

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, October 24, 2002
1:15 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Dan Feeney (chair), Gary Balas, Muriel Bebeau, Susan Brorson, Arthur Erdman, Marti Hope Gonzales, Marc Jenkins, Candace Kruttschnitt, Marvin Marshak, Judith Martin, Martin Sampson, Charles Speaks

Absent: Tom Clayton, John Fossum, Mary Jo Kane, Mary McEvoy, Jeff Ratliff-Crain

Guests: Athletic Director Joel Maturi, Interim Vice President and Chief of Staff Kathryn Brown; Regents' Professors John Chipman, Joanne Eicher, Patricia Hampl, Ronald Phillips, Lanny Schmidt, David Tilman

Other: none

[In these minutes: (1) discussion with athletic director Joel Maturi; (2) discussion with the Regents' Professors; (3) other business]

1. Discussion with the Athletic Director

Professor Feeney convened the meeting at 1:15 and welcomed Mr. Maturi. He said he was glad Mr. Maturi was at the meeting and at the University. He said the purpose of the meeting was to establish a liaison with Mr. Maturi so he would feel free to call if he needed help and so that if the Committee had questions, it could contact him. Everyone is focused on the same goals, research, teaching, and the student experience, and he wants to be sure everyone is on the same page.

Mr. Maturi said he was glad to be at the meeting and able to meet Committee members. He said he believed it better for people to get to know one another in order that there is less mistrust.

He is the athletic director at the University of Minnesota, he said, but he is not the one who decided the University would be Division I-A, that it would have a broad-based sport program, that it would build the facilities that it has. At the same time, he believes the mission of athletics can be consistent with the University mission. There are challenges, however; the merger of the two departments, which were significantly different, will take time. Each had wonderful people who worked to achieve the best for their program; his problem is that the two departments were not consistent and must be transformed into one culture. They are all the University of Minnesota, trying to convey a message internally and externally; they love the University and the state, they care for students, and wish to do things right. They may not always agree on how to get there.

* 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.

The graduation rates for athletics are not good, Mr. Maturi said, and he intends to find out why. Even though the rates are calculated consistently for all schools, they are odd (if a student transfers from the University of Minnesota to another school and graduates, the individual still counts as a zero for the University's graduation rate). He said he did not know if Minnesota had a lot of students who transfer in good standing but he has asked for the data. A lot of Minnesota athletes also turn professional, which also counts for a zero. He said he intended to get to the bottom of the low graduation rate.

Mr. Maturi said he has told the coaches that the admissions office is responsible for admitting students it is sure can graduate. If the admissions office says a student cannot graduate, the athletic department must respect that call. He said he knows there are exceptions here, just as there are at Harvard, Stanford, and so on, and he can live with that because there is a good academic support system in place. At-risk students have a chance to graduate if they want to. He has, however, told admissions that he wants to keep track of every special admit by sport--and he has told the coaches he intends to do so. If a sport has had a number of special admits in ten years and most of the students have graduated or are still in school making progress to a degree, he would approve additional special admits. If, however, a team has had a number of special admits and most dropped out, he will not approve any more. Every coach thinks every athlete is a potential all-American who can bring his or her team to the top; in reality, few are. The University of Minnesota may have been getting some marginal students who are also marginal athletes--students whom the coach can let go the following year and so get the athletic scholarship back. Mr. Maturi said he intends to put a stop to that practice so the University is not misleading students. Some coaches may not like his decision but that will be the rule. He pointed out that it will take a few years for the impact of these decisions to take effect.

He is working on a bonus plan for coaches linked to the graduation rate of their athletes, Mr. Maturi told the Committee (there is already in place such a plan for championships). For example, the men's basketball graduation rate was reported at 9% in the most recent data; if Coach Monson can lift that to 50%, he should be rewarded (and maybe 50% is still too low, but it is a lot better than the current rate). In another sport, the graduation rate may always be above 50% because of nature of the students it attracts, so a 50% graduation rate would not be rewarded--but increasing the rate above what has been the norm would be.

