

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee**  
**Thursday, September 25, 2003**  
**1:15 – 3:00**  
**238A Morrill Hall**

- Present: Judith Martin (chair), Gary Balas, Jean Bauer, Susan Brorson, Charles Campbell, Tom Clayton, Gary Davis, Arthur Erdman, Dan Feeney, John Fossum, Marvin Marshak, Fred Morrison, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Martin Sampson, Carol Wells
- Absent: Emily Hoover, Marc Jenkins, Mary Jo Kane
- Guests: Executive Vice President and Provost Christine Maziar; Dean Charles Casey
- Other: Professor John Ramsay (American Council on Education Fellow); a DAILY reporter for the open part of the meeting; Lynn Holleran, Kathryn Stuckert (Office of the Chief of Staff); Elizabeth Wroblewski (Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost)

[In these minutes: (1) various items (ombuds function, closing the meeting, faculty advocates, allocation of faculty senate seats in a reorganized senate); (2) discussion with Executive Vice President and Provost Maziar; (3) reorganization of the Minnesota Extension Service; (4) stadium principles; (5) cost of moving a football game]

**1. Various Items of Business**

Professor Martin convened the meeting at 1:15 and began with several matters.

- The President has responded to the report from the Grievance Advisory Committee concerning an ombuds function. As expected, he did not recommend creating a new office. Instead he has asked the Grievance Advisory Committee to assist in implementing the recommendations in the “present” section of the report and had further asked Ms. Chalmers, the University Grievance Officer, to create a working group to examine policies and coordination possibilities.
- The charge to the committee needs review; the Committee approved a small revision.
- The vote to close the meeting for the discussion of the draft stadium principles provided by the President was approved overwhelmingly (by email vote the day preceding the meeting). Professor Martin said she would speak later with the Star-Tribune reporter who asked to be present.

Professor Wells asked about the applicability of the state open meeting law. Professor Morrison said that the General Counsel's position--which has never been successfully challenged--is that

---

\* 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 law applies only to bodies that exercise official government authority. Since Senate committees do not exercise such authority, they are not subject to the law.

- In the case of a faculty member who wishes a faculty advocate in a dispute, the individual should contact Ms. Chalmers, the University Grievance Office, and Professor Sheets, chair of the Senate Judicial Committee.
- The proposed number of faculty senators by unit, should the number be changed in the proposed Senate reorganization, was presented for information. The number of faculty senators would be reduced from 183 to 125. It was noted that CLA and the Medical School, which lost the largest number of senators, would have 37% of the faculty/P&A eligible to vote for faculty senators and would have 36.8% of the senators--so the reorganization would not have a significant effect on the proportionality of representation.

Professor Ratliff-Crain expressed concern about the reduction in student numbers (from 59 to 50). In a number of the smaller colleges, the number of students will be reduced from 2 to 1, which makes a difference: It makes it more difficult for a person to represent a unit by working through ideas with someone else. How is this different from having one individual from one college on FCC, Professor Martin asked? She suggested that the students be allowed to work through the problem. Professor Marshak commented that this reflects what was said at the FCC retreat: There are too many deans, too many colleges, and too many divisions in the Senate.

## **2. Discussion with Executive Vice President and Provost Maziar**

Professor Martin welcomed Dr. Maziar to the meeting.

Dr. Maziar said she had several issues she wished to raise.

- She would like to hear from the chairs of standing Senate committees on the issues that will be bubbling up, especially with respect to changes in Regents' policies.
- She told the Committee about her appearance on KSTP television.
- She and the Committee held an extended discussion about tuition policy, the report of the legislative auditor on the reciprocity agreement with Wisconsin, tuition for non-resident/non-reciprocity students, and tuition rates at various educational levels.

Professor Balas asked if any thought had been given to a "tuition reward" of some kind for students who make satisfactory progress to a degree. Dr. Maziar commented that about 20% of seniors with 90 or more credits do not graduate within 3 years after obtaining the 90 credits--and 15% of them disappear from the University altogether. This is an enormous loss of investment both for the students and the state; they intend to look into the problem. The University could change its graduation rate very quickly if it could solve that problem.

Professor Marshak commented that the University's retention rate among upper-class students is bad in comparison to its peers; small changes could make a big difference. While some students may be lured away to jobs, Dr. Maziar pointed out that the colleges with the biggest retention

problems are those that do not have a large job market: liberal arts, natural resources, agriculture, and human ecology.

One possible improvement might be to permit graduates to avail themselves of the college placement office, Professor Fossum suggested; at present, students lose eligibility once they graduate. Some students may defer graduation for a term in order to continue to use the placement service. Another problem might be lack of support for students who need to complete a senior project, Professor Sampson said. On the other hand, the change to a four-year limit on financial aid from the state may encourage students to graduate in a more timely fashion. Or DISCOURAGE them from graduating, Professor Marshak responded; Professor Campbell agreed.

