

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, December 5, 2002
12:00 – 2:00
4-300D Carlson School of Management

Present: Judith Martin (chair pro tem), Gary Balas, Muriel Bebeau, Susan Brorson, Gary David, Arthur Erdman, John Fossum, Marti Hope Gonzales, Mary Jo Kane, Marvin Marshak, Judith Martin, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Martin Sampson, Charles Speaks

Absent: Dan Feeney, Tom Clayton, Marc Jenkins, Candace Kruttschnitt

Guests: Professor Eugene Borgida (Advisory Committee on Athletics), Professor Laura Koch (Faculty Academic Oversight Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics); Professor Sara Evans; President Robert Bruininks, Associate Vice President Donna Peterson

Other: none

[In these minutes: (1) athletic committees; (2) the presidential search; (3) discussion with President Bruininks]

1. Assistance to the Athletic Committees

Professor Martin convened the meeting at 12:30 and welcomed Professors Borgida and Koch to discuss with the Committee ways in which it could support the work of the two committees that attend to matters associated with intercollegiate athletics on the Twin Cities campus. Professor Borgida chairs the Advisory Committee on Athletics (ACA); Professor Koch chairs the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (FAOCIA).

Professor Koch began by saying that the work of the two committees seems to be devalued; she reminded the Committee that ACA and FAOCIA are not part of athletics but are appointed to provide oversight to the athletic program. There were conflicts last year about the role and responsibilities of the two committees; that problem continues this year. She noted the appointment, by the Big Ten faculty leaders at their annual meeting in November, of individuals to serve on a committee composed of faculty representatives from the six largest athletic conferences to work with the AAUP and the Association of Governing Boards on developing recommendations to the conference presidents on reforms in intercollegiate athletics. None of the three individuals appointed (from Indiana, Penn State, and Minnesota) are involved in athletics on their campuses; and even though he was specifically requested to serve by the group, the representative from Minnesota¹ is not even a faculty member. It is no reflection on him, she said, but it is disappointing that the Big Ten faculty leaders apparently never thought to appoint anyone from their campuses who has been involved in oversight of athletics. They spend many hours deliberating issues and put in a lot of hard work, but it seems that those efforts are not valued.

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

¹ The author of these minutes.

Professor Borgida concurred with Professor Koch's views. He said they were not informed about the discussions by the Big Ten leaders except by one email earlier in the fall, even though they have spent two and one-half years discussing athletic reform issues. The appointment of these three individuals by the Big Ten faculty leaders is a "disrespectful slight" even if it was not intended. The problem is that they--the athletic committee chairs or faculty members--are not at the table when connections to national discussions about athletics are being conducted.

Professor Martin responded by saying that she did not know how far the effort would go forward. The Executive Director of the Association of Governing Boards joined the meeting of Big Ten faculty leaders and expressed interest in faculty involvement in discussions of athletic reform. This is the first time, apparently, that the AAUP and the AGB have cooperated on just about anything and the faculty at the meeting thought it would be helpful to have the two groups involved.

It would make sense to have an athletic committee chair as part of the group, Professor Koch suggested. Professor Borgida said that there is a sense that reform proposals must be carried to higher levels; no one institution can accomplish them. If the faculty on the athletic committees have expertise, they should inform the aggregation of information that goes forward.

How is the current committee structure working, Professor Martin asked? It has its ups and downs, Professor Koch said. Four faculty members (she and Professor Borgida, the two athletic faculty representatives) serve on both committees, as do three of the ex officio members. The remainder of the FAOCIA members are all faculty; the other members of ACA include staff, students, and alumni members. One difficulty is that compliance matters were assigned to FAOCIA but most compliance issues do not revolve around academic matters; as a result, they parse out the responsibilities depending on the issue.

There is some redundancy built into the system, Professor Borgida said, but that is acceptable because it leads to greater inclusivity in dealing with the issues. It is also not always easy to separate academic and non-academic issues, such as in proposed NCAA legislation. The two committees meet together twice a year to discuss the overlapping issues. The system works, Professor Koch concluded. They have talked about suggesting that all of the FAOCIA faculty members also be members of ACA, but that is just conversation at this point. They want to be sure that when they leave their positions, their successors do not face the same problems that they have.

Professor Borgida added that Athletic Director Joel Maturi has been very respectful of the work of the two committees.

With respect to the integration of athletics and academics, Professor Koch said, she was recently invited to attend an event with donors to athletics. Because of the way the bylaws read, she was unable to go because the bylaws forbid her from accepting from the athletic department tickets to events sponsored by athletics. The Faculty Consultative Committee works with the administration, and sometimes takes adversary positions, but nonetheless has the occasional lunch or dinner with members of the administration; if members of the athletic committees do the same, however, that is perceived as a problem. She suggested the Committee might review the rules. As for tickets to sporting events, she personally does not care whether she has tickets but it is helpful for athletic committee members to see what is happening. The athletic department wants faculty more involved in the lives of the student-

athletes but committee members cannot participate in events. Does the University want athletics more isolated or more integrated, she asked?

Professor Martin agreed that it could be time to review the rules.

Professor Evans, who had joined the meeting to provide a debriefing on the presidential search, recalled that the rule about tickets applied to athletic events, not to other events. The problem with tickets to sporting events was that there was a perception among the faculty that individuals sought membership on the committees in order to get the free tickets--and were compromised as a result. There is a good reason for the ban on free tickets to athletic events. Professor Koch said that is understandable but the rules should be redrafted to allow participation in other events. She noted that there are also a lot of other sports besides those that attract all the media attention; it would be helpful if faculty on the athletic committees could attend some of those events.

Professor Erdman said it might be helpful to learn what the other Big Ten schools do.

Professor Martin thanked Professors Borgida and Koch for joining the meeting.

2. Debriefing on the Presidential Search

Professor Martin now formally welcomed Professor Evans to the meeting to discuss the presidential search.

Professor Evans began by noting that she remained extremely constrained in what she could say. It was agreed that the discussion would largely be off the record.

Professor Evans related how the faculty members of the search committee met with faculty leaders in colleges throughout the University about what was needed in a new president; they presented those views to the search-advisory committee. She said they were listened to by the members of the search-advisory committee when they discussed these characteristics. There was no significant division of opinion on the search-advisory committee about what was needed.

The group did what any search-advisory committee does, she said; it was pretty standard. It reviewed a very large number of files, conducted its own interviews, and presented a stellar list of finalists, any one of whom could have been president. Even given the stellar finalists, Professor Evans said she agreed with the action taken by the Board of Regents in hiring Dr. Bruininks. The finalists identified by the search-advisory committee would NOT have been public candidates.

Professor Evans and the Committee agreed with a suggestion from Professor Ratliff-Crain that it is perhaps time to look at the structure of presidential searches, before the next time there is occasion for a search. Most of the University's peers have a much higher level of faculty involvement in the search than Minnesota has had.

The Committee thanked Professor Evans for the work that she and her colleagues, Professors Ahern and Sullivan, did, and gave her a round of applause.

3. Discussion with President Bruininks

Professor Martin welcomed the President to the meeting; it was agreed that the discussion would be off the record inasmuch as it concerned how the University would approach the Governor and legislature given the \$4.56-billion deficit.

The Committee also spent a little time discussing with the President the events of Founder's Week and the presidential inauguration.

Professor Martin adjourned the meeting at 2:10.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota