

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee**  
**Thursday, November 15, 2012**  
**1:00 – 3:00**  
**238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Sally Gregory Kohlstedt (chair), Linda Bearinger, Peter Bitterman, James Cloyd, Chris Cramer, Will Durfee, Michael Hancher, Scott Lanyon, Russell Luepker, Alon McCormick, James Pacala, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, George Sheets

Absent: Avner Ben-Ner, Brian Buhr, Nancy Ehlke, Elaine Tyler May, Ned Patterson, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, Richard Ziegler

Guests: Athletic Director Norwood Teague; Provost Karen Hanson

Other: Liz Eull (President's Office); Ken Savary (Office of the Board of Regents); Susan VanVoorhis (Registrar)

[In these minutes: (1) discussion with Twin Cities Athletic Director Teague; (2) discussion with Provost Hanson; (3) Faculty Senate docket approval; (4) discussion with Legislative Liaison Professor Sheets (closed); (5) report from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy; (6) report from the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs]

**1. Discussion with Twin Cities Athletic Director Teague**

Professor Kohlstedt convened the meeting at 12:00 and welcomed Mr. Teague. She noted that the Committee had provided him a few questions in advance.

**The first question:** "What have you learned since arriving at the University of Minnesota that surprised you? What gives you the most satisfaction about your position as Director of Intercollegiate Athletics? What do you see on your agenda for change?"

Mr. Teague began by saying the satisfaction he derives from his position is from the great job that the University does in educating the student-athletes and the work that the faculty do and from the great amount that athletics adds to the experience of the students who participate. He said he believes that when athletics is done right, and is excellent, it can be a "front porch" for the University and generate support and spirit among alumni and others interested in the institution.

What surprised him is the passion that people across the state have for Gopher football to be more successful, Mr. Teague related. Fans have been frustrated for a long time, but they also want the team to win in the right way, not at all costs.

As for his agenda for change, beyond increasing the success of the football program, Mr. Teague said it includes continuing to support the other sports, which have had great success, but there is one area

---

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

that needs enhancement: The support facilities for athletics are behind those of the University's competitors. He said he does not want to get into an "arms race," but there are needs. For example, the University has only one indoor practice facility, attached to the football offices, and demands on it are so great for practice times that in some cases the schedule affects the courses that students can take—because teams are in there all day long—and can also have an effect on the majors that students choose. They need a second facility. They also need more area for the academic advising center because it is not large enough nor is it up to date. As they recruit student-athletes, they need to have comparable facilities. The "arms race" phrase is worrisome, because he wants to build facilities that are attractive but not over the top.

**The second question:** "Funding: a. Under your predecessor, the amount of institutional funding support the athletic department had been steadily declining. Do you expect that trend to continue, if not why not? Do you expect the level ever to reach zero? b. Division I intercollegiate athletics, especially in the revenue-producing sports, face a continued arms race, with (among other things) escalating coaching salaries and facility costs. How will the University of Minnesota respond to those pressures? Is there any solution to the escalating costs?"

Mr. Teague said he needs to continue to build the budget and so must have a robust development effort. He needs more people in fund-raising and believes there is great potential; the department should be able to raise much more money. He said he was unsure where the funding from the University would end up; there is very little such funding now, about \$1.8 million in an \$80-million budget. He said he would be sensitive about drawing on University funding.

Professor Kohlstedt asked Mr. Teague if he found good collaboration with the rest of the University. He said it has been outstanding and that athletics should not be an island. He said he has found great support; for example, they had a 70% response rate on the request for mid-semester evaluations of student athletes, a very good rate compared to other institutions with which he is familiar. Student-athletes must meet with their advisers typically each semester. In light of the problems in men's basketball in 1999-2000, the University created two athletic committees; many athletic directors would dislike that much looking over their shoulders but he likes it a great deal because it provides excellent oversight and the opportunity for dialogue.

