

Minutes*

**Senate Consultative Committee
Thursday, November 21, 2013
3:00 – 4:00
Room 238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Will Durfee (chair), Avner Ben-Ner, James Cloyd, Katherine Cramer, Eva von Dassow, Jigna Desai, Janet Ericksen, Russell Luepker, Alon McCormick, Andrew McNally, Karen Mesce, Cynthia Murdoch, Paul Ranelli, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, David Satin, Thomas Sondreal

Absent: Rylee Ahnen, Rachele Alcini, Prahith Chakka, Frank Farleo, Karl Freese, Bill O'Neill, Alex Stangel, Chris Uggen, Jean Wyman

Guests: Professor Paul Siliciano (chair, Advisory Committee on Athletics); Professors Doug Ernie and David Kirkpatrick, Sarah Waldemar (Committee on Committees)

Others: none

[In these minutes: (1) annual report from the Advisory Committee on Athletics; (2) Committee on Committees review; (3) update on strategic planning]

1. Annual Report from the Advisory Committee on Athletics (ACA)

Professor Durfee convened the meeting at 3:00 and welcomed Professor Siliciano to provide the annual report from the Advisory Committee on Athletics (ACA).

Professor Siliciano began by reviewing the charge to ACA and observing that it deals with all matters related to intercollegiate athletics except academics, and the list includes policies and major decisions relating to athletic programs and operations, equity and student welfare, finances, physical facilities, personnel matters, positions that should be taken on behalf of the University in the NCAA and in other external bodies, and the activities of booster clubs and other support organizations. The Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics (FAOCIA, on which he sits as an ex officio member) deals with academic issues.

Professor Cloyd asked why there are two committees. That is an historical arrangement, Professor Siliciano said, a response to a scandal in the men's basketball program a number of years ago. The University developed a rigorous structure of which it can be proud, and while it is a lot of work for FAOCIA to look at transcripts, curriculum, etc., it is a very robust oversight committee that consists only of tenured faculty members. ACA, on the other hand, includes P&A, civil service, alumni, and student members as well as faculty.

Does the structure work, Professor Cloyd inquired? It is very effective, Professor Siliciano said. They have talked about relaxing a few of the rules, such as the one that prohibits contact between coaches

* 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.

and faculty members, which could be modified to allow some communication between the two if a student is having trouble in a class; right now there are people who go between the coach and faculty member, such as one of the Faculty Athletic Representatives or a member of the McNamara Academic Center advising staff.

Professor Siliciano touched briefly on the job of the Faculty Athletics Representative, which is prescribed by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and the Big Ten Conference. Most institutions have one; Minnesota has two, and they have enormous jobs because they serve on both athletic committees, have many duties in athletics, and responsibilities with the Big Ten and NCAA. It is almost too much even for two people.

Professor Siliciano reiterated the point that the University has a robust structure; the University had already implemented the vast majority of the recommendations in the lengthy report at Penn State about institutional control. At the University, the compliance office reports to the General Counsel and the academic center for student-athletes reports to the provost, so neither office is beholden to intercollegiate athletics. Those arrangements are key to the University's structure, and were changes it made after the scandal.

In general, the situation seems to be good, Professor Siliciano said; graduation rates are high and grades are up.

Professor Durfee asked why things are good. Is it random? Have there been changes that caused increased GPAs? Professor Siliciano said that recruiting has been a help: students are coming with a good chance of academic success, the McNamara Center provides help, and coaches recognize that academic success is important and he believes they want the students to graduate.

Part of the charge to ACA is find ways to enhance communication between the athletic and academic communities at the University to help build a sense of community, Professor Siliciano related, something that is easier to do in a small town.

Professor Ropers-Huilman asked about the graduation rate increases by gender. Professor Siliciano said that the 6-year graduation rate is 74%, versus 70% for students as a whole, but that is a matter that FAOCIA considers, not ACA.

Professor Durfee asked what in general were the issues that ACA discussed in the last year. Professor Siliciano said that one big concern was the effect on student-athletes of changes at higher levels, such as the rate of expansion of the Big Ten Conference. It took place so quickly that the committees were not provided time to provide advice, although he said he was not sure that the result would have been any different because the decisions involved enormous national questions about money and athletics. ACA wrote to President Kaler about what factors it believes should be considered if the situation arises again (such as the requirement that students leave early, and miss class time, when the competition is farther away). There are potential pressures as well because of the changes in conference structures; the Big Ten Network could want Wednesday evening events, which ACA believes could be deleterious.

Who gets to decide, Professor Durfee asked? Professor Siliciano said he did not know; the question is whether one can raise hands high enough to get attention. The other big question, related to

the first, is the battle "for the soul of the NCAA," which involves the smaller Division I schools versus the bigger ones and the increasing difficulty in keeping them together. There was a proposal for a new division, composed of the five wealthiest conferences, behind which was the threat that those conferences would leave the NCAA; if that happened, it would have a significant effect on the University.

Professor Ranelli asked if ACA is involved in athletic facilities issues. It is, Professor Siliciano said, and said the \$93-million plan to improve athletic facilities is within ACA's purview. One frustration is that the plan was never fully explained in the media (e.g., with current basketball practice facilities, the men and the women must trade practice times, which restricts the courses student-athletes can take when their team has the worse time—and basketball crosses both semesters). A new practice facility would allow both teams to practice at the times best for their student-athletes.

Professor Durfee said that ACA and the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning need to understand and interact with each other about facilities in athletics and on the rest of the campus. Professor Luepker said that Athletic Director Norwood Teague talked with the Committee on Finance and Planning and told it that all the money for the athletic facilities would be raised privately. Is that happening? It will be, Professor Siliciano said, and observed that fund-raising is one of Mr. Teague's strengths; he said he did not know the details but that the athletic department has hired a consultant to assist in the fund-raising.

Professor Satin said that Professor Siliciano had identified several issues of time for student-athletes; who is in a position to deal with those? And what about the possibility of moving some courses so student-athletes can more easily take them? Professor Siliciano commented that scheduling can be rather random but it might be possible to move some courses to allow easier access for student-athletes, and said it is something that could be looked into.

Professor Durfee thanked Professor Siliciano for his report.

2 Committee on Committees Review of the Committee

Professor Durfee welcomed Professors Ernie and Kirkpatrick and Ms. Waldemar to the meeting from the Committee on Committees; he noted that it is charged to review senate committees on a periodic basis and is looking at the consultative committees this year to determine if they function well.

Professor Kirkpatrick explained that they are interested in knowing if Committee members believe it is meeting its charge, has the appropriate number of members, addresses issues, and if it needs change. They would like to have a sense of the pulse of the Committee and are prepared to talk confidentially with individual Committee members; after their discussions, the Committee on Committees will prepare a report that will be provided to the Committee and ultimately to the senate. In light of what it has done the last few years, Professor Ernie asked, has the charge encompassed what the Committee worked on? The charge identifies consulting, steering, and executive functions—is this what the Committee is doing and what it should be doing?

Professor Durfee suggested that the Committee could consider which matters go to the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) and which to this Committee. Sometimes the line is unclear. Professor Cloyd agreed and recalled that President Kaler had talked to FCC about campus safety—but that is an issue that cuts across every constituency. Professor McCormick said he thought the charge needs to be

revisited but that he liked the structure because it distinguishes between the administrative purview and other senates

Professor Ernie asked about how the Committee is consulted on regental and administrative policies and how it is informed about issues. Does it have the opportunity to provide consultation it believes appropriate? Professor Mesce said there are differences between the charges to FCC and this Committee and she is still learning them. Professor Ropers-Huilman said she feels that FCC receives a great deal of information and is engaged, and she assumes that the other consultative committees are the same. The discussions at this Committee are not as rich, when representatives from all the consultative committees come together, which may be fine. In any case, she said, she does not want to see the same conversations happen twice.

Professor von Dassow said that she and Professor Desai are new members as well and have seen that there have been many FCC meetings this fall but that this is only the second meeting of this Committee. In terms of what could be learned, what issues concern the other governance bodies? There could be a richer conversation if representatives from the other consultative committees tell about what is going on in their part of the governance system.

Does the Committee have enough/too many members, Professor Ernie asked? Are they distributed appropriately in terms of campus, gender, etc.? Is this a system committee, Professor Ranelli asked? It is. Then why is he ex officio, Professor Ranelli asked? He said he did not understand why Rochester was not also represented and why it does not deal with system issues. Both he and Professor von Dassow expressed support for adding a representative from the Rochester campus at an appropriate point.

Professor Durfee observed that in theory the Committee has good student representation, although no students were in attendance at this meeting. There is a need to identify a better way to obtain the student voice (although their views were articulated in the discussion about tobacco use on the Twin Cities campus).

Ms. Murdoch observed that only the chairs and chairs-elect of the P&A and Civil Service Consultative Committees serve on this Committee, so it is difficult to see how all the groups could have system representation; it would be necessary to increase the number of representatives on the Committee. Would that be desirable, Professor Ernie asked? Would it make representative more effective? Ms. Murdoch said it probably would but that she liked the idea of reports from each of the consultative committees. Mr. Sondreal said that as a representative from Crookston, he has found it very useful to be a member of this Committee and the Civil Service Consultative Committee so that he can bring back information to his campus, and while he would like to see regular representation from his campus, budget cuts make the travel costs an issue.

Professor Ropers-Huilman suggested that to ensure representation of all groups, perhaps the facilitator of the meeting could be rotated among the members. As for diversity, she said she would like to see racial and gender diversity; right now the Committee seems very white. Professor McCormick suggested it might be useful to look at representation over time.

Professor Ernie asked if the ex officio membership is appropriate and matched to what comes before the Committee, and are there others who should be on it. Professor McCormick noted that there

are 7 ex officio members who are asked to attend; it was noted that the chairs of certain senate committee are asked to serve as ex officio members because items from their committees may sometimes be of interest to all or some of the groups represented on this Committee. Professor Ropers-Huilman suggested that perhaps the ex officio members could call in for specific agenda items where they are needed.

Professor Ernie asked about the relationship with the University Senate, for which this Committee serves as steering and executive committee. Has there been feedback from senate members on how business is handled? Professor Cloyd said there is virtually no communication between the Committee and the University Senate; he said that he does not feel this Committee does much consulting, with the exception of the tobacco issue, where it was quite appropriate. But the Committee should not waste people's time and the agendas should contain items of substance. Professor von Dassow said that the second meeting of the Committee was cancelled, as well as the second meeting of the University Senate, but not for lack of issues; it seems that the P&A and Civil Service governance bodies had issues that could have been addressed.

Professor Ernie asked for thoughts on what could be done to make the Committee function more effectively. Mr. Sondreal said that recent meetings with the chairs/vice chairs/chairs elect of the consultative committees have been very helpful and he wished they had been started earlier. Professor Luepker asked about the back-to-back nature of these meetings and FCC meetings, with students not in attendance today. For those on FCC, these are 3-hour meetings, which is a long time; should they be split? He and Professor McCormick, for example, as ex officio members do not need to be at every meeting; could a time be scheduled that would be more convenient for students? Professor Desai said she would welcome more discussions with students and staff members and having them would make sense for everyone.

Professor Ernie invited additional thoughts by email. Professor Durfee thanked Professors Ernie and Kirkpatrick and Ms. Waldemar for joining the meeting.

3. Update on Strategic Planning

Professor Durfee provided a brief update on strategic planning. The working group is developing value statements and identifying with whom it should consult. Major questions include identifying what it is that is unique about the University of Minnesota compared to its peers and finding ways to articulate its strengths that all recognize: a major university in a metropolitan area. The process is moving along, although not quickly, and at this point there is not a great deal to report.

Professor Cloyd repeated his concern that the strategic planning process will identify what the University does well, and what it could do well, but through an entirely internal process. The president told the Committee that the University does not need others to tell it what to do, but Professor Cloyd said he was not satisfied with that approach; an outside examination could not hurt and would most likely benefit the process. Professor Durfee said that while there are no external members of the working group, there is considerable engagement with external stakeholders and they will play a significant role in the process. Should there be an external committee? Professor Cloyd expressed endorsed consultation with external groups and noted that there are those who look at geography, trends, and so on (e.g., the Rand Corporation); he said he is afraid that only asking internally how the University can be great could mean missed opportunities.

Ms. Murdoch asked what the deliverables from the working group are expected to be and when they will be delivered. Professor Durfee said the next step is a report from Provost Hanson to the Board of Regents; the working group has a succinct schedule, with the report due at the end of April; after which various elements of it will be fleshed out.

Professor von Dassow said she did not see the benefit of involving an external group, while agreeing that there is a danger that the University could pat itself on the back. What advice could an external group offer without the risk of homogenization? Institutions should be different from each other. She said she did not agree with the argument for an external group; for one thing, different people would have very different perspectives.

Professor Luepker noted the news this morning announced MnSCU Chancellor Steven Rosenstone planning a greater emphasis on distance learning for a different type of student—context matters. Is the strategic planning group aware of this? The Finance and Planning Committee has not had a recent discussion with the State Economist, but there are major demographic changes occurring in the state.

Professor Cloyd said he was not suggesting an external committee but there are businesses that could be consulted to look, for example, at the University's business model. He said he hoped that external stakeholders would have an opportunity to present their views.

Professor Durfee adjourned the meeting at 4:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota