

## **FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

October 16, 2014

Minutes of the Meeting

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

[In these minutes: Nominating Subcommittee, FCC Mid-Term Replacements, Collegiate Athletics, 2018 – 2019 Academic Calendar, President Kaler]

**Present:** Rebecca Ropers-Huilman (chair), Chris Uggen (vice chair), William Durfee, Eva von Dassow, Gary Cohen, Gary Gardner, Maria Gini, Susan Wick, Colin Campbell, Dale Carpenter, Jigna Desai, Janet Ericksen, Jean Wyman

**Regrets:** Linda Bearinger, Kathleen Krichbaum, Karen Mesce

**Absent:** Joseph Konstan, James Cloyd

**Others attending:** Becky Hippert, Jason Langworthy, Jon Steadland

**Guests:** President Eric Kaler, Faculty Athletics Representatives Professors Emily Hoover and Perry Leo

1. **Nominating Subcommittee:** Nominating Subcommittee Chair Professor von Dassow convened the Nominating Subcommittee. In preparation for this meeting, members had received materials to review that would help them identify faculty who might be willing to stand for election to serve on the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC). Professor von Dassow emphasized the importance of broad representation of schools/colleges on the FCC.

Following a short brainstorming session, a list of faculty was compiled. Next steps, said Professor von Dassow, would be to get information about the faculty nominees that members were minimally familiar with, then to rank order the nominees at the next meeting, and begin contacting them to see if they would be willing to stand for election. Last year, despite a long list of nominations, noted Professor von Dassow, the subcommittee had difficulty finding faculty who were willing to stand for election given the FCC time commitment, and their already busy schedules.

2. **Moment of Silence:** Professor Campbell asked for a moment of silence to reflect on the Ebola crisis in West Africa. In addition to the people of West Africa who have died from the disease, a sizeable number of health care professionals from around the world have sacrificed their lives to help stop the devastating disease.

3. **FCC Mid-Term Replacements:** Professor Ropers-Huilman reminded the committee that the FCC seat vacated by Professor Kohlstedt needed to be filled. She said Professor

Konstan would be willing to fill the seat if the committee voted to elect him. Members unanimously voted to elect Professor Konstan to fill the open seat.

Professor Ropers-Huilman added that Professor Carpenter's seat would be open spring semester when he is on leave. She asked Professor Carpenter to say a few words about the person he would recommend fill his seat while away. Professor Carpenter said he would recommend the committee vote to have Professor Allan Erbsen, a Law School faculty member, fill his seat while he is away. He briefly shared background information on Professor Erbsen including information about his education and accomplishments. Members then voted unanimously to have Professor Erbsen fill Professor Carpenter's seat for spring semester. Professor Durfee suggested Professor Erbsen attend a couple of FCC meetings before his term officially starts. Professor Carpenter said he has already mentioned this to him and he plans to attend a meeting or two along with Professor Carpenter before his term officially begins.

**4. Collegiate athletics:** Professor Ropers-Huilman welcomed the University's Faculty Athletics Representatives, Professors Emily Hoover and Perry Leo. She said she invited them to the meeting to give members a sense of what is happening at the national level regarding athletics and to understand the impact on the University of Minnesota.

Professor Leo began by providing an overview of the national landscape in athletics:

- The University of Minnesota is one of approximately 340 schools in the NCAA Division 1. Each of the schools falls in to one of three groupings 1) Football Bowl Subdivision, 2) Football Championship Subdivision, and 3) ninety-eight schools in Division 1 with no football programs.
- In 1997, Division 1 schools reorganized to give the Football Bowl Subdivision schools more power, which was accomplished through weighted voting.
- By 2012, after being the target of public pressure, media pressure and law suits, the NCAA set about remaking itself to respond to various issues. In August 2012, Dr. Mark Emmert, president, NCAA, held a retreat with the goal of making rapid reforms. The reforms were in three areas:
  - Academics – increased goals in academic progress rates.
  - Instituted a ban on post-season play for schools that did not achieve their academic goals.
  - Scholarships – multi-year scholarships and the cost of attendance capped at \$2,000.
- The 1997 structure had been written so proposals could be over-ridden. The full cost of attendance was over-ridden, but multi-year scholarships were not. The override process, led to a revolt by the Power 5 conferences because they wanted more autonomy.
- Beginning in January 2015, the governance structure of the NCAA will change. For Division 1, the structure will consist of a board of directors (primarily university presidents with some faculty athletics reps and student athletes), a council comprised of athletics directors, senior women administrators, and some faculty athletics representatives. The board will have oversight responsibilities,

- e.g., set direction and strategy, and the council will make day-to-day decisions. Under the new structure, each school will have one vote.
- There will be certain issues autonomous for the Power 5 conferences and these include:
    - Cost of attendance.
    - Medical coverage for student athletes.
    - Recruiting rules and mandatory hours spent on individual sports.
    - Agent rules to be relaxed.
    - Meals and nutrition.
    - Expenses and benefits for others, e.g., family members.
  - Non-autonomous items include academic standards, transfer eligibility, freshman eligibility, and scholarship limits.
  - Challenges facing the NCAA include unionization and lawsuits, e.g., O'Bannon v NCAA, Jenkins v NCAA.
  - Big Ten Commissioner Jim Delaney is predicting it will take roughly five to seven years to settle all the lawsuits, and, after that, he believes Congress will take over decision-making for the NCAA in terms of what will and will not be allowed. It is expected that it will take about 10 years to resolve all the issues facing the NCAA.
  - At the NCAA convention in January 2015, it is thought that the only vote that will be taken will be on cost of attendance, and it will be the full cost of attendance, not capped at \$2,000.

At the local level, noted Professor Hoover, the University of Minnesota has a robust athletics committee governance structure, and, in her opinion, the structure is working well. The University's Faculty Athletics Representatives (FAR) are appointed by the president and serve three-year terms and can be reappointed. A lot of Big Ten institutions only have one FAR, but the University of Minnesota has two. Professor Hoover went on to provide information about the two Senate athletics committees, the Advisory Committee on Athletics (<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/committees/aca.html>) and the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/committees/faocia.html>). Besides serving on these two committees, the FARs also serve on a number of other bodies and attend many meetings.

#### Member questions/comments:

- Who at the University is responsible for appealing decisions concerning student athletes who lost their eligibility to play for academic reasons? Professor Leo said either he or Professor Hoover, depending on the sport, would write the appeal. He added that this happens very infrequently.
- Are discussions taking place about injuries and concussions? Professor Hoover reported at a recent Big Ten meeting there was a discussion about concussions. She added that Commissioner Delaney is concerned about concussions and puts student health and welfare, particularly as it relates to concussions, as a top priority for the NCAA. Professor Leo added that on November 18 the Advisory Committee on Athletics is hosting a faculty/coach conversation on concussions. This is a big issue. The University has detailed concussion protocol.

- There can be long-term impacts of injuries, are there discussions taking place around long-term care for a condition that might arise in the future?  
Commissioner Delaney, said Professor Hoover, talks a lot about student health and welfare, but she is unaware of any long-term care discussions. Professor Leo added this is a good question, and these discussions need to take place. One of the issues the autonomy group plans to address is long-term medical insurance for athletes who are injured.
- Have schools been sued over athletic injuries? Professor Leo said he is unaware of any lawsuits, but that does not mean there have not been any.
- Is the Athletics Department good about maintaining the integrity of the academic sport and academic performance of its student athletes? Are coaches trained in this area? The University does an excellent job in this area, said Professor Hoover. The McNamara Academic Center for student athletes reports to Vice Provost McMaster the Compliance Office reports to the Office of the General Counsel. Coaches are not allowed to contact faculty, but faculty can contact a coach if there is an academic performance issue. Academic advising is a big issue because not only are advisers helping with academics but they are managing a number of risks such as academic dishonesty. Professor Hoover noted that she and Professor Leo were at the Big Ten academic advisors meeting where the advisors felt their job was not just academic advising but also managing risks such as academic integrity, admissions, at-risk students, etc.
- What are the financial implications for the Athletics Department and more generally the institution regarding the proposed changes that are being considered? Professor Leo said cost of attendance would have major financial implications for the University. Cost of attendance is the difference between the full cost of attending the University, less tuition, room and board, and at the University the difference is about \$2,100. For the University, this would mean \$500,000 - \$600,000. The worry nationally is that non-revenue generating sports will be cut.
- Was the Advisory Committee on Athletics consulted on shifting the cost of attendance for student athletes on scholarship from the Athletics Department budget to the general University budget? This change means the general University budget is paying the tuition benefits for these athletes. Professor Leo said he does not believe it came before the committee. He added it is his understanding that the Athletics Department pays for the scholarships.
- The online, early semester feedback from grade reports is helpful. Professor Leo said that the University has a 60% - 65% response rate, which is the highest response rate in the Big Ten.

Professor Ropers-Huilman thanked Professors Hoover and Leo for an informative discussion. She encouraged members who have additional questions, to contact them directly.

**5. 2018 – 2019 Academic Calendar:** Professor Ropers-Huilman called on Professor Wick, chair, Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), to provide information about a request SCEP has been asked to consider concerning the 2018 – 2019 academic

calendar. Professor Wick said SCEP is the committee responsible for approving academic calendars for the Twin Cities and Rochester campuses.

To put the issue into perspective, Professor Wick provided some background information. She noted that currently there are 70 instructional days in fall semester and 74 instructional days in spring semester, and spring semester historically begins the day after Martin Luther King Day. SCEP was approached last spring and asked to consider changing the calendar in order to have spring semester start earlier. SCEP formed a subcommittee to look into this request. The subcommittee surveyed senators, student leaders, student advisers, etc., and asked three questions:

1. Should spring semester start the third week of January even if this means starting before Martin Luther King Day?
2. Should there be 70 instructional days for spring semester, just like fall semester?
3. Should there be a full break between spring semester and May Session?

In terms of the first question, noted Professor Wick, survey respondents were split on this question. Respondents who did not want the semester to start earlier were often passionate about why they thought this was not a good idea and Professor Wick provided a couple of examples. Regarding the second question, 71% of respondents said fall and spring semesters should be equal in length.

SCEP is in the process of conducting yet another survey, said Professor Wick. One of the questions in the second survey has to do with the number of instructional days per semester. Professor Wick asked for members' thoughts on this matter and whether they think there would be a lot of push back if the academic calendar were to be changed. She said there are two strong camps around this issue. The one camp takes the position that the legislature and the public would be opposed to the reduction of instructional days, and the other camp that believes it only makes sense to have the fall and spring semesters equal in length.

Professor Gardner said a few years back President Kaler had talked about possibly moving to a trimester system and wondered whether this was taken into consideration when SCEP discussed this issue. Professor Wick said it was her sense that the trimester system was going to be too complicated to implement at least in the near future.

Professor Cohen asked whether it would be possible to split the difference and have 72 instructional days in the fall and 72 instructional days in the spring. Professor Wick explained that current policy requires finals to be done by December 23 and because classes cannot start before Labor Day, this would not work. She added that it would be possible, however, to have 70 fall instructional days and 72 spring instructional days. There are other institutions that have an uneven number of instructional days for fall and spring semester.

Professor Campbell said he could foresee people expecting tuition to be reduced if instructional days are being cut. Professor Carpenter agreed that cutting instructional days would be perceived negatively and would be hard to defend publically and politically.

In response to a question from Professor Uggen about instructional days at peer institutions, Professor Wick said the institution with the lowest instructional days was University of Michigan, which has 68 fall instructional days and 69 spring instructional days. The University of Purdue, Penn State and a few others have 74 fall instructional days and 74 spring instructional days.

Professor von Dassow commented that students are exhausted by week 15 and have learned as much as they can for that subject and for that term. It would not serve students well to add instructional days. What is more, it makes no sense to push the calendar against the realities of winter; last year two whole instructional days were lost due to weather conditions so severe as to prompt cancellation of classes.

Professor Cohen said that a number of faculty use the break time between fall and spring semester to do writing, research, etc., and, therefore, he would not want spring semester to start any earlier than the third week in January.

Professor Wick thanked members for their feedback.

**6. Discussion with President Kaler:** After some preliminary comments about issues that he is currently engaging, President Kaler discussed the Employee Engagement Survey, which he genuinely hopes people will do. Last year's participation rates were good, and hopefully this year's rates will be equally as good or better because a lot of valuable data is gleaned from the results.

Regarding strategic planning next steps, President Kaler reported that the deans are highly engaged in the Strategic Plan the Board of Regents recently approved. He added that there are a considerable number of people who served on the planning workgroup and issue teams who want to remain engaged and help move the plan into the implementation phase. President Kaler said he does not want to lose momentum around the plan because he is excited about the direction the plan will take the University.

In terms of the closure of PsTL (Postsecondary Teaching and Learning) in the College of Education and Human Development, President Kaler reaffirmed the University's commitment to first generation students. The University has rolled out a new initiative, Retaining all Our Students (RaOS), to improve first-year retention of low-income students. He added that RaOS will build on the success of existing University efforts such as the President's Emerging Scholars (PES) Program. While the University is constantly under pressure to consolidate and reduce, the programs of PsTL will not go away, only the department structure.

Professor Cohen asked about what will happen to the liberal education courses that PsTL teaches. President Kaler said he does not have all the details, but is able to report that Vice Provost McMaster is working on this.

Professor Gini asked why technology was not specifically mentioned in the Strategic Plan. Not including technology in the plan seems like a missed opportunity. President Kaler deferred to Professors Durfee and/or Uggen to comment because they were more involved in the strategic planning process than he was. Professor Durfee said the three Grand Challenges that were identified are initial examples of areas where the University has existing strengths. As implementation moves forward, additional grand challenges will be identified. President Kaler added this process was clearly outlined in the report.

Professor Gardner said it is critical that the language in the plan makes it clear that all faculty have a role in contributing to the success of the plan. It will be important to get buy-in from all faculty because not all faculty see their work in the three initial grand challenges. President Kaler said he understands the inclusiveness aspect, but it is reality that not everyone will see themselves in one or more of the initial Grand Challenges. There will be situations where faculty who are strong in their discipline will be doing work not directly relevant to one of the Grand Challenges, and this should be expected in an institution of this size. Professor Gardner said he assumes there will be funds earmarked for pursuing the Grand Challenges, and recommended access to these funds by any/all applicants.

In Professor von Dassow's opinion, no matter what the merits of the Grand Challenges are, people who are not in those fields feel excluded from the vision embodied in the plan. President Kaler said the plan is not the death of disciplinary research. There will continue to be disciplines and people working in those disciplines just like now. With that said, the plan will be a template for a majority of future investments in those directionalities. Over time, disciplinary fields can move and align with other fields where there is no alignment at this time. Professor von Dassow responded that this sends the message to faculty that the University is disinvesting in certain fields and there is no intention to maintain certain fields. President Kaler said it would not be a visionary plan if it sets out to replicate tomorrow what was done yesterday. There will continue to be evolution in the research focus of the University like there always has been. The framework of organizing around the Grand Challenges is a guidepost for doing this, but it does not mean if a particular discipline is not currently aligned with one or more of the Grand Challenges that that program will be closed because this is not the intent. Professor Uggen added that Provost Hanson was concerned that the plan would be read as saying all disciplines need to be aligned with a particular interdisciplinary vision. The vision is not that everyone needs to aggregate along one of the three Grand Challenges. This is an opportunity, noted President Kaler, for faculty to evolve their research in a direction that might align with one or more of the Grand Challenge. The goal is to have greater impact with alignment than disbursement.

Professor Desai voiced concern over the dispersal and decentralization of resources for first generation, low-income students with the dissolution of PsTL, and also the loss of a community for these students. She said her sense was when General College was in existence that students felt like cohorts and had a sense of community. First of all, reminded President Kaler, PsTL was not a major. The support and resources for low-income students will continue to exist. While a cohort feeling is important, it needs to be

balanced against the fact that the academic outcomes of General College students were nowhere near as good as they are for students of color today. President Kaler said it is important for the University to build a campus climate and community where students of color will succeed.

President Kaler spent the remaining few minutes talking about the University's biennial budget request, which benefits students as well as the state. He said it will be important for the University to continue to engage with the state and demonstrate the value the University brings to it. He also talked about the importance of enhancing the University's philanthropy efforts.

In light of time, Professor Ropers-Huilman thanked President Kaler for a good conversation, and adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey  
University Senate