with our colleagues throughout the state who have similar situations.

Regarding the evaluation process, Ms. Spencer indicated that since teaching courses is not considered part of their primary responsibilities, standard departmental teaching evaluations will be required from these individuals.

Ms. Spencer also indicated to Council members that department supervisors have the ability to approve or disapprove a request for one of their staff members to teach classes and may not permit the staff member to teach all three semesters -- a mutually acceptable work schedule should be arranged between the employee and his/her supervisor.

7. Second Reading, Commission on Student Affairs Resolution 1994-95C, New Student Member Assigned to Commission on Student Affairs.

Dr. Thomas Goodale represented Dr. Jim McKenna and presented Commission on Student Affairs Resolution 1994-95C, New Student Member Assigned to Commission on Student Affairs for second reading. The motion passed.

8. Second Reading, Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies 1994-95C, Resolution on Religious Holidays.

Dr. Betty Heath-Camp presented Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies 1994-95C, Resolution on Religious Holidays for second reading. After a brief discussion, the motion passed.

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

* Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs, November 29, 1994.
* Commission on Faculty Affairs, March 9 and March 30, 1995.
* Commission on Graduate Studies, March 1, 1995.
* Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, February 27 and March 27, 1995.
* Commission on University Support, April 4, 1995.

8. For Information

* Minutes of University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning, March 8, March 20, and March 22, 1995.

Announcements

Question/Answer Forum

Dr. Torgersen asked for input from Council members regarding his address to the Faulty Senate on Wednesday, April 19, at 4:00 p.m. He outlined what a stressful time it is for the university and reiterated his desire to share with the university community the direction of the university and what can we do to ease some of the tension and lift spirits.

Suggestions from the floor included: sharing with the university community how decisions are made and what the process is, particularly where the financial issue is concerned; discussing opportunities for raising funds such as the capital campaign, short courses, supplemental income; needing to re-assure faculty and shore up their faith - they are shaken up by this internal problem and are asking "what has faculty done to deserve this."

Dr. Torgersen explained that decisions are made at many different levels of the university and that it is his hope, along with Mr. Ridenour and Dr. Meszaros, that in the future there will be very little information that cannot be available for common knowledge. Dr. Torgersen said that because we are caught up in the downsizing of state government, Virginia Tech will have to do some belt-tightening.

Dr. Torgersen thanked members of Council for their suggestions.

The meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl

University Council Minutes, May 1, 1995

Present: P. Torgersen, P. Meszaros, C. Nickerson, A. Spencer (for M. Ridenour), L. Peters, K. O'Rourke (for C. Steger), J. Eversole (for R. Smoot), M. Williams (for E. Blythe), L. Swiger, P. Knox (for P. Edwards), R. Sorensen, S. Crumwell (for W. Worner), F. W. Stephenson, G. Brown, V. Wall (for J. Johnson), E. Hitchingham, E. Holford, M. O'Neill, F. Phillips, J. Merola, B. Heath-Camp, C. Tze, C. Polan, T. Sherman, L. Shumsky, G. Brown, N. Castagnoli, R. Daniel, K. Kubin, W. Knocke, C. Carrig, L. Richardson, K. Burke, J. Williams- Green, B. Misra, S. Wheeler, G. Dunn (SGA), C. Burbach (SGA).

Guests: A. McDaniel, Commission on Academic Support; N. Eisler, Spectrum.

1. Adoption of Agenda

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

2. Approval of Council Minutes of April 17, 1995

Dr. Torgersen noted that the minutes from the April 17, 1995 University Council meeting were voted on (and approved) electronically. They will now be sent to the Governance Information System on the GOPHER for public access.

3. Second Reading, Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1994- 95D, Resolutions on Modifications to the Freshman Rule.

Dr. Betty Heath-Camp presented Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1994-95D, Resolutions on Modifications to the Freshman Rule. The resolution was voted upon and passed.

4. Second Reading, Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1994- 95E, Resolution to Lift Ban on College-Level Examination Program.

Dr. Betty Heath-Camp presented Commission Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1994-95E, Resolution to Lift Ban on College-Level Examination Program. The resolution was voted upon and passed.

5. Second Reading, Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1994- 95F, Resolutions to Modify the Obsolete Credit Rule.

Dr. Betty Heath-Camp presented Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Resolution 1994-95F, Resolutions to Modify the Obsolete Credit Rule. The resolution was voted upon and passed.

6. Second Reading, Commission on Classified Staff Affairs Resolution 1994-95A, Policy for Classified Staff Teaching Courses.

Dr. Fred Phillips presented the Commission on Classified Staff Affairs Resolution 1994-95A, Policy for Classified Staff Teaching Courses. The resolution was voted upon and passed. One course per semester and typically outside the normal working hours of the individual.

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

* Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs, January 25 and March 22, 1995.
* Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, February 8, 1995.

* Commission on Faculty Affairs, February 17, February 23, March 2, March 9, March 24, April 7 and April 13, 1995.
* Commission on Graduate Studies, April 5, 1995.
* Commission on Research, March 8 and April 12, 1995.
* Commission on Student Affairs, March 2 and April 6, 1995.
* Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, April 10, 1995.

8. For Information

* Minutes of University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning, April 5, 1995.

Announcements

Dr. Torgersen shared with Council members good news regarding very attractive enrollment figures for the coming year, both in- and out-of-state. He said that the situation now would be to finding room for them in the dormitories.

Dr. Torgersen reminded Council members that this is the final meeting of the 1994-95 academic year, and concluded by saying that although it has been a long and difficult year, he appreciated the good will existing in the university community.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Nickerson
Executive Assistant to the President

/bjl