The University has a large compliance staff; one part of the ugliness of intercollegiate athletics is that one must oversee a large number of rules from the NCAA, the Big Ten, and the Western Collegiate Hockey Association. The University spends the money on compliance because the NCAA requires institutional control--so that if there are problems, the University will not be severely punished. The University has had problems in the past and cannot afford to have more.

Mr. Maturi said that responsibility begins with him. He has told the coaches that he wants their evaluations to be based on more than won-lost record. He has also asked them if they would support him if he supports a coach who is perhaps not winning as much as the public might want. If a coach improves graduation rates, makes a contribution to the community, serves as a role model, the department and University may have to be more patient with him or her. The reality of Division I athletics is that coaches are hired and fired on winning; it needs to get away from that. The University cannot be inconsistent in its message: if a coach is to be judged on academic matters, community service, and so on, Mr. Maturi said he will be true to his word in evaluating the coach. He recalled that before he left his last school he had extended the contract of the men's basketball coach, someone who had not won enough for three years. The students adore him, he is a model citizen--and was astounded to be reappointed. The

president supported the decision; some of the alumni were outraged. Mr. Maturi said he told them politely that he needed their support. He said he will not hesitate to make the same decisions at Minnesota.

The athletic arms race is a reality, Mr. Maturi said. The cost of intercollegiate athletics in the last 15 years has become frightening; he said he knew of no other area of endeavor where "if they have it, you must" operates so much, or a program will not get the great recruits. He said he did not know if that was actually true; a program must have something but perhaps not everything. All schools are feeling the pinch; the Big Ten athletic directors have talked about what they can do as a conference. One example might be to cut football scholarships from 85 to 60--but the large schools are hesitant to do that because it would increase parity. And some coaches' salaries are hard to justify (in the case of one school that recently hired a new football coach, the individual's salary went from \$80,000 to \$800,000, and he had done nothing to earn that money the first year). Mr. Maturi said that when he was at Miami of Ohio he had commented that as soon as the six big conferences go a different direction the better off the rest of the schools would be. Now he finds himself part of one of the big six conferences and wants to use the position to speak about doing the right things and making decisions that have some sanity. This is easier for some schools, he pointed out: Ohio State recently spent \$200 million on facilities; institutions that don't have new facilities would say that any moratorium on new facilities would be unfair to them.

Professor Marshak said that it is important for the University that Mr. Maturi communicate to the rest of the University when he finds out why athletes do not graduate. The general graduation rate at the University is not good and perhaps some of the reasons are the same. If the University can apply what Mr. Maturi learns, that might help. And there is a better chance of getting data in athletics because the coaches know the athletes better than other students are known. The University, he commented, should be graduating more than 50% of its students.

Professor Marshak also said that coaches are the most important person in the lives of the athletes. If the coach reinforces the importance of academics, that will mean more than anything else to the athletes. Coaches must seriously encourage academic performance. Mr. Maturi said most coaches do so. At the same time, if a coach learns that an athlete is not as good as was predicted, the coach wants the athlete to leave so he or she can replace the athlete with someone else--because the rewards and spotlight are focused on winning.

So if an athlete is not good, the coach can persuade him or her to flunk, Professor Marshak asked? Or go elsewhere to school, Mr. Maturi said. The coach can tell the athlete he or she will never play and encourage him or her to transfer to a Division II school, for example. He said he does not believe that is what the University should be about. If an athlete WANTS to transfer to another school, that's fine, but if the athlete wants to stay at the University, he or she should not have aid removed. What if the student does not want to participate in athletics? Then the student loses the aid, Mr. Maturi said. At the same time, he will not MAKE a coach keep an athlete on a team; if the coach wants an athlete off the team, the student keeps his or her scholarship if performing academically. He will not remove an athletic scholarship in that case unless there has been a documented violation of the rules.

In terms of graduation rates, Mr. Maturi commented that women athletes graduate at phenomenal rates; the men do not. This is an issue he must deal with, he will, and the rates will improve, he declared.

Professor Speaks spoke approvingly of the new electronic method for reporting the academic progress of athletes; who is using it, he asked? They receive only about a 53% return on the requests for information, Mr. Maturi said; he said he hoped more faculty would help. He said they do not want to place a burden on faculty. The information provided goes to the academic counselor and then to the coach--who, he agreed, has more influence than anyone on the athlete. They need to know before 12 weeks have elapsed how an athlete is doing. He said that there will be a reminder sent to faculty, and then the counselor will call, and the faculty representative will call after that, if necessary, so the call is faculty to faculty. Professor Speaks said he found it appalling that the faculty talk about an emphasis on academics and then don't respond to requests for information. Some believe students should handle things on their own, Mr. Maturi observed; Professor Speaks responded that the University now requires alerts for all first-year classes.

Professor Balas said he thought the bonus plan for coaches to improve graduation rates was a good idea--but is it not already part of their job? Mr. Maturi just spoke about over-compensated coaches, Professor Balas recalled; he said he was dismayed by this proposal. Mr. Maturi said that Coach Glen Mason already has a clause providing a bonus if he goes to a bowl game; there should be a similar clause if academic improvement is achieved as well. The additional salary should not go into the base; this means someone is getting an increase for doing his or her job, Professor Balas objected. This is like the variation in academic disciplines, Mr. Maturi said; it would be difficult for him to recruit a top coach but pay a lower base salary. Professor Balas said that if Mr. Maturi, a leader, cannot make changes, then he (Professor Balas) has little confidence the athletic arms race will ever stop.

Is he optimistic the Big Ten might be able to do something, Professor Sampson asked? It would be more likely that something would happen at the national level, Mr. Maturi said. He said he was optimistic about the appointment of Myles Brand, a college president, as head of the NCAA, and that he did not believe the athletic directors could accomplish what needs to be done. The presidents will have to take action, he said. There will be movement, that will be slow, but there will be changes and progress, he said.

Is there any possibility that the Big Ten or NCAA might eliminate freshman eligibility, Professor Martin asked? That has been talked about a lot, Mr. Maturi said. The Big Ten will not act alone; that must be a national decision. In some sports, moreover, freshmen are not the least bit fazed by athletics--they do just fine academically. He said his own view is that athletes should have five years of eligibility, period, and there should be no red-shirting and no medical waivers.

There are three areas in athletics where the financial situation can be improved, Mr. Maturi told the Committee. First, expenses: while the department cannot go backward, it can control how fast it moves forward--it can control the number of staff, trips, and so on. Second, it needs to be more responsible in generating revenue (such as in football), and third, it needs to do a better job of fund-raising. The University ranks low in athletic fund-raising; he said he did not know why, but he has a program that now works with the University Foundation.

Is there still a moratorium on athletic facilities, Professor Speaks asked? There is, Mr. Maturi said. Then what about the complaint by one sports columnist that the baseball coach could raise all the money needed for a new stadium but the University won't let him? Mr. Maturi said he understands the coach's frustration. He said he told the coach that the University needed to do a study on land use in the area; the conclusion of the study was that the baseball stadium should be moved to north of Mariucci

Arena and the land currently occupied by the stadium given to recreational sports. The current stadium is NOT a good facility but he will not dispute the moratorium with the Board of Regents at this point in his tenure; they will not build anything until they have the money. Up to now, facilities were built but the money was not in hand—so now a big part of their financial problem is debt service. If the program can raise every dime, there may be a new baseball stadium in the future.

Professor Martin asked Mr. Maturi his opinion of a joint-use stadium with the Vikings. Mr. Maturi said it will be interesting. He said he believed football should be on campus. His preference is for a Gopher-only stadium, but if the only way they can get a stadium on campus is with a joint-use facilities, it should be considered.

Professor Sampson said he understood that the crew team has one of the best practice facilities in the nation and that this is a great area for soccer—why have those sports not been added? Mr. Maturi said that requirements of gender equity do not allow adding men's soccer, thus adding more male athletes. Women make up 52% of the students so 52% of the athletes should be women. He said he was amazed that the University did not have men's soccer but it is a challenge for them to add any men's sports. He also said he does not want to add sports that have no chance to succeed because they do not have sufficient support—he does not want to water down support for sports so they are not competitive.

Professor Feeney thanked Mr. Maturi for joining the meeting.

2. Discussion with the Regents' Professors

Professor Feeney next welcomed Regents' Professors John Chipman, Joanne Eicher, Patricia Hampl, Ronald Phillips, Lanny Schmidt, and David Tilman to the meeting. He said the Committee had no fixed agenda; it wanted to spend time talking with highly responsible individuals that it has not drawn on before. He said the Committee wanted to hear about things they believe it should be doing or learn what problems they see facing the University.

Professor Phillips recalled that he had served on this Committee and believed it an important activity. He said he believed there needs to be better ways to communicate with various communities, such as Native Americans. He has done work on the molecular genetics of wild rice, which has raised concerns in the Native American community, and there was also the recent debate about the telescope in Arizona. He said he took the position that if they are doing things for the good, the situation will work out. No one found any middle ground in the telescope debate; he expects that they will in the wild rice research. The University approaches these matters in a very rational way and may not understand the issues on the other side; it needs better avenues for communication.

Should the Committee do this, or should such communication be through the Committee, Professor Feeney asked? Should it have played a role in the telescope debate? Professor Phillips said he was not sure; he agreed that he raised a difficult question. The administration—college and central—does a good job of assessing a situation and making rational decisions. But it is different when faculty are involved; students can become polarized while faculty can bring a set of skills to the table that others may not have.

There was a basic issue, a land-use conflict, in the telescope debate, Professor Marshak said. The nature of academics is to say that if there is a conflict, there should be a compromise position. The

problem is that there are a lot of these issues around the world where people say they will not compromise because it is a matter of principle. As academics, faculty do not know how to deal with such situations and they need to understand how to address them. One sees partitions instead of sharing.

The Committee is largely concerned with things inside the University and spends a lot of time listening, Professor Sampson maintained. Professor Phillips is saying it has a role with respect to the outside as well. He said he did not know what the division of responsibilities between the administration and a faculty committee would be.

Professor Eicher said she has said little because the Regents' Professors did not know what the agenda was; they were surprised to be invited to join FCC. They are selected for this high honor but then it is as if the University does not know what to do with them. The President and Provost entertain them; the Regents have lunch with them. Most of the Regents' Professors are willing to serve in an all-University capacity but they have not been asked to do so as a group. Professor Feeney said the Committee had concluded it should establish a line of communication with the Regents' Professors; this meeting is intended to explore the possibility of doing so. The question is how to make use of people who have received high honors to help the University move forward and to serve as models for junior faculty, Professor Balas added.

Professor Eicher related that she served on the McKnight Distinguished University Professor selection committee and was concerned about it: this is a high honor but no one outside the University learns about it. Awards inside the University are not promoted outside it. There needs to be a way to recognize these awards so other institutions appreciate the University's distinction. Professor Erdman added that the Academy of Distinguished Teachers is not used very well, either.

Professor Speaks observed that the administration and Regents appear to be on a fast track for a new joint-use stadium; a preliminary decision will be made in December. What is the perspective of the Regents' Professors on the marriage between a professional and a college team on campus? Professor Chipman said he could not understand why the University would engage in an industry such as professional sports; that is not what the University is about.

Professor Hampl said the question assumes the Regents' Professors are an aggregate; they are not. They rarely meet or see each other. No one can say what "the Regents' Professors" think. Professor Speaks said he wanted to hear what the Regents' Professors at this meeting think about the University's involvement with a pro sports stadium. Professor Hampl said it is only the most dramatic example of the entrepreneurial university that has grown up in the last ten years. The University has changed deeply, even in such places as English, her department. It has moved to much more of a business model, a more demanding entrepreneurial model that includes getting grants. That is not the only academic model, she said, but the stadium is not a watershed—it reflects the way the University is moving and it is only natural that it would occur in sports. Along with medicine, sports is the biggest business the University is in.

Professor Sampson recalled that the Regents' Professors came together in the tenure debate. Professor Eicher said that was unique. Professor Chipman recalled that before President Yudof's tenure, every president invited the Regents' Professors and their spouses to Eastcliff each year; Professor Eicher said that President Yudof had invited them twice but the responsibility for meeting with them went to the Provost. Professor Phillips said the Regents' Professors had acted together only twice, once during the Vietnam war and during the tenure debate.

Professor Sampson said he was not sure the stadium rose to the level of importance of the tenure debate and Vietnam. The more he thinks about the stadium, he said, the more concerned he is about the opportunity costs and the financial risks for the University. He said he was dismayed to see the State Fair renovate its stadium, which could be the site for a football stadium. The issue could have huge consequences for the University.

Professor Tilman said he has never liked the professionalization of college sports. He said he appreciated the camaraderie of sports, and having them on campus would be nice, but one must ask at what price. A program that is costing the University \$10 million per year, that pays high salaries, and is marketed to companies and alumni, one in which basketball seats are auctioned, is a run-away sports program. It should be part of the broader view of the University, more available to students, and more a part of the academic community.

Professor Chipman said he had the impression the President spent 85% of this time on athletics. How can he do his job, he asked? Professor Tilman recalled that when he came, President Yudof said he wanted to work on intellectual issues but spent all his time on sports.

Professor Martin noted that there seemed to be an overlap between the concerns expressed at this meeting and the questions that the Committee had raised earlier about a stadium. She suggested the Regents' Professors be sent a copy of the questions FCC had raised and asked if they concurred. Professor Tilman said he thought it would be useful to have a discussion about sports—what they should achieve, how much they should cost, and so on.

Professor Tilman went on to say he would like to see discussion of big issues—the undergraduate experience, the graduate experience, the role of sports—and to have a free-wheeling exchange that could generate ideas. The Regents' Professors could be one group that participated, but not the only group; the Academy of Distinguished Teachers should be included, as should new assistant professors. These groups could brainstorm about big issues and put something together for the new president. Professor Feeney said he thought the University would be well served if the Regents' Professors were to meet as a group and provide advice to the Committee and others.

A key to making the Regents' Professors more effective would be the provision of a small amount of staff support, Professor Marshak said, someone who could make sure they are invited to Eastcliff. He agreed that it would be useful to have a forum on intercollegiate athletics.

Professor Martin said the Regents' Professors should be provided the notes of the intellectual future discussions. Professor Speaks noted that the Committee had such a discussion last week; in the future, the Regents' Professors should be invited and FCC should sit quietly and listen to what they advise. Professor Feeney agreed; the point is to glean ideas from the Regents' Professors. Professor Eicher said that if 12 of the 20 Regents' Professors were to respond to such an invitation that would be a good response—and they would be willing.

Professor Hampl said she liked the idea of including other groups, such as faculty from the two McKnight programs (which would pick up both assistant professors as well as mid-career faculty). She said many would show up if invited and suggested a gathering each spring. What happens to the recommendations from this Committee, she asked? Something has to happen if people are to be asked to

spend their time. Much of what they do goes to the Senate as policy, Professor Martin responded. Must the Committee's actions be attended to, Professor Hampl asked? They are, Professor Martin said. Then it would be useful to include other groups, Professor Hampl said, and many would come if they believed they would have a hand in developing policy. It would help if there were a specific focus for discussions.

One issue could be policy on academic governance, Professor Bebeau suggested. There is tension over what the Committee is doing with respect to the responsibilities of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, but their proposal could be a way to help the non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty; they are much like the tenured and tenure-track faculty, but there are differences.

Professor Tilman said there could also be something like a distinguished scholars committee, a pool of perhaps 100 people who could be used on ad hoc committees to focus on issues and produce a white paper. He noted there are plans for a "scholar's walk" from the MacNamara Center to the center of campus; he said the Regents' Professors should discuss it and should meet with FCC about it.

Professor Hampl said she has often felt that the University has not found a way to tell its many stories. Often what the University does is public relations or publicity. She said that when serving on committees to select award winners she has been astonished at the protean work being done; it is thrilling to read the dossiers, but this work is untapped. The scholar's walk is one way to get ideas out. Magazines are constantly looking for stories—not press releases, because that looks like publicity—but STORIES. Will the renovated Coffman Union have pictures and a hallway with a story, she asked? Professor Kruttschnitt said she believed that the people in Morrill Hall are desperate to get stories out; there was a very good one recently about Professor Katherine Sikkink and her work and the attempt to recruit her from Minnesota.

Professor Martin said the Committee has talked several times with Vice President Gardebring about this; her office does not do this because they see it as the job of the colleges, given the way the University is decentralized. The University is not structured such that it is job of University Relations, which feels it is responsible for dealing with the legislature and political matters. She agreed with Professor Hampl; she has seen amazing dossiers when reviewing candidates for teaching awards but only a few people know about the work these people do. Professor Tilman agreed with Professor Hampl's view that stories should be told; they are a way to remind students and faculty that there are scholars in a broad range of disciplines who strive for excellence.

Professor Phillips related that the Center for Microbial and Plant Genomics organized a lecture series with National Academy of Science winners; they would be invited to talk about their research and to spend an hour with graduate students talking about the ethics of research. The lectures would be a way to provide public exposure for the meaning of their research. He said they found this very difficult to get across to University Relations, which was not particularly interested except as something to invite reporters to. The University needs a different approach, he said; if it does not important ideas across, no one will listen. In small towns the newspaper lists all the talks that will be given, Professor Tilman said. Perhaps the University should take out a paid ad each week listing the 20 lecture topics that would be most interesting to the public—and perhaps provide a web site for each as well. But it should be something EVERY WEEK, across disciplines. (Professor Martin observed wryly that the response of many members of the public would be "where can I park?")

Professor Hampl said that connecting students to students across disciplines was also important. Some of the most exciting essays being written are in the sciences. It is important to have journalists trained in the sciences and to have scientists trained to work with journalists. Students do not bring in the biases that older practitioners do.

Professor Schmidt pointed out that in three months the Campus Club would be open again. He said he hoped it would succeed and the University must work to be sure faculty return to it. Lunch seminars at the Campus Club could be very successful. The Club was glue holding the faculty together; he said he hoped it would do so again. Professor Tilman said another way to feel part of the community had been service on the Graduate Research Advisory Committee; most feel intellectually isolated and need these opportunities. Professor Eicher noted that at Michigan State, there is a public listing of all promotions, deaths, and other things that make the university one community.

Professor Feeney said the Committee would talk at its next few meetings to try to identify a way to proceed. For many this does not feel like an academic community, he said; people do not want to cross into anyone else's back yard. The Committee is deeply interested in the intellectual future of the University but this issue has not come up. He thanked the Regents' Professors for joining the meeting and said he thought it had been very productive. Professor Schmidt urged that the Committee play a role in organizing discussions with other groups.

3. Other Business

The Committee held a brief off-the-record discussion of the status of the stadium negotiations. It was agreed that the Committee on Finance and Planning should go ahead and consider adopting a statement on the stadium and that this Committee would consider communicating with the Board of Regents before the December Board meeting.

The Committee approved unanimously the report from the ad hoc committee on chair compensation.

Professor Feeney adjourned the meeting at 3:25.

-- Gary Engstrand