Professor Lanyon suggested to Mr. Teague, apropos of mid-semester reports, that the athletic department or academic advising staff contact the department heads when there has been no response from some faculty members and ask for help. That might increase the number of responses. Professor Durfee agreed but pointed out that the responses are optional, and while it is good if instructors respond, they can only be cajoled unless there is a policy. Professor Lanyon concurred but said that it is good for the students if instructors respond.

One report this Committee received included a worry about the majors and courses that student-athletes take, Professor Kohlstedt recalled. Mr. Teague said he talks about that with the coaching and advising staff.

Professor Bitterman asked Mr. Teague what he thought about corporate naming rights as opposed to individual donations. Mr. Teague responded that one must be careful about corporate naming rights, what the expectations are, and what industry the corporation is in. TCF has been excellent to deal with,

and corporate naming rights can work well if they are done well. He said he would like to see more corporate naming in smaller facilities.

Professor Bearinger said, with respect to the need for students to sometimes select different majors because of scheduling problems, that happens in many areas. As institutions move more into online courses, that change may help. She then asked if there is a hotline or confidential reporting line where student-athletes could report problems with faculty members or others. That would be a way for them to speak up and a way for the institution to get a handle on problems.

Professor Luepker asked about the development effort that Mr. Teague wants to expand. How do those activities relate to the University of Minnesota Foundation? There is no reporting line to the Foundation, Mr. Teague explained, but the development staff in athletics talk with the Foundation staff just about every day, and the Foundation is a big help to their efforts. Is there conflict in going after donors, Professor Luepker inquired? They receive directions from the Foundation and are informed about donors who are being cultivated by other University units; they have a lot of communication.

Professor Durfee observed that when President Bruininks was making a pitch for the new football stadium, he would say to potential donors that they should give X% to the University for undergraduate scholarships--which led to a big uptick in support for them. As he pitches to potential donors to athletics, does he also make a case for the University? He does and has done so before, Mr. Teague replied. As they develop background information on a prospective donor, they learn about the donor's interests; if someone is interested in athletics and engineering, for example, people from both athletics and engineering will meet with the person. There is much such collaboration. If he can help raise money for other units, that is fine because it is all for the common good. When those links occur, Professor Durfee advised, it would be a good idea to publicize them; that might temper the views that some have about intercollegiate athletics, if they realize that the program is good for the University.

Professor Hancher commented that this is an urban area; how does that play out in recruiting? The facilities can be improved, but how strong is the pull of the city? Mr. Teague noted that he had previously been at Arizona State (in Phoenix) and Virginia Commonwealth, and said he believed the effect of the city was positive. He has heard from student-athlete alumni who tell him that when they saw all the Fortune 500 companies located in the area, that is why they came to Minnesota. The University is not downtown, it is in a university setting, so has the best of both worlds.

Professor Bearinger said that it is pretty standard, for Division I athletes who want to be in a lab major and/or go to medical school, for them to take five years. They should be advised that school will take that long. Mr. Teague said he never wants to hear that anyone in athletics has advised a student to shy away from an intensive major, and if he does, it will get his attention.

**The third question:** "NCAA a. What would you think about seeking an anti-trust exemption for the NCAA so that it could begin to regulate costs, including salaries? b. The NCAA Rules Working Group has proposed many changes to NCAA rules, most of which are mundane. But one of them has caught the attention of a number of faculty members, the underlined language below. Is a financial advantage a "natural" advantage? Are conference alignments "natural"? Does this change essentially set aside the old principle of competitive equity?"

### 2.17.3 The Commitment to Fair Competition.

Bylaws of the Association shall be designed to promote the opportunity for institutions and eligible student-athletes to engage in fair competition. The concept of fair competition requires that all member institutions compete within the framework of the Collegiate Model of athletics in which athletics competition is an integral part of the student-athlete's pursuit of higher education. Areas to be regulated include, but are not limited to, personnel, eligibility, amateurism, recruiting, financial aid, the length of playing and practice seasons and the number of institutional competitions per sport. Fair competition does not support bylaws designed to prevent or reduce the advantages that arise from a student-athlete's level of talent or an institution's financial or other natural advantages.