### **3. Reorganization of the Minnesota Extension Service**

Professor Martin welcomed Minnesota Extension Service Dean Charles Casey to the meeting to join Dr. Maziar in a discussion of the MES reorganization. Dean Casey had prepared remarks for the Committee; slightly edited, they were as follows:

"Thanks for the invitation to provide some background on the changes Extension is involved in. While difficult, I believe them necessary, and they will ultimately result in improved programming that will address critical issues across the state of Minnesota.

"Much of the change we have been doing began nearly two years ago as we made the decision to have educators specialize in a particular discipline or area of expertise. For example, youth development, family resource management, crop production or leadership development. That change took place on July 1, 2002, and while it drew some criticism, it was beginning to be accepted. There were budget implications, but the primary reason was to strengthen the connection between our campus faculty and educators in the field.

"In 2003, with the state budget deficit, we heard from counties their concern about their ability to fund Extension. We also were aware of the impact of state budget reductions to the University of Minnesota, and specifically to the state special that provides funding for the Agricultural Experiment Station and Extension. So with two of Extension's funding partners facing serious reductions in Extension support and our third--Federal--having a flat budget for the last 10 years, it became clear the current funding model was not sustainable." So they decided they needed to make a bold move to build a budget model that would be sustainable into the future.

"Extension's decision to move from a county based funding model to a regional model in what is drawing a lot of public attention. Other University units have experienced funding reductions, but haven't had the public exposure Extension has. As an organization, Extension is very visible across the state.

"Strong local connections established by Extension have brought support for the University from citizens for many, many years. Some are feeling the University is withdrawing that support. My view is what we are doing will maintain the commitment, rather than lose it slowly county by county.

"On the budget, I want to make a few points. When I began in April of 1999, Extension was overspending by nearly \$2 million per year on a \$36 million budget. Reductions were made, but it was clear, merely making reductions for 2000 would not solve long term problems. For 2004, Extension had a base reduction in state support of \$2.3 million (on a base of \$27 million). Increases in IRS added another \$300,000. We moved to reduce support positions on campus (18 in Coffey Hall), reduced collegiate allocations (\$800,000), and a number of other expenses to meet those reductions. The unknown for us was the county budget situation. Counties paid about 38% of the salary of field educators and the state and federal dollars paid 62%+ of all fringe costs. Losing county dollars put Extension at risk in supporting the number of people we had.

"We designed a regional approach with the naming of 18 regional centers that would house 5-10 regional educators supported by state and federal dollars. No county dollars will support the regional centers. We then said to counties, 'with the dollars you have, you can decide how you want to invest those dollars at the local level.' At this point, all most all are supporting the 4-H youth programs and many are working with a neighboring county to support agriculture positions. We are in that place now and I'm confident we'll have a number of those positions finalized over the next 60 days." They had about 200 extension educators but can only fund about 155-160, so about 40 were not reassigned.

"This is a difficult time for Extension and its employees. We have a number of individuals who do not have positions. Many will in the next 60 days, as I've indicated. Citizens are unsure how the regional centers will serve them and have contacted their legislator who in return is contacting me. There are suggestions that they will remove funding from Extension and direct it to MnSCU or the Department of Agriculture. Both options will not serve agriculture well in the future.

"Why do I believe in the regional system? By building strong program teams of campus faculty and regional educators the quality of Extension will increase.

- By building strong program teams of campus faculty and regional educators the quality of Extension will increase." They will be able to connect people in the field to campus research.
- "Having a critical mass of educators at a center will foster interdisciplinary programming. Regional Centers are supported by department heads and provide easier access for faculty." It was daunting for departments to deal with 91 offices in 87 counties; 18 is a more reasonable number.
- "Regional centers located at other University facilities provide opportunity to link with current research and Extension faculty.
- There can be opportunities to link to collegiate units beyond Extensions traditional partners.
- Opportunities for support from non-county agencies and non-profits exist.
- Technology connections to the University will be greatly enhanced at regional centers." They will be far better than what was available at county offices.
- "Opportunities will exist for grants not possible on a county by county basis."

Professor Marshak inquired if there will be people at the regional centers every day or if they will be out in the field. Dean Casey said they will have offices at the centers but they will be out doing programming. These will be University employees funded by the counties, Professor Marshak asked? Dean Casey said they would be.

The Extension Service has done a lot of small projects, county by county, across the state, and it is very difficult to document the impact of this work, Dean Casey said, other than that it generates good will. State-wide programs will allow Extension to make a greater impact--and better able to document that impact. He identified in 2001 three things that are important to the Extension Service: it must be current in the issues it addresses, it must be relevant in the issues and must connect to research-based information (the Service's competitive advantage), and it must add value: if it receives funding, it must show it provides good value, which means having good information. Those three things are still important today.

Are there legislative hearings on the changes to MES, Professor Martin asked? There have not been, although there could be, Dean Casey said.

Professor Balas asked if the University would own the sites where the 18 centers will be located. Dean Casey said they developed selection criteria to help with the process. The President suggested that they go to places the University already has investments (e.g., Rochester, Crookston, Morris, Grand Rapids, Cloquet); in those places, it will own the sites. In others, the University will lease and pay support costs. Some will be at MNSCU institutions; others will be in private buildings. They wanted to stay close to MNSCU because of the technology infrastructure. Most are in larger towns, and they were criticized for not putting jobs in small towns, but the technological costs of placing the centers in small towns would have been too high. The cooperation with MNSCU has gone well, he said.

Professor Marshak commended Dean Casey for the changes. He suggested that Dean Casey meet with the Governor and seek a corresponding reduction in the number of counties in Minnesota. Rural Minnesota is seeing a decline or stagnation in population. The definition of a county was how far someone could ride in one day on a horse, or something like that; there are enormous inefficiencies with 87 sheriffs, and so on. Counties can collaborate, but in the end, they cannot, for example, support an elderly population without a population base of younger people.

Dean Casey said that 26 counties saw a decline in population, 1990-2000 and 7-8 only saw an increase of less than 2%. But these would be very tough decisions in small towns. There will be increased pressure for more collaboration, but these are deeply-held emotional decisions that will not happen easily.

Will there be any loss of connection with the communities in the event of a crisis, such as an outbreak of mold or animal disease, Professor Feeney asked? Can the Service still respond? Dean Casey said he did not see that as a problem; those are big matters. The greater concern is the visit to the farm about a problem; that is where the grass-roots service has been and people will feel that loss. The Extension Service, however, can deal with the bigger problems.

What does he see as the issues that might bubble up in the legislature next year, Professor Bauer asked? Some feel the University is not serving rural Minnesota as it was before, Dean Casey replied, or that it is not serving agriculture as much as it did. There are also issues across different committees in the legislature. The political dynamics can be urban-rural, Republican-Democrat, and along other lines, Dr. Maziar observed. Dean Casey pointed out that of the 18 centers, one is in the northern suburbs, one is in the southern suburbs, and the remainder are spread across the state, so they are based on geography, not on population.

Professor Martin thanked Dean Casey and Provost Maziar for their presentation.

#### **4. Principles for a Football Stadium**

Professor Martin turned next to Professors Campbell and Erdman to lead a discussion of the actions of their committees on the draft stadium principles that had been prepared by the President.

Professor Campbell reported on the Finance and Planning discussions. The committee supported the administration's draft principles with very minor changes. Concerns were the potential financial liability of academic programs for paying the costs of the stadium and incorporation somewhere in the documents of the language on the façade of Northrop Auditorium (how does a stadium fit in that summary of the University's mission?) and the goal of reducing the institutional subsidy of athletics. They will know a great deal more once the stadium feasibility study has been completed around November 1.

Professor Erdman reported that the Advisory Committee on Athletics, which had invited Professor Campbell to join its meeting, also generally supported the draft principles prepared by the administration. There was considerable discussion of the possible financial impact on students if they are asked to support the stadium; they felt that the administration must hear from the general student body as well as the student leadership. They also felt it was important to communicate with the University community about what is happening with the stadium. Professor Erdman distributed copies of a 3-page statement about the stadium (including an overview and a "why now" section) and a description of the stadium feasibility study. Ms. Holleran reported that this summary has been provided to groups as part of the consultative process. Finally, Professor Erdman said, there must be continual pressure to ensure that stadium funding does not conflict with academic needs.

Professor Campbell said that the Finance and Planning Committee was also concerned about students. They also noted that there are different kinds of students (i.e., undergraduate, graduate, professional) who may have different views about a stadium.

Committee members made a number of suggestions for slight wording changes in the draft stadium principles.

A crucial issue, Professor Marshak said, is that there needs to be an overall business plan. The University will not take itself out of Division I, Big Ten football, so the team must have a place to play. A business plan must set out goals and how they will be accomplished. (For example, has the Gateway project accomplished what was intended?) The stadium is MUCH more expensive than the Gateway project; the Committee must push to understand what will be accomplished. What does it mean to enhance campus life, for example? What specifically will be done to achieve the goals? If a goal is to enhance revenue, the University would be better off buying bonds. The Committee must keep the pressure on the proponents to come with a plan on what is to be achieved beyond just building a monument. How will football Saturdays be different? How does anyone know students will attend? Middlebrook Hall is closer to the Metrodome than the proposed on-campus stadium.

Professor Sampson said he shared Professor Marshak's curiosity but said he was unlikely to be very interested in the answers because the alternatives to an on-campus stadium are likely to be ominous.

With respect to a business plan, Professor Morrison said, he would have to know where all the funding for the stadium is coming from before he could support a proposal. He also contended that the draft principles appear to SUPPORT the construction of a stadium rather than asking for a neutral study of whether it should be constructed. It is about which, not whether, and he suggested that the wording be modified accordingly.

The stadium feasibility study will have parts of a business model, Professor Campbell said, and many issues will be easier to deal with once it has been prepared. Some of the issues in the summary that Professor Feeney prepared will emerge again (although they are not appropriate for a statement of principles). The President has seen that summary and has thus been given notice that the committees will follow up on them. He agreed with Professor Sampson that a decision has to be made; those who must make the choice confront other alternatives that they do not like. His own view is that this would be an appropriate time to discuss whether the University should continue to have Big Ten football, but that will not be on the table.

Professor Wells wondered about the representativeness of the views of Committee members. She has discovered considerable support among some faculty for the stadium. If there is to be a stadium, she said, this Committee should advocate for it being done as well as possible. Professor Martin said that most faculty she interacts with have very little interest in whether there is a stadium. The timing is atrocious, Professor Sampson said; some contrast the amount of money that would be directed to a stadium with the pain of cuts in employee benefits and a salary freeze, especially for lower-paid employees.

It was agreed that Professor Martin would communicate the views of the Committee to the President, along with suggested changes in the wording of the principles and the views expressed by the other two committees. It was also agreed that the minutes of stadium discussions (by this and other committees) would be held until the Regents' meeting, but that the President would receive the minutes with a request that he forward them to the Board in advance of its discussion of the stadium principles. [Subsequent to this meeting, the administration decided to delay the Regents' stadium discussion until November; the President indicated no objection to the minutes of stadium discussions being distributed as usual.]

## **5. Costs of Moving a Football Game**

Professor Feeney drew the attention of Committee members to an article in the newspaper about the costs to the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics of changing the October 11 Minnesota-Michigan football game from Saturday to Friday in order to accommodate the Twins baseball play-off schedule. He expressed outrage that Minnesota would be expected to pick up the tab for Michigan football fans who were unable to attend the game because of the change (who could not use airline tickets or hotel rooms, etc.) and who could document a direct loss. Those could be significant expenses, he said; how can the University pay those expenses when some employees are considering going on strike? Committee members nodded their heads in agreement with Professor Feeney's sentiments.

Ms. Holleran reported that the decision was made by a vote of the Big Ten presidents; this was the compromise if the game was to be moved from Saturday to Friday. The other alternatives, moving the game to Thursday or moving it to another site, would have been even more expensive. She said she did not believe the University necessarily thought this was a desirable decision.

But the University must pay the costs, Professor Morrison said. And since the athletic department operates at a deficit, with an institutional subsidy, the money will come from the academic budget, Professor Campbell added. This is bad scheduling, Professor Morrison said; the Big Ten has known since the 1980s that there was a possible conflict with baseball play-off games. Ms. Holleran said the Big Ten has now concluded that as long as the potential conflict exists, the University of Minnesota should not have home football games scheduled in October. The red flag on this should have been raised before now, Professor Morrison said. Ms. Holleran pointed out that in the past, when there has been a conflict, the games have been moved without trouble; this is the first year the Big Ten has had to become involved.

Professor Martin recalled that this Committee has expressed its concern about the institutional subsidy for athletics on several occasions. The President has indicated that the subsidy will decline, but this expense could eliminate the reduction this year. There is a cap on the portion of the expenses that will be used to reimburse fans, Ms. Holleran said, and the University continues to talk to the Big Ten about this decision.

There needs to be communication about this, Professor Feeney said. This is just another part of the athletic arms race; the Big Ten controls what is going on and the University can't afford what it decides. Professor Sampson said he hoped that any reimbursement would be only for what someone lost, not what it costs someone to replace a cheap ticket with a more expensive ticket to attend the game on the different date.

This isn't an ideal outcome, Professor Wells said, but what are the alternatives? The same question can be asked about the stadium, Professor Campbell observed.

The loss in revenue for the University has also been dramatic because of the delay, Professor Erdman said, because some people will be unable to change plans and attend the game on Friday, so the financial hurt goes beyond the Big Ten decision.

Professor Martin said she would write to the President about the decision to convey the Committee's sentiments. Professor Campbell cautioned that she should first ensure that the facts reported in the newspaper are correct. [Subsequent to this discussion it became clear that whatever reimbursements were caused by this change would be borne by the Athletic Department.]

Professor Martin then adjourned the meeting at 3:30.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota