Minutes,  
Commission on Student Affairs,  
April 28, 1994,  
219 Squires Student Center,  
Special Call Meeting  

Present: Dr. Jim McKenna, Dr. Tom Goodale, Ms. Christina Fariss (for Mr. Seth Ginther), Ms. Laura Lew (for Mr. John Kruep), Ms. Ionna Spyroupolou, Ms. Erin Smith, Ms. Lisa Auleta, Mr. Jon Perrelli, Ms. Marcey McCammon, Mr. Henry Hsu, Mr. Carl Mitchell, Mr. Tim Schell, Ms. Maureen Bezold (for Ms. Jennifer Tank), Dr. Cornel Morton, Ms. Pam Winfrey (for Dr. Edward Spencer), and Dr. Richard Sorensen.

Absent: Dr. John Eaton, Mr. Vaughn Shannon, Ms. Dimples Irby, Ms. Shannon Milliken, Mr. Keith Coutray, Col. Milton Bradley, Ms. Judy Davis, Mr. Robert Graham, and Dr. Jeanne Howard.

Guests: Mr. Bill Campion, Mr. Ron Fischer, Ms. Cathy Buttimer, Mr. Leo Smith, Ms. Alicia Cohen, and Mr. John Aughenbaugh.

1. Call to Order

Dr. Jim McKenna, chairperson of the Commission, called the meeting to order at 4:07 p.m.

2. Introductions

Dr. McKenna began the meeting by having all guests and members of the Commission introduce themselves.

3. Announcements

Dr. Goodale announced to the Commission that the Board of Visitors (BOV) selected senior Mr. Kevin LeClaire to be the student representative to the BOV for the 1994-95 academic year. Mr. LeClaire's term will begin with the BOV's August 1994 meeting.

4. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as presented.

5. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of April 21, 1994 were approved as submitted.

6. Unfinished Business

-- Dr. McKenna stated that the Commission had two student organizations appealing specific Student Budget Board (Board) annual funding recommendations (based on the Commission accepting the ad hoc appeals committee recommendations at its previous meeting).

Before the Commission decided on the procedures it would follow to hear
the appeals, Mr. Leo Smith, Assistant Director of Recreational Sports, raised a criticism of the appeal process. Particularly, Mr. Smith criticized the lack of communication flowing from the Commission to appealing organizations, as the ad hoc committee did not tell some of the appealing organizations when the committee was deliberating, whether additional information was needed, or the final recommendations coming from the committee. Ms. Amy Coates of the Virginia Tech Union also disparaged the process, claiming the criteria upon which organizations could appeal was too narrow. Dr. McKenna asked Ms. Coates to raise this point during discussion of the Board Task Force Final Report (see item #4 under Unfinished Business).

Following a suggestion by Mr. Bill Campion, chairperson of the Board, the Commission decided to use the following procedure to adjudicate the appeals.

a. The Board presents the reasons why it did not fund the annual funding recommendations in question.

b. The appealing organization(s) presents the reasons that it is appealing the Board's decision.

c. The Commission then questions both representatives from the Board and the appealing organization(s) on matters concerning the appeal.

d. The Commission concludes by discussing the appeal, presentations, and any other pertinent information among itself before voting on whether or not it should grant the appeal.

The Commission first heard the appeal coming from Virginia Tech Union (VTU) (see attached), adhering to the aforementioned process. A motion was made and approved to grant and fund VTU's appeal at $3000 (VTU asked for $4799). The Commission then heard an appeal from the Women's Field Hockey Club, part of the Extramural Sports Federation. A motion was made and passed to fully fund the appeal at $3575.

Per Mr. Campion's request, a motion was made and approved to allow the Board to cover the total amount granted in appeals ($6575) from the approximately $11000 remaining in the Board's 1993-94 contingency fund. Mr. Schell stated, for the record, that he found the Board not funding a student organization because it failed to register most appropriate and that the Commission's appeals process was the correct avenue to settle the matter.

-- The Commission approved the Board's 1994-95 annual funding recommendations, as amended by the appeals granted today.

-- Mr. O'Neill presented for second reading a resolution concerning student evaluations of professors. Mr. O'Neill disseminated a revised version of the resolution, noting that he tried to incorporate some of the Commission discussion from its last meeting. Mr. Schell offered an amendment, accepted as "friendly" by Mr. O'Neill, that would delete the second sentence of the Resolved clause and be replaced by, "We would like to ensure student input in the evaluation of faculty." After limited discussion, a motion to support the resolution was approved. The approved version of the resolution is as follows.
WHEREAS the current student evaluation of teaching professionals at the end of each semester is a vital tool for the instructor to evaluate his/her teaching methods, AND WHEREAS student input on faculty performance is needed, AND WHEREAS the assigning of a number value to quantify teaching methods may not reveal a professor's true teaching ability, THEREFORE LET IT BE RESOLVED THAT as students, we are generally concerned when we hear that current faculty evaluations may be inadequate or unfair. We would like to ensure student input in the evaluation of faculty. Most students appreciate the amount of input they currently have in a faculty member's promotion or tenure, and would like this to continue in the future.

-- Mr. John Aughenbaugh, Student Affairs Coordinator for Graduate Student Life, explained what was included in the Student Budget Board Task Force's Final Report, which was distributed at the Commission's April 21 meeting (see attached). Mr. Aughenbaugh stated that Dr. Goodale asks the Commission to act on two items within the Final Report, recommendation C. under issue #1 and the revised Budget Board Policies and Procedures. Mr. Aughenbaugh briefly discussed both of these items and presented them to the Commission for first reading. Second reading of these items will occur at the Commission's June 23, 1994 summer meeting.

Mr. Schell said that he disagreed with the Task Force's recommendation under issue #3 in its final report; he felt that the Board is resistant to change, particularly with new projects that benefit all students on campus.

Dr. Goodale noted that he convened the Task Force because the Board had not been significantly reviewed since its inception. He also stated the amount of funds available to Board has substantially increased since 1989, but with overall funding cuts to all sectors of the University community, that trend would stop. Dr. Goodale also stated that the Board, along with the rest of the university, is probably in a period of being forced to set priorities regarding what it will fund. The Board will not be able to fund all worthy student organization programs in the near term and student organizations must be prepared for this reality. Dr. Goodale concluded by congratulating the Task Force on its fine work, noting that the Task Force's performance was just the beginning of a continuous review process of the Board.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.