Mr. Teague said he would worry about the anti-trust proposal, but if the NCAA had an anti-trust exemption, that could solve some problems, especially escalating salaries. He commented that he is not a lawyer but he wonders if Congress would be willing to grant such an exemption. He told the Committee that there will likely be some stunning buy-out numbers coming out of the Southeastern Conference in the near future, numbers that could raise more anti-trust questions. Mr. Teague recalled that the NCAA at one time did try to restrict the earnings of assistant basketball coaches; the coaches sued and won on anti-trust grounds.

With respect to the proposed bylaw amendment, Professor Kohlstedt asked if it is a "natural advantage" if an institution has more resources. That is a tricky question, Mr. Teague said. He said believed that things will evolve; the NCAA will have to stay diligent whether it is on anti-trust matters or dealing with the rich getting richer.

If the goal is to maintain competition, Professor Kohlstedt said, that means some idea of equity. This proposal says it can be eroded. Mr. Teague said he hoped that is not the intent. He said he hoped the NCAA has good leadership and smart regulation because those are big issues. He said that when the situation becomes extremely complex at the national level, he tends to focus on what they are doing at the University, because people have great values, they are educating students, and have excellent programs. The large issues are important but it is not always clear what they can do about them.

**The fourth question:** "What mechanisms are in place to reduce the likelihood of scandals such as those that rocked Penn State, Ohio State, North Carolina and Southern California in recent years?"

Mr. Teague said that two features at the University may become more common. One is that the athletic compliance officer reports to the general counsel and has a dotted line reporting line to the athletic director; he has never seen that before but thinks it is excellent. The other is that the academic advising staff reports to the provost, and that changes their world. Having those two mechanisms in place is a great relief to him, Mr. Teague related. He said he attended North Carolina and was not thrilled when it faced an academic scandal; in that case, it was the behavior of a tutor, but he knows that will always be a potential challenge in athletics. Minnesota, however, has extensive training for tutors and he feels good about how the system works.

Professor Hancher asked if other schools are taking note of the arrangements here and following the University's lead. They have taken note, Mr. Teague said, but he does not believe they are following the lead. There is always a dotted line to an academic officer for athletic advising programs, and while there has been some change in compliance office reporting, it hasn't been a rush.

Professor Kohlstedt observed that the Big Ten presidents are talking about governance and compliance. Mr. Teague said that compliance offices have gotten much bigger. When he was at Virginia in 1992, there was no compliance staff and they later added one person. The University of Minnesota has seven full-time staff and they are busy.

**The fifth question:** "How do you envision working with faculty and others on campus to enhance the educational experience of the athletes in your program? Have you had good experience in working with faculty directly or through various representative committees and groups?"

Mr. Teague repeated that he is enjoying interacting with the two athletic committees that oversee the department. He likes more dialogue and wants to be a participant in conversations about the program to generate ideas on how to work together better.

Professor Kohlstedt asked how they gauge how student-athletes are responded to by the faculty. If there is resistance? Or are things working smoothly? There are occasional issues, Mr. Teague said. There are eight or nine academic advisers who work with the faculty to identify solutions when there are problems. He responded to Professor Bearinger's suggestion of a hotline: The advisers serve that function, he said, and he also has a student-athlete advisory committee (composed of team leaders) that he meets with once per month. They also do exit interviews of student-athletes who are seniors and use immediately what they are told. He said he puts special emphasis on them because they don't have any fears as a sophomore or junior might.

Professor Bearinger did not agree with Mr. Teague. She said she had children who were Division I athletes and they would not have wanted to bring an academic issue to a coach—and not to a faculty member out of concern that it would only make things worse. Exit interviews are a good idea but many student-athletes just bear a burden quietly. Mr. Teague said he thought that academic advisers become involved and help sort out problems. Is it not appropriate for an adviser to call a faculty member, Professor Kohlstedt asked? [Advisers may contact instructors; coaches are not supposed to do so.] Mr. Teague said that advisers provide guidance to the student on how to handle situations. There are students who miss part or all of practices because they have a lab or class; the culture among the coaches here is that that is understood.

Professor Hancher noted that he serves on the Board of Directors of the Alumni Association and pointed out that student-athletes become alumni; what is the chance of drawing on them for their identification with the University, and possibly becoming donors? Mr. Teague said that they have the M Club, which is a source of support for them—it is a development club, in many ways, something that they have to emphasize over the next few years. There are a lot of alumni in the area, some of whom are engaged with the University and some of whom are not. But this is an especially promising group of people who retain contact with the University, Professor Hancher said. Mr. Teague agreed. He said he has been surprised at the number who stay involved. They work constantly with the Alumni Association on events.

Professor Cloyd asked if Mr. Teague or any of the head coaches visit departments or colleges. Would they find that useful? Mr. Teague said he has spoken with the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics about doing more, and they will do more. That would be an expansion of the twice-per-year faculty-coach lunches, Professor Cramer said. It would, Mr. Teague said,

and they are looking for ideas how to expand it. Professor Cloyd said such events could help them reach faculty members who may be skeptical or antagonistic; it would be beneficial to try to get to where people are and answer the tough questions, especially in departments where there may be a number of student-athletes. Professor Lanyon added that they should find one or two student-athletes in the department and bring them along; faculty will listen to students, and if the students talk about the importance of athletics, the faculty will listen.

Professor Cloyd related that he is in the McGuire Translational Research Facility, which was occupied in 2005, across from the site of the TCF bank stadium, so they watched it being built. He heard a lot of comments about the stadium from scientific colleagues, most of which were negative. They did not understand that the University could not simply switch revenue streams and did not understand that good athletics can be good for a university.

Professor Bearinger related that one of her children who was an athlete had an alumni (athlete) mentor, which was great for her child. That helps alumni stay connected and it helps the student-athletes. And it is no cost.

Professor Bitterman said that the Committee has heard from a number of University leaders that they are told it is important that students learn to work well in teams. This is a group of students who are really good at working in teams, at building a team. That is a transferable skill and it would be great if they could help transfer the knowledge. Those who had an athletic experience in college, as he did, found it very valuable later in their career.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Mr. Teague for joining the meeting.

## **2. Discussion with Provost Hanson**

Professor Kohlstedt welcomed Provost Hanson to the meeting and noted that the Committee would like to hear from her about gender equity in faculty salaries and making the arts, humanities, and social sciences more visible.

Provost Hanson said that the gender-equity process has taken a number of turns since she last spoke with the Committee. Vice Provost Carney (Faculty and Academic Affairs) is working hard on it, in concert with Associate Vice President Kristin Lockhart and Vice President Kathryn Brown, and has met with the associate deans of all of the colleges about implementing the recommendations. Some in the smaller colleges are concerned about the number of people available to serve on the two committees; the colleges prefer that the salary-equity committee be at the college level. There are also updates on the salary analyses. Some of the Academic Health Center (AHC) colleges without clinical faculty will follow the same path as non-AHC colleges, while those with clinical faculty are facing the challenge of comparing a more complex set of variables. In addition to salary, there has been concern about other benefits and perquisites at time of hire, so the Faculty and Academic Affairs office is creating a database of new faculty with information on financial and other considerations in order to keep track of them and judge equity in both initial offers and retention. Vice President Brown has offered assistance from Human Resources in training college staff and committees to do salary analyses. The work will start in spring semester.

Professor Kohlstedt commended Provost Hanson for going beyond salaries to look at other benefits and said she was glad that progress is being made.

Professor Bearinger said that in schools with faculty of mostly one gender, there is the misperception that one cannot do salary-equity studies. There must be an equity review for them as well and they cannot be compared only within that school. Provost Hanson said there will be a standing committee in each college to take all complaints but that there are no plans to look across schools at gender disparities for this process to review how Minnesota faculty are paid compared to faculty at peer institutions.

Professor Bearinger maintained that now is the time to develop a mechanism to identify partner schools to compare (for example, the School of Nursing and the School of Public Health). To miss this opportunity is an oversight and puts some schools at a disadvantage. That may be, Provost Hanson said, but salary inequities must be made up by the school and cross-school comparisons are vexed by that problem. There is no fungibility of faculty lines across colleges. That does not mean inequities should not be identified, Professor Bearinger responded, because otherwise the University is presenting itself as addressing gender equity when it is not—and this is not just about the School of Nursing. Provost Hanson said the University can look at the differences but one must be clear-eyed about the fiscal implications; most differences across colleges are due to market issues. Law professors may be paid more than faculty members in some other colleges. What they are looking at now, however, is gender equity within each field.

Professor Kohlstedt noted that the Committee received data from Dr. Radcliffe in the Office of Planning and Analysis that would make it possible to look across institutions; it would be useful to ask him to gather information that would allow comparisons on gender equity and equity for minority faculty members. Provost Hanson agreed and said she could see the need for the University to be competitive, but there are limits to comparing beyond college boundaries.

Professor Kohlstedt said she was glad to see movement and suggested that there be publicity once there has been action and improvements made. The provost said she would include the subject in her next message to the faculty. Professor Bitterman said that publication of a general comment from the senior leadership would be helpful in recruiting students and faculty.

Provost Hanson turned next to increasing the visibility of the arts, humanities, and social sciences. She said she recognized that the balance of the publicity recently has been connected with the legislative request, the Itasca Project, etc., and people are not hearing as much about how important the arts, humanities, and social sciences are to the University's profile. She said that she raises the point for discussion almost no matter the forum but she agreed that there's a need to fly the flag more—and this is not just about CLA, she added. There is a need to think about how the University presents itself to the public, and the humanities are a special concern. Northrop Auditorium will open soon, which will put the focus on the arts and humanities, and not just because of the performance spaces (Northrop will also be home to the Institute for Advanced Studies). But that is some time in the future.

In many of the forums where there are discussions with external constituents, they find that those constituents believe in a liberal education, Provost Hanson said, but the role the liberal arts play in the state is not well understood. This question has been on her mind since she came to the University, and

she looks for opportunities to make the case, but there needs to be a larger overall strategy. She asked Committee members what they thought.

Professor Lanyon suggested that the University causes some of the problem itself. Some units look at their alumni and where they go (e.g., biology, engineering) but he said he did not know if the University does that with its liberal-arts graduates. They may have great careers but it may be more difficult to track them because there is not usually a one-to-one relationship between their majors and their careers. But it is clear that liberal-arts majors play a significant role in the state.

Provost Hanson agreed and said there are many cases to make the point. They also know that chief executives value liberal-arts graduates; the question is whether their human resources offices do.

Professor Sheets observed that this topic has come up numerous times at many meetings. At one earlier meeting, there was discussion about informing the public about the impact of a liberal education, something that is not readily recognized. One idea was to put brief segments on the University's home page about people who are not in a liberal-arts career but who have liberal-arts degrees and who can talk about how their degree affected them and their favorite course. That could make an impression and break down misunderstanding; an advertising campaign that included TV spots could help change minds and it could be done quite simply.

Provost Hanson agreed and said she would also like have something moving forward supporting research in the humanities and not just talk about the well-rounded person and success on the job. There is need for a more difficult communication about the roles that the humanities play in advancing the culture.

Professor Bitterman suggested that part of the problem may lie in names. The Institute of Technology (IT) changed its name to the College of Science and Engineering (CSE), he assumed to avoid ambiguity with the contemporary use of the term "IT" to mean information technology. "College of Liberal Arts" is ambiguous. "Liberal" has a political connotation that some bristle at, like it or not, and "Arts" can be interpreted more narrowly than some might want. Everyone would agree that one of the goals of an education is competence in the three Rs—and two of those Rs are in CLA. Many institutions have different names for that kind of college. Professor Sheets said that is an excellent point and agreed that "Liberal Arts" is a vacuous term. Provost Hanson agreed that it is ambiguous.

The Committee and Provost Hanson discussed briefly the progress on Northrop Auditorium, the scheduling of events, and establishment of an advisory committee. Professor Durfee asked about the rationale for having the director of Northrop report to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. She really reports to the provost, Dr. Hanson said; because the Institute for Advanced Studies and the Honors College will be in Northrop and because Vice Provost McMaster has been deeply and energetically involved in the project, it was a good arrangement for now, but the director does report to him. Professor Durfee said it will be important to convey that message, and that Northrop is a University-wide asset, not one focused on undergraduate education. Provost Hanson concurred and said there also needs to be some linkage with the Weisman to create synergy between the two.

Provost Hanson turned to the matter of administrative reorganization, another topic the Committee had posed for discussion. She said that Senior Vice President Jones' office has been a significant one for the University and there are difficult questions about how to address the significant



loss. The transfer of units from the provost's office to the Office of the Vice President for Research should work very well. The large units transferring from Dr. Jones' office to her office are self-sustaining and will continue to do well, but it will be necessary to think about how to connect them with the other units in her office. That will make a difference in how she organizes the provost's office and it remains a work in progress, Dr. Hanson concluded.

As for the new associate dean for graduate education, Provost Hanson said that it is important that the institution proceed vigorously to assist and enhance graduate and professional education across the University. The primary work of the office will be on program review and enhancement and on quality metrics.

Professor Bearinger reported that the Senate Research Committee earlier in the week had a discussion of public engagement and elements of it related to research. In the preamble to his remarks, Associate Vice President Furco laid the framework for outlining how public engagement should be woven into all of the University's missions. The juxtaposition of that discussion with this one about Northrop and the Weisman suggests that the University should expand its thinking to include all the ways it interacts with the public, including concerts, displays, community research, and so on. The University needs to think futuristically about public engagement rather than just about where it is now. Provost Hanson said that Dr. Furco is looking for opportunities to connect with academic units as well as units such as the libraries and Concerts and Lectures.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Provost Hanson for joining the meeting.

### **3. Faculty Senate Docket Approval**

Professor Kohlstedt reported that Provost Hanson has agreed to provide a regular provost's report at Faculty Senate meetings, and take questions, parallel to the president's report and questions at the University Senate meetings. The Committee approved the Faculty Senate docket.

Professor Durfee inquired what the criteria are for cancelling a Senate meeting. The FCC/SCC chair reviews the proposed docket and decides to cancel the meeting if there are an insufficient number of items of business, and where none are pressing.

### **4. Discussion with Legislative Liaison Professor Sheets**

Professor Kohlstedt accepted a motion to close the meeting, which was adopted unanimously.

Professor Sheets reported on the role that he and Professor Buhr will play as legislative liaisons.

### **5. Report from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP)**

Professor McCormick next reported for the Committee on Educational Policy. There are two items coming to the February Faculty Senate meetings, one of which is a response to the Committee's charge to SCEP concerning grades in context and grade compression. Professor McCormick reviewed the information that SCEP has considered and said that has led to two items.

First, SCEP would like to see units do something with the 1999 SCEP report to the Senate, which called for annual provision of grading to the Senate, deans, and department heads. SCEP is drafting questions that it will provide to this Committee and the Faculty Senate that it will recommend that Vice Provost McMaster send to all deans asking that they ask departments to reflect on their grading practices, including the definition of an A grade, whether courses are norm-referenced or criterion-referenced, and so on). What will be different this time is that SCEP will ask for reports back on the results of the discussions.

Second, in terms of providing context for the range of grades in specific classes, it is possible to change the transcript—but it would be very difficult. It is also possible for the University to provide grading information that would be used by students as well as advisers. Grading distributions by course are already available to students, from myedu.com. Professor McCormick said he has asked a number of faculty members about providing such data and the idea seems to be catching on. There are worries; the main one is that students would change their program or classes in order to get good grades—but they already have access to the information. Students doing well in a difficult program would have the opportunity to research and explain their own grades.

