

Minutes\*

**Senate Committee on Finance and Planning  
January 23, 1990**

Present: Burton Shapiro (chair), David Berg, David Biesboer, Carol Campbell, James Coad, David Dittman, Arthur Erdman, Lael Gatewood, Virginia Gray, Nick LaFontaine, Cleon Melsa, Jeff von Munkwitz-Smith, Charles Speakes

Guests: Ken Jansen (Regents' Office), Donna Olson (Women's Athletics), James Turman (Recreational Sports), Chris Voelz (Women's Athletics)

**1. Discussion with Women's Athletic Director Chris Voelz**

Professor Shapiro welcomed Chris Voelz to the meeting to discuss the budget and funding for women's intercollegiate athletics.

Ms. Voelz thanked the Committee for the opportunity to meet with it; she started the discussion by showing a graph which recounted the funding for women's athletics for the past five years. For 1988-89 \$2.626 million of the budget came from the State Special, out of a total budget of \$3.121 million, so the State provided about 84% of the funds. The 1988-89 State support represented an increase of 9.9% over the previous year; Ms. Voelz told the Committee it would not be realistic to expect that much of an increase each year.

With this much of the budget coming from the State, Ms. Voelz said, the department does everything it can to be responsive to the people of the State; it tries to repay that support by responding to requests for speakers, holding camps and clinics, and in other ways.

Another source of income, fund-raising, has not increased very much over the past few years. For 1988-89 the income was \$130,000; Ms. Voelz said the projection for the current year is \$150,000 and it is \$200,000 for next year. These figures do not, however, include the \$2.5 million endowment that the department has built up--which will serve them well in the future. It was clarified for the Committee that the fund-raising income is net after expenses. One Committee member expressed surprise, when seeing the budget, that the department spent \$101,000 to raise \$150,000; Ms. Voelz agreed that those numbers appeared to be unsatisfactory but that budget also includes development.

Gate receipts are another source, although it has only amounted to about \$50,000 per year. The women's department does not have the season ticket base--and thus the discretionary income--that the men's program has. TV provides the other revenues, at \$25,000 per year. That income is in jeopardy now, however, because the Big Ten has signed a pre-emptive television contract which begins next year; the department is in the process of negotiating local coverage for some events.

The women's department has, in some years, accrued a deficit; whenever that occurred it has been

---

\* 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 represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

approved in advance by the vice president to whom the department reported. Of the total \$1.7 million in deficits from 1982-83 to the present, the men's department has paid \$1 million of them and the University has covered the remaining \$700,000. The University is providing \$577,000 of the operating budget for 1989-90.

On the expenditure side, 18.7% of the budget goes to scholarships, 44.4% is in payroll, and 36.9% goes for operations (which includes team travel, officials, supplies and equipment, insurance, etc.). Ms. Voelz noted that the department is providing the maximum amount of financial aid to student-athletes permitted under NCAA rules--which is a credit to the institution.

Ms. Voelz reviewed briefly the sport budgets of the departments, noting that it takes different amounts of money to make a sport competitive. Her aim, she said, is to have all sports get into the top 20; she does not want to push for more than that because then academic standards tend to be sacrificed.

The department is seeking to be more competitive by increasing the number of coaching positions, primarily--at present--by paying stipends to part-time assistant coaches.

Ms. Voelz pointed out that the department has tried to reduce its expenses by such steps as requiring that the parents' health insurance be the primary carrier and the department policy serving as secondary coverage, by moving to desktop publishing, by bringing the sport camps under the control of the department and retaining the income, and by seeking to increase corporate sponsorships. The sport camps had previously been run by individual coaches, with the income accruing to them; at her request, Ms. Voelz said, they had agreed to forgo that income and permit the department to run the camps and collect the income. Ms. Voelz told the Committee that one small part of their efforts with the corporate community involved going to corporations which had had problems with equity and offering to help, in return for which it was hoped financial support to the department would be extended. One Committee members expressed reservations about this approach, wondering if it might not be interpreted as blackmail, but Ms. Voelz assured the Committee that no one she talked with would ever come away with that feeling. This is, she added, only a very small fraction of their total efforts; much of their support comes from the most reputable corporations in the Twin Cities.

Her future expectations, Ms. Voelz said, include increasing fund-raising income and development, increasing the sport camp income, increasing corporate sponsorships, and to lobby hard for increased State support. She also said she will review staffing issues and will seek to be a full partner with the University in the area of facilities. She added that she and the department are strong advocates of the proposed pavilion; it will be, she pointed out, the first facility on the campus apart from the new swim center which will specifically take into account the needs of women athletes.

On the general question of equity in athletics, Ms. Voelz recited from a report written four years ago which expressed concern about inadequate levels of participation in athletics compared to that for men (given the number of men and women in the student body) and which said that only in the area of scholarships is financial support on a par with participation vis-a-vis the men. This situation, she concluded, has not improved in the intervening years. At present the men spend an average of \$27,311 per student-athlete; the women spend \$17,598. She acknowledged that the gap is smaller if one excludes football from the comparisons but also pointed out that the federal regulations governing provision of equal opportunity for men and women in athletics do not permit excluding football from the comparisons.

Ms. Voelz concluded her remarks by saying that the investment in women's athletics is one the University can be proud of. The students in the program are mostly in CLA, IT, and Education, and 53% of them have GPAs at or above 3.0; 17% are at 4.0. The investment will pay off for society because it is providing lessons in life for young women and creating future leaders for society.

Asked whether or not she needed another sport to bring participation more in line with that of men, Ms. Voelz said she did but that she would not add one until she could take care of the current sports. She would like to add a sport during this decade but will not do so if it means reducing support for the existing program. If the opportunity were in front of her now, she would add soccer.

Professor Ibele observed that not only is separation from the men's program important, as Ms. Voelz had pointed out, but even more important is being different. There is an opportunity to develop values independent of winning and entertainment, something men's programs have lost sight of. The difference can permit better opportunities to extract the values acquired from competitive sports--and the more participants there can be in such a program the better.

Ms. Voelz was asked, apropos all the new facilities planning, which sports will not have their needs addressed. She responded that the media did not cover very well the entire planning effort that went into the development of the proposals. The pavilion would take care of three sports (gymnastics, volleyball, and basketball). Renovation of the Peik Hall gymnasium will provide practice facilities for gymnastics; the new swimming and diving facility being built will be among the finest in the nation. Track and field will have an outstanding facility when the track renovation is completed; cross-country use of the golf course is satisfactory. The softball facility needs upgrading and the tennis teams (men's and women's) practice at off-campus sites as much as 45 minutes away; if there will be one great need remaining it will be an indoor tennis facility. Ms. Voelz said she hoped these needs could all be met within the next five years--or there will be a missed opportunity for an entire generation of student-athletes.

The Committee thanked Ms. Voelz for her presentation.

## **2. Discussion of New Athletic Facilities**

Professor Shapiro next welcomed Jim Turman, Director of Recreational Sports, to the meeting to outline the plans for new sport facilities. Mr. Turman explained to the Committee that there are five buildings included in the plans: The aquatic center and natatorium, the recreation center, and remodeling of Cooke, Peik gymnasium, and the St. Paul gymnasium. He presented to the Committee a series of drawings showing where and how the new and remodeled facilities would look after they are completed.

Mr. Turman recalled that in 1987 Governor Perpich recommended no funding for athletic facilities for any of the higher education systems--but instead supported funding for the Amateur Sports Commission and a variety of facilities around the state. The legislature, in response, split the funding between the schools and the others, which led the University to divide in two the construction of the first phase of new facilities. The funding for these facilities, he said, is unusual; normally bonds are used but in this case funds are coming from students, from the state, and from income.

Mr. Turman and the Committee spent some time discussing various elements of the proposals. One

major element will be remodeling of the basement of Cooke Hall into a 12,000-square-foot Human Performance Laboratory.

Mr. Turman emphasized that it was important that the legislative support for the remainder of the construction be obtained because without it there would be virtually no possibility of constructing the pavilion or renovating various outdoor facilities (needs for which total about \$2 million). If the funding is not obtained this session, he warned, the projects will never be finished--which would be a shame because much of the foundation work and utility preparation for the new facilities have been completed in the first phase of the construction. He also emphasized that completion of these facilities would have a significant impact on the atmosphere and quality of life on the campus; they would become the center of many social activities and would help the University fulfill its responsibility to help young people and faculty develop healthy lifestyles. They would also help keep people on the campus.

It was suggested to Mr. Turman that he should be contacting department chairs to solicit help; he would get considerable support. Mr. Turman said he was just beginning to do exactly that.

Mr. Turman was asked where the pavilion would be located; he told the Committee that the most recent plans call for it to be located where the east end of Memorial Stadium now sits. This is a change, because it was originally thought the arena would be on that site; it now appears there is not sufficient space so the arena may be built where Williams Arena now stands. Williams Arena may be torn down even if there is no alternative practice facility for hockey. The parking lots on Fourth Street are also being looked at as possible sites for facilities. Committee members agreed that it would be better not to try to jam as many buildings as possible on the Memorial Stadium site. Memorial Stadium will not be saved [although there are plans for preserving and re-using the actual memorial part of the stadium].

Committee members discussed various elements of the plans with Mr. Turman; he concluded by noting that the entire northeast quadrant of the University was being reviewed to take into account parking, possible light-rail transit, traffic, etc.

Asked about a tennis facility, Mr. Turman noted that originally there had been a plan to put a bubble over 12 of the outdoor courts but that then the men's tennis coach had argued for a building instead. A building rather than a bubble raised the cost substantially so the whole project was put off to the second phase of the plans.

Professor Shapiro thanked Mr. Turman for his presentation.

The Committee adjourned at 4:55.

### **Correction to Minutes of January 2 meeting**

The January 2 meeting minutes failed to reflect the presence of Professor Cleon Melsa; he was present at that meeting.

-- Gary Engstrand