

Minutes
Commission on Student Affairs
February 20, 1992

Present: Dr. Barbara Pendergrass (for Dr. Tom Goodale), Ms. Melissa Byrne, Ms. Mary Cacheris, Mr. Brad Haley (for Mr. Tray Isley), Ms. Joanne Waters, Mr. George Asimopoulos, Mr. John Aughenbaugh, Ms. Eleanor Haughey, Mr. Lee Carroll, Ms. Jessica Williams, Col. Lee Rice, Mr. Kevin Mottley, Mr. Patrick Larkin, Mr. Andrew Wolff, Dr. Peter Feret, Dr. Beverly Sgro, Ms. Sharon Yeagle, Dr. Rita Purdy, Dr. Harlan Miller, and Dr. Paul Sorrentino.

Absent: Dr. Tom Goodale, Ms. Beth Rexroad, and Mr. Tray Isley

Guests: Ms. Kimberly Clark, Ms. Cathy Collins, Mr. William Campion, Ms. Julie Moore, Ms. Jaimee Oichelberger, Ms. Sue McGrant, Mr. Ron Giddings, Ms. Anita Ware-Garris, Mr. Leo Smith, Mr. Thomas Schweitzer, and Dr. David Ostroth.

In the absence of the chair, Dr. Barbara Pendergrass called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Announcements

The following announcements were made.

- o February 17 minutes of the Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Visitors.
- o Final recommendations of the Governor's Task Force on Substance Abuse and Sexual Assault on College Campuses.
- o Hate Crime Forum.
- o Ms. Byrne announced that the Senate had passed a resolution whereby each year senators are required to attend a rape awareness seminar. Tech is having a seminar on March 4 in the Colonial Room from 7-8 p.m.
- o Ms. Byrne also stated that Senate had passed a resolution requesting students be allowed to see student evaluations of the professors.

Approval of the Agenda

Mr. Aughenbaugh made a motion to change the order of the agenda so as to start with Unfinished Business and then have the Reports of the Subcommittees. Mr. Carroll seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

Unfinished Business

1. Continuation of the review of the report on classification and funding of student organizations and second reading - Mr. Aughenbaugh.

Mr. Mottley stated that the subcommittee had met again and went over the recommendations from Commission and he feels that this is the best proposal. He urged Commission to make any amendments to the proposal as needed and either vote the proposal up or down.

Dr. Ostroth was asked by the chair to follow up and clarify on an issue regarding paying of interest on student organizations' accounts in central accounting. He noted that the University would begin paying interest on these accounts.

Mr. Aughenbaugh noted that on the Feb. 6 minutes under Unfinished Business there were recommendations from the Commission on the proposal that were referred back to the subcommittee for review. Mr. Aughenbaugh stated that he would like to go through these recommendations and then proceed on to Sections D & E.

USLP

A.2.

- More specific language needed for Performing Arts and Virginia Tech Corps of Cadets.

The subcommittee reviewed this issue and decided that more specific language was not necessary.

- What distinguishes VTU from organizations in this category?

VTU has a student president who controls the daily functions of the organization; though VTU constitution has veto language it doesn't equate to departmental control; and they do not meet the definition for USLP, they are put in the UCSO category.

A.3.

- Should the VPSA review petitions or should that be the job of a designate?

The subcommittee changed the language to read the Division of Student Affairs instead of the VPSA.

- There needs to be an appeals procedure.

The subcommittee discussed this issue and decided that an appeals process was not needed.

A.4.

- The need for constitution should be re-examined.

A decision was made at the last meeting to delete clause A.4.a

and the subcommittee felt this clause should stay in. Clause A.4.b indicates that you must have a provision for amendment. Clause A.4.c stays in. The organization in mind here was the Corps of Cadets and because they are in the USLP category, the language is necessary.

UCSO

B.2.

- Should organizations whose status will change as a result of this proposal be advised or is this a decision for the committee?

The subcommittee felt it was not necessary to inform organizations of the change.

B.7.

- Should organizations in this category be provided with assistance in procuring tax identification number?

The subcommittee would like to do this but there is no way that the CSA can possibly commit another body to provide assistance for these

organizations in procuring a tax identification number. They recommend that some type of arrangement needs to be made, but the subcommittee cannot mandate such an arrangement.

Proposed corrections to the document:

USLP

A.4.a. This item was deleted.

Subcommittee felt this item remains in the document instead of being deleted as stated.

A.6.b. "Accounts" changed to codes.

Subcommittee suggested that the word "accounts" stays instead of being changed to codes.

UCSO

B.3. "University changed to office of student organizations.

The subcommittee reworked the language and organizations will be categorized as UCSO.

B.2. Added "and member organizations" to Student Media Board.

With recommendations from the advisor of the Student Media Board, the subcommittee felt that they would keep the language as is.

B.3.d.3. "paid" changed to "compensate".

The subcommittee did change the word "paid" to "compensate".

RSO

C.6.c. "school" changed to "academic".

Subcommittee felt that it was appropriate to change the wording to read "academic year" instead of "school year".

C.8.b. "A student organization" changed to "a registered student organization".

Kevin Mottley made a friendly amendment to change "a student organization" to "a registered student organization".

Mr. Aughenbaugh proceeded to discuss item D - Funding Model for the Reclassification of Student Organizations.

Mr. Larkin made a friendly amendment to change Resident Hall Federation to Residence Hall Federation on the flow chart under this section.

Step 1

Mr. Larkin recommended that a statement needed to be added in the clause stating when the RSO's could go to the RBB for their funds.

Mr. Campion stated that the annual hearing process to fund chartered organizations and provide funds to RBB would probably occur early in the second semester.

Step 2

Step 2 was discussed and questions were entertained.

Step 3

Dr. Feret made a friendly amendment to drop the word "any" in clause 2.

Step 4

Mr. Larkin made a friendly amendment to change line two in this clause to read...will identify additional funds to facilitate small grant and instead of will identify additional funds to facilitate small grant or.

Step 5

Step 5 was discussed and questions were entertained.

E. Composition of the Regranting Budget Boards

Ms. Mary Cacheris inquired as to who was on the House's Committee on Committees.

Mr. Mottley stated that the committee was composed of four senators (from different colleges) and four representatives.

Ms. Waters made a friendly amendment to drop the words "with some financial background" from the E.1.B.1.

Dr. Feret made a friendly amendment to delete the words "in the House" on the third line of clause E.1.B.2.

Dr. Miller made a motion to delete item E.1.B.4. Mr. Larkin seconded this motion. The chair asked that we complete discussion of the document and then come back for amendments. Dr. Miller withdrew his motion.

Section E.1.C - Commission on Student Affairs Selection Process and Section E.2. - GSA Regranting Budget Board were discussed and questions were entertained.

Mr. Aughenbaugh made a motion to accept the entire document as discussed. Mr. Mottley seconded the motion.

Mr. Larkin made a motion to amend Section E to read: SGA and GSA RBB's compositions will be determined by those respective organizations. The process for their selection will also be determined by these organizations. Their processes will be subject to approval by GSA. Dr. Miller seconded the motion but it was defeated by the Commission.

Dr. Miller made a motion to delete sections E.1.B.4., E.2.C. and #.2.D and in section E.2.A. place a period after academic college, remove the next two sentences and replace it with to be elected by the GSA members from each college. This motion was seconded by Mr. Larkin but was defeated by the Commission.

Mr. Mottley moved that Commission vote on the proposal.

The proposal was accepted by the Commission with 16 votes in favor of the proposal, two abstentions, and 1 opposition.