Professor Lanyon reported that Professor McCormick had brought these options to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs earlier in the week, and one comment was that 15 years ago students knew grade distributions because everyone posted them on their office doors. To report grades on the web would simply be returning to what had been done in the past.

Professor Kohlstedt said her original thought was that SCEP would bring the issues to the Faculty Senate for open discussion in order that people would feel they had been consulted. Professor McCormick said he agreed but it was the consensus of SCEP members that that they were not ready to bring a proposal to the Faculty Senate. Professor Bitterman asked for the rationale for declining to bring the issues to the Faculty Senate now; Professor McCormick said he did not know fully, except that they felt there are still a number of questions they would like to work on. Professor Cramer commented, endorsing the SCEP movement toward openness, that any time the University starts a discussion about keeping its practices secret, it looks conspiratorial, which is not appropriate for a public institution—and when it wants to keep its practices secret but the information is available elsewhere, it looks both conspiratorial and stupid.

Professor Hancher commented that grades are information that have an audience; Professor McCormick mentioned two, faculty and students; Professor Hancher asked are there others? Professor McCormick said the general public. There is an intermediate audience that looks at transcripts, Professor Hancher said, and that is reviewers of transcripts for admission or award decisions. The original proposal that this Committee suggested to SCEP was to put the information on the transcript to provide context; there is an important audience whose needs would be met by that proposal. He has served on such committees and wanted to know the context of the grades; the proposal to make data available on the web does not meet that need.

Professor McCormick turned to Ms. VanVoorhis to further explain the difficulties with the transcript change proposal. Ms. VanVoorhis explained that she is the Registrar and said that one suggestion her office made was to provide grading information on the Registrar's website, something they can do sooner rather than later. They are going through an upgrade of the PeopleSoft student system, and one thing that President Kaler has made clear is that he wants the systems to stay "vanilla" and not have a

lot of internal work modifying them. The proposal to add context to transcripts would not work in the new system because no other institution does do. To make that modification they would have to make it for all campuses and would need to rewrite programs outside the PeopleSoft system—which they could do, but which would mean losing other functions. The University would need to weigh the benefits and costs. She added that she believed very few people would actually look at the contextual information.

Other concerns were that if the University puts contextual information on transcripts, could University students find themselves disadvantaged in comparison with students from other institutions, Professor McCormick reported. SCEP had discussed the concern that, while information could help for students with A's in courses with few A's, the appearance of even a few courses with a large percentage of A grades could cause a reader of the transcript to gain the impression that the University of Minnesota grades too easily.

Professor Bitterman said an important point, when looking at transcripts, is to understand that there are two kinds of grades, competency-based and norm-based. It would be useful to know which one a course is. That could be a good starting point for the audience that Professor Hancher has mentioned. Professor Cramer observed that the current grading system does not recognize competency-based grading, and such courses could be pass-fail.

Another issue that could require feedback from this Committee, Professor McCormick said, is that Vice Provost Carney has been asked to encourage faculty buy-in to releasing the data from the student-release questions. SCEP has learned from Tracy Smith in the General Counsel's office that some of those questions could be rephrased so that releasing the results would not require permission of the instructor, so it would no longer be a matter of encouraging the faculty to release the data.

## **6. Report from the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA)**

Professor Lanyon recalled that last year this Committee referred to SCFA the task of drafting a statement on faculty productivity in response to proposed measures in the Texas and Florida legislatures that would have measured productivity by tuition dollars generated and grant funding obtained. SCFA prepared a document and brought it to this Committee and informally to University Relations. At this point SCFA is uncertain that such a statement for University Relations is still needed. SCFA members observed that these calls for productivity measures seem to be cyclical, and in their view University Relations must always be prepared to respond. What is needed is more than a report, what is needed is a dialogue about what SCFA can do to help University Relations be prepared. There needs to be an understanding of a day in the life of faculty members and examples of what faculty produce, and recommended metrics to measure efficiency, rather than have them imposed on the University. SCFA concluded that the dialogue needs to continue.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Professors McCormick and Lanyon for their reports and adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand