

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, October 25, 2001
1:15 – 3:30
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Joseph Massey (chair), Wilbert Ahern, Susan Brorson (by teleconference), Arthur Erdman, Richard Goldstein, Marti Hope Gonzales, Candace Kruttschnitt, Leonard Kuhi, Marvin Marshak, Judith Martin, Scott McConnell, Paula Rabinowitz, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Charles Speaks

Absent: Muriel Bebeau, Les Drewes, Daniel Feeney, Marc Jenkins

Guests: none

Other: none

[In these minutes: (1) review of Senate committee proposals by Finance and Planning; (2) list and discussion of issues raised in lunches with department chairs/heads; (3) Pac-10 faculty senates resolution on athletics; (4) expansion of Senate Research Committee membership; (5) faculty legislative liaison: (6) representation from UMD]

1. Resolution from Finance and Planning on Review of Proposals

Professor Massey convened the meeting at 1:15 and called on Professor Speaks to lead a discussion of a proposal from the Finance and Planning Committee (SCFP).

SCFP adopted the following motion at an earlier meeting, Professor Speaks reported; he now brings it to this Committee for comment.

Whenever a committee of the Senate or the Twin Cities Campus Assembly approves or endorses a proposal that has financial implications, such proposals should be presented for review and comment to the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning before it is presented to the Senate for action.

The resolution was drafted in response to a discussion SCFP had with Provost Bruininks at its retreat; he suggested that any Senate committee action with financial implications should go to SCFP for financial analysis before it is forwarded to the Senate or the administration. SCFP agreed in principle, but did not believe it should do, or had the capability to do, the financial analysis itself; the SCFP role would be to ensure that a financial analysis was completed, was done well, and was understandable. SCFP would not be a gatekeeper or take a position on proposals (since they presumably were deliberated by another Senate committee). SCFP believed the motion should come to this Committee before it went to the Senate.

* 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 Committee discussed the motion for some while. Professor Ahern pointed that almost all committee proposals have financial implications; perhaps it would be better to refer proposals to SCFP when the administration says the University cannot afford them, in order to evaluate the administration's financial analysis. Professor Speaks said SCFP would not just check the analysis; the administration can say something is a good idea the University should not do for the following reasons--and the list of reasons can be elastic. SCFP would not be a "traffic cop"--if that role is to be played, it should be by FCC--it is only asking if it has a responsible role to play in evaluating financial implications of proposals. Professor Massey suggested the SCFP role might violate the practice of permitting any Senate committee to bring anything it wishes to the Senate.

The issue is not who refers something to the Senate, Professor Kuhi maintained, it is how a proposal gets higher on the administration's priority list so it gets done. Items of importance to the faculty seem not to get onto that list. The fact that SCFP has gotten into the budget process early is a positive step, Professor Ahern commented. Professor Speaks agreed that the process has worked better in the last year or so, although not all that SCFP recommends is approved.

Professor Martin asked if the referral process needs to be formalized; cannot the committee chairs talk among themselves and decide when a referral to SCFP is appropriate? One possibility would be for the committee chairs who meet with Dr. Bruininks once per month to discuss proposals. After further discussion, Professor Speaks said he would recommend to SCFP that an informal system be tried and that if it does not work, this proposal could be resurrected later.

Professor Goldstein agreed with Professor Ahern that nearly ALL proposals have financial implications, so everything would have to go through SCFP. In earlier years everything went through this Committee; items were referred to SCFP if more evaluation were thought necessary. He said he believed that all items headed for the Senate docket should be referred to FCC first. The problem was that FCC ended up rehashing the same issues the committees had discussed, Professor Martin recalled, which is the reason FCC and SCC decided not to review proposals.

2. Issues from Lunches with Department Chairs/Heads

Professor Massey asked Committee members to offer views on how to deal with the various issues raised by department chairs and heads at the recent series of lunches FCC had sponsored. The list of issues follows, with FCC response in caps (along with notes on the FCC discussion of some of the issues). The issues are not listed in order of importance.

1. (This issue, in one way or another, came up several times.) The devolution of work on departments from the central administration with no corresponding increase in resources (e.g., the Certified Approver program, EGMS); the more successful the faculty are (e.g., in obtaining grants) the worse the problem. This increase in workload is increasing the number of errors made; the pleasure of working in the units is declining. In addition, the P&A and Civil Service policies prevent units from rewarding employees, and Civil Service rules for reclassifying people are so daunting that many do not try; it is very difficult to reward and keep people. The increase in workload is a burden on departments but the impact on staff is important. "Decentralized paperwork but central jerking around continues," which creates tensions in departments; expectations of departments are high with no influx of resources.

Relatedly, there are no funds to train people for new tasks. The certified approver program, PeopleSoft, CUFS are examples. Sponsored Projects Administration is no smaller than it used to be but many of its functions have been shifted to departments.

DEFERRED TO A FUTURE MEETING.

2. The application of IMG at the department level: they can earn resources by increasing tuition and other income. Heads then direct faculty to chase dollars. IMG has changed the role of the department head from academic leader to business strategist, to entrepreneur, who must generate money to meet the bottom line.

3. IMG is a huge impediment to cross-college interdisciplinary degrees and programs; disciplines do not always follow college lines. (This was addressed when tuition from a course went to the home department of the social security number of the instructor; now, when the revenue follows the designator, faculty are discouraged from teaching in other units.)

There are still historical subsidies above the college level; the University knows where teaching funds are allocated but not the rest. There needs to be more transparency in the process of administering IMG, ICR funds, and a place where faculty have a voice in the process. If there is not a good argument for the subsidy, it should not continue. If there are transfers from College A to College B, that should be transparent.

It is time to revisit IMG and see how it is working. For example, advising graduate students and outreach activities are very difficult to take into account in IMG, but they are among the two most important things faculty do. In the IMG environment, there is no incentive to do outreach.

ITEMS 2 AND 2 WERE REFERRED INITIALLY TO THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY, INASMUCH AS IT HAD LAST YEAR A SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMG. Professor Speaks noted that the Committee on Finance and Planning could devote one or two sessions to reviewing IMG, but it does not have the time or ability to conduct a thorough analysis. IMG may well need to be refined but it will not go away, he averred.

4. It is increasingly difficult to hire 11-month faculty (sometimes summer salary will be provided for the first three years; after that, the department must find the money; Extension faculty cannot be on 9-month appointments because there are too many summer programs--but those cannot typically be funded with grants).

Relatedly, units are losing the ability to do Extension work because they do not have the money available to pay faculty for the work. Extension has mandates in its mission but Extension funds have been cut so badly that Extension faculty and staff cannot carry out that mission.

THE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS WILL REVIEW THIS ISSUE.

5. The issue of P&A and tenured/tenure-track faculty was mentioned several times.

-- In one case, a department has about the same number of each; they want to treat the P&A faculty well, but the clear message from the University is that if one is not tenured or tenure-track, you are second

class. At the same time, it is difficult to distinguish between the two groups in terms of the work they do. If the University is going to continue to use P&A faculty, it must find a way to support and develop them.

A different view of this: University staff are often more committed to the University than are the faculty and they want jobs that have the potential for career advancement. The staff make the University run but they are dispirited; they need to have career paths. Another view: new, young staff use their position at the University to go to school and advance their careers.

Salary increases tend to treat several classes of employees differently, with different methods, which creates an adversarial climate and creates more difficulties with the unions. The "3+2" for the faculty was confusing. This several-tiered system is not healthy. Many at the University want to be helpful but the salary system is at odds with bringing people together; it is creating divisions between faculty, P&A, and other staff. The compensation plan this year was more elitist and divisive than was necessary.

-- Departments are saving money by hiring "adjuncts," and a new career track is emerging, that for people who teach constantly but who are not linked to the research enterprise and who have a different culture. (Who has voting authority in departments?) Few understand the new regulations about professional/academic staff, but they have major implications and different schools are handling them differently. At the same time, research faculty do not want to teach introductory courses; departments need to talk about responsibilities to undergraduate and the responsibilities of research university faculty.

THE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS (THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TENURE) WILL TAKE UP THESE ISSUES. Professor Goldstein recalled that Professor Bales had chaired a committee to look at these issues; the final policy recommendation to the Senate, after prolonged discussion and work by another committee chaired by Dean John Brandl, were ones that Professor Bales thought were better than nothing but they were not really adequate.

6. The EGMS system is a great disincentive for faculty to apply for small grants; is there a way to expedite treatment of small grants? Grants of \$8 million and \$8,000 are treated the same way; Sponsored Projects Administration, understaffed, logically gives its attention to the large grants. Some faculty, rather than put up with the procedures at the University, farm out small grants to community agencies.

FCC TOOK NO ACTION ON THIS ISSUE.

7. There is salary creep between young and senior faculty. The only way to get a raise is to get an outside offer. At the same time, with no central funds for retention, every time a faculty member gets a significant raise as a retention offer, the other faculty in the unit are penalized because they must perforce receive a lower raise inasmuch as all the salary funds are in the college. (Before, the cost of retention increases was spread across the University.)

Relatedly, the "merit" pool is a cost-of-living pool and it makes both faculty and staff unhappy. There is also an enormous equity issue: people who have been here 20 years can never catch up with the salary of someone newly hired at the same rank (professorial appointments).

There is a need for more honesty about how 4% turns into 2.8%.

SOME OF THESE ISSUES WILL BE TAKEN UP BY THE JOINT FACULTY AFFAIRS-FINANCE AND PLANNING SALARY SUBCOMMITTEE. Several FCC members expressed the view that the small amounts of money available for increases are not merit increases because they do not even keep up with inflation and that they should be distributed as cost-of-living increases. At the same time, the additional 2% that was distributed to a small group of faculty this year (and it may be 3% next year) will likely go to the same group of faculty next year because the most meritorious or most subject to retention or market pressures will probably not change very much. This will mean that over two years 40% of the funds for salary increases will have gone to 20-25% of the faculty. This will create enormous discrepancies and a starkly bimodal distribution in increases.

In previous years, there has been consultation (usually with the Committee on Faculty Affairs) about how faculty salary increases would be structured. What was disturbing about this year was that there was no consultation at all. There must be consultation with the governance structure before raises are determined.

8. Facilities Management is difficult to work with, pulls money from CUFS accounts without authorization, the cost differentials with outside contractors are extremely large, departments must fix what FM screws up, bids go out with the wrong information. FM has people who cannot do the job, who are sheltered; FM is very slow to react to problems, even if they are urgent, and FM's cost accounting often does not come for nearly a year and it is impossible to understand.

Others indicated satisfaction with the FM staff they have worked with and the speed with which FM has responded; there appears to be tremendous variability in the quality of FM employees. Everyone seemed to agree, however, that the cost differentials between FM work and that of outside contractors is indefensible.

THIS ISSUE WILL BE TAKEN UP BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TWIN CITIES FACILITIES AND SUPPORT SERVICES.

9. Where do the internal tax funds (IRS, Enterprise) go, are all subject to them, are they equitably shared across the University, who decides how much they will be? Inasmuch as they are tied to salaries, as salaries go up so do the taxes--but departments have no additional funds to cover the increased taxes, which means an attrition in support funds in the department.

FCC TOOK NO ACTION ON THIS ISSUE.

10. The number of students is overloading departments; is there any planning underway about enrollment? Has enrollment been increased to deal with financial problems? The University could cut back the number of students to increase quality.

FCC TOOK NO ACTION ON THIS ISSUE.

11. Departmental liability for vendors who do not pay their bills.

FCC TOOK NO ACTION ON THIS ISSUE.

12. Demands on office space and secretarial support created by emeriti faculty are a problem. If people know they will be outcasts immediately, they are less likely to retire, but departments are strained to provide support. There need to be guidelines.

THERE IS SENATE AND REGENTS' POLICY ON THIS MATTER; THE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS WILL ASK THAT DEPARTMENTS BE INFORMED OF EXISTING POLICY.

13. The Senate should distribute to department heads a list of FCC members with the telephone numbers and email addresses so chairs and heads can approach them about problems.

FCC TOOK NO ACTION ON THIS ISSUE.

14. What is the distinction between the University and MnSCU? FCC should pay attention to this; it affects the profile of the University and the profile of MnSCU. If FCC presses on this, it could help both the University and MnSCU; instead, MnSCU appears often to be trying to do what the University does.

THERE IS A LEGISLATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY RIDER ON THIS SUBJECT; THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY WILL TAKE IT UP IN CONSULTATION WITH THE OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST.

15. The departments could have done a more intelligent job of distributing the faculty salary increase funds than was allowed by the procedures from the administration. Having the President decide how to distribute raises is not the way to go. There needs to be a process in place to follow up on how salary funds were distributed, to be sure that they were all spent, and to be sure there is some long-term plan for salaries. No two departments have the same salary structure; this year's model does not work.

With respect to faculty salaries, it also appears there are rules and then there are rules: even when the rules are supposed to be the same for all, they are not.

THIS ITEM WILL ALSO BE TAKEN UP BY THE JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE ON SALARIES. There was also concern that the joint subcommittee may not receive the necessary administrative support to do the job it has been requested to do.

FCC unanimously adopted a resolution on this matter: Decisions about the delivery of salary increases should be made in consultation with the Faculty Consultative Committee. In addition, the joint subcommittee on salaries should receive the necessary cooperation and support from the administration.

It was agreed that this resolution would be placed on the docket of the next Faculty Senate meeting.

16. There are more computer-enhanced classrooms--but no computers. More and more faculty are using PowerPoint but do not have in the classrooms computers that can support it. In the case of one department, NOT ONE classroom on the campus is set up for delivery of the curriculum; they have not been able use electronic delivery because of inadequate technology. There are very different needs across

campuses; one model does not work for all. In some cases, departments have to replace equipment (e.g., microphones) that should be provided centrally.

Relatedly, there is need for a media library so each department does not have to buy videos and other materials.

THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY IS TAKING THIS UP AND WILL CONTINUE TO WORK ON IT; THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND PLANNING WILL ALSO LOOK AT THE FINANCES FOR CLASSROOM UPGRADES. It was also agreed, however, that Vice Provost Swan would be invited to an upcoming meeting of this Committee to discuss funding for classroom upgrades. At some point the Committee will likely wish to take a statement to the Senate advising the administration about classroom upgrades.

Several Committee members joined in expressing dismay that faculty must carry equipment with them to classrooms. Faculty are supposed to be here to teach students, Professor Rabinowitz observed, but one of the least-discussed topics at the University is entire apparatus for teaching; it is something that seems to be shunted aside. Instead, one has the sense that faculty must fill out more and more paper forms. Professor Gonzales said that when new buildings are built, everyone lauds the new technology--but rooms are not equipped with what faculty need nor are there trained staff available to help them.

It is possible to refer these issues to committees, as was suggested by a couple of FCC members, but Professor Kuhl insisted that to do so misses the point: the committees can talk about the issues until they "are blue in the face" but the problem is to change priorities. The problem is that there is a "real" budget (payment of bonds, utility increases, and so on) and what is asked for but not funded goes in the hopper for the next year, Professor Marshak said; the question is now to get real money for classroom upgrades. This is an issue the Committee may have to push the administration on.

17. There is a work speed-up: there is more to do. One area that takes more time is hassling over rooms and equipment.

THIS WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE ITEM CONCERNING CLASSROOMS.

18. Scheduling of classes across standard class periods is enormously wasteful; it "makes life hell" when each department is allowed to do whatever it wants.

THIS WILL BE TAKEN UP BY THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY. There will be a resolution brought to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly in early December on class scheduling; it will urge greater adherence to the policies already approved by the Senate and the Assembly.

19. There was no time for consultation with department chairs on the compacts this year.

THERE IS TO BE A JOINT FACULTY AFFAIRS-FINANCE AND PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE TO LOOK AT THE COMPACT PROCESS. This is an important issue, Professor Kruttschnitt maintained, because it goes to the allocation of resources. Who is being

consulted about the compacts is important as well. Professor Speaks said it is his sense that the charge to the joint subcommittee included inquiring about whether the process is working, to talk with a few deans about their views, to learn if there is enough money available to warrant using the process, and what the compact cycle should be (e.g., every year, every two years, every three years). Who was involved in developing the compacts would be part of the subcommittee's review. It is his sense that the deans do consult inside the colleges about the compact; Professor Speaks said he did not know if the Provost then consulted as he evaluated the compacts.

20. Spousal/partner hires are a concern for large departments. It is not the case here that a spouse or partner is imposed on a department. A department has the right to say "no." The problem is that the spouse/partner must be good enough for the department to be willing to give up a line to hire the person. At other universities, maybe Illinois and Michigan, for example, the cost of hiring the spouse/partner is shared so the department being asked does not bear the full burden---the department which has made an offer to someone it wants pays 1/3, the department who is asked to consider hiring that person's spouse/partner pays 1/3, and the Provost pays 1/3. Here there is no University policy; departments have to work this out; who pays is fundamental. (At the same time, there can't be very many of these when positions are so short.)

21. Minnesota is not as aggressive as other universities in creating financial incentives to attract people of color. It is worth having FCC look into what we do here vs. places like Wisconsin, Michigan, and Illinois, to see whether we are behind the curve or pretty much in line with them.

THESE TWO ITEMS WILL BE TAKEN UP BY THE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS, which will talk with Vice Provost Jones about them. The problem is that the University "talks the talk but does not walk the walk" on affirmative action because it does not have the money to engage in a major recruiting effort for faculty of color, Professor Rabinowitz said. There is a policy on spousal hiring, Professor Goldstein observed, but there is no recurring funding for it.

This is connected to "target of opportunity" hiring, Professor Rabinowitz said; the University does very few such hires; if it is serious, it needs to have policies like other Big Ten schools, which have been much more successful in hiring faculty of color. The University also does not do well in retaining faculty of color, Professor Marshak said, which is an argument for a better policy on spousal hiring; when both partners are hired, it becomes more difficult to move. This becomes a faculty stability and retention issue.

Faculty also need to understand that with diversity in color comes diversity in behavior, Professor Ahern said; in a quest for collegiality faculty who do not conform to expectations in this respect may be let go.

One department recently lost a faculty member whose expertise is in the recruitment of faculty of color. Professor Ahern noted that the University recently sponsored a national conference on recruiting and retaining faculty of color; it ought to have the know-how but doesn't seem to make use of it.

This is also related to graduate education, Professor McConnell said; the University must be sure it is preparing faculty of color. The history is uneven in that regard. There are, however, centrally-sponsored programs that seem to be quite good.

There need to be funds available to hire faculty of color and departments need to know about those funds, Professor Goldstein said.

22. Which course gets credit for the one-half price tuition? That affects budget planning.

PROFESSOR SPEAKS SAID HE WOULD INQUIRE OF ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT PFUTZENREUTER AND REPORT BACK TO THE COMMITTEE.

23. All faculty are required to do certain things (e.g., fill out the AREPA form); some refuse to do so; department chairs have to spend a lot of time getting these tasks completed. Salaries should be stopped for faculty who do not do what they are supposed to. (In the case of one college, the dean has told the faculty that if the forms are not filled out, they will not receive a salary increase.)

Some faculty have nothing to report; it is a waste of time and money for chairs to approve forms for faculty who have nothing to report. This takes time even though no outside activities need to be reported.

THIS WILL BE TAKEN UP BY THE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS.

Professor Goldstein said it is his view that the administration must make these forms simpler and needs also to provide a paper copy option.

24. There are expanding programs that all want space but there is no space to house them. There is no system or guidelines to make decisions on space allocation. Models would be helpful.

FCC TOOK NO ACTION ON THIS ITEM.

25. The allocation of ICR funds between the colleges and departments is an issue.

THIS ISSUE IS BEING ADDRESSED BY THE SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE.

26. The University's cost accounting system is such that it does not know what it costs to do things (these FCC lunches were cited as an example).

FCC TOOK NO ACTION ON THIS ITEM.

27. Buildings are very rigid, without flexibility; the University builds bunkers. Other organizations seem to be able to adapt to change--in jobs and in their physical plant--far more quickly and easily than the University.

FCC TOOK NO ACTION ON THIS ITEM.

28. The President's budget is hard to follow, in the view of one who has spent time at the legislature; that makes it difficult to explain. It is not built so people can understand it. Part of the problem is the

unwillingness of the administration to explain cross-subsidies in the institution (e.g., in teaching loads). Some budget investments have large pay-offs for Minnesota industry; student numbers are not always used as the basis for decisions, but there is not enough information available to make decisions or answer questions about them.

FCC TOOK NO ACTION ON THIS ITEM.

3. Pac-10 Resolution on Athletics

Professor Massey next asked Committee members for their views on a resolution that has been adopted by the Pac-10 faculty senates. He, Professor Gonzales, and the FCC staff will be attending a meeting of CIC (Big Ten plus the University of Chicago) leaders in the near future; this resolution will be on the agenda.

PAC-10 SENATE RESOLUTION ON ATHLETICS

{Source: <http://www.uoregon.edu/~uosenate/dirsen001/US0001-7.html>}

Athletics at NCAA Division I universities are undergoing rapid expansion and commercialization, resulting in an "arms race" universities find increasingly difficult to control. These concerns have been summarized by Myles Brand, president of Indiana University, in an article in the *NCAA News* of March 12, portions of which are appended below. It is a common proposition in the national dialogue on this issue that meaningful reform of intercollegiate athletics must begin with the university presidents of individual athletic conferences. Therefore, the faculty and university senates of the ten universities in the PAC-10 Conference join together to make the following recommendations:

1. We urge the presidents of our ten universities to begin serious discussions aimed at moderating the exponential growth of athletic programs and budgets in the PAC-10. We urge them to put this topic on the agenda of their June meeting.

2. Further, we endorse the recommendations made in the appended essay, "Presidents Have Cause, Means to Reduce Arms," and urge the presidents to address them as the basis for their discussions.

From "Presidents Have Cause, Means to Reduce Arms," by Myles Brand, *NCAA News* (Feb 12, 2001)

University presidents believe their primary job is to preserve and create environments where new knowledge can be discovered, transmitted and preserved. But often, the public sees the university differently. For them, the most visible and vital role played by these institutions is as a sponsor of athletic teams. . . . This enormous interest in college sports has led to growing commercialization and the blending together of intercollegiate athletics and entertainment. That has an impact on the entire institution, and the public's perception of it. . . . This focus on athletics turns the attention of the public, and sometimes of university administrators, away from our real job. . . . Athletic success cannot substitute for academic success. Universities must be judged by their achievements as academic institutions, not as sports franchises. I believe now is the right

time to renew the athletic reform movement. Call it "Academics First." Presidential control of athletics must be a cornerstone of this effort. Presidents must work to eliminate the excesses of commercialism, to ensure the academic success of student-athletes, and to make certain that athletic programs enhance and support the larger academic mission of the university. . . . The success of an Academics First movement depends, I am convinced, on action taken by presidents and their boards. . . . A president embarking on this project will also find able allies in his or her peers. In addition to working through the NCAA, mutual support among college presidents may best be achieved on the conference level. In these small circles of similar schools, presidents have opportunities to examine and debate issues and to take action. If redirection of intercollegiate athletics is to occur, it will likely begin at a conference level. . . . What should the presidents' goals be? Here are a few suggestions:

-- Make certain that academic support systems for athletes are totally integrated into university-wide efforts. That would lessen the chance for the high-profile academic scandals we have seen at some of the Division I institutions and it would reduce the isolation of student-athletes from the rest of the student body.

-- Resist over-commercialization. Working together, especially through conferences, presidents can limit the times and days when basketball games are played, the number of breaks in games for commercials, the type and prevalence of advertising in the stadiums and arenas and the logos worn by players and coaches. Limiting the revenue flow to athletics programs leads to the next step.

-- Stop, or at least slow, the "arms race." Resist subsidizing athletics programs from the academic side of the institution. Demand the same cost accountability from athletics programs that is expected from other university programs.

-- In the specific case of men's basketball, an area of significant concern, support the formation of a true developmental league and include the opportunity for young players to go directly from high school into the league. . . . Taking pre-professional basketball players out of the mix of entering college students should help to improve graduation rates.

The path that we are now following leads to an ever-widening gap between the academic and athletic cultures on our college campuses. Over time, it could well lead to college programs that differ little from professional ones. It already has led to a growing sense among members of the public--and even members of the university community--that athletics success is the main goal of too many institutions of higher learning. We must get off that path. We must make certain that academic concerns are first and foremost. To do that, we don't have to turn off the game. We just have to turn down the volume.

The critical question, Professor Marshak said, is whether the Big Ten is a big enough unit to act. Everyone understands that that no university can take unilateral action; the question is if the Big Ten can, or if action must be taken by NCAA Division I. The question to weigh is whether the big Ten can do something effective as a conference, or if it so locked in to the national situation and to other conferences that it cannot do anything alone.

Professor Kruttschnitt said the groundwork has to start somewhere. She recalled serving on an ad hoc committee on athletics in the early 1990s; President Hasselmo told the group to forget adopting any resolution that the University should not be in Division I athletics, although that is the question a lot of faculty were asking at the time. Professor Martin agreed; she said the University and the Big Ten must keep saying what it thinks should be done.

Professor Erdman pointed out that he is on the Advisory Committee on Athletics and has a slightly different bias from others on this Committee. He said people should think first about the student-athletes, who comprise about 2% of the students on the Twin Cities campus. He said he admired President Brand for what he has done but is concerned that an emotional reaction would lead to "throwing out the student-athletes with the bowl game." The group of athletes in whom he is interested are not ones who want a ticket to professional contracts--those are in the minority. It is easy to get angry about what happened at the University, which was a disservice to the University and many suffered because of those events. He said he hoped that emotions would not lead to decisions that do not make sense.

Professor Erdman said he totally agreed with the sentiment about stopping the "arms race." Athletics are out of control and being led by the television networks. Should universities cut teams? He said he would be saddened if the University were to drop teams. Why punish those in non-revenue sports for problems created elsewhere? Is it correct to say that some alumni identify the University through athletics? Yes. In some cases, do they do so in the wrong way? Yes. Do some do it in the right way? yes. There are good things that come out of athletics, he said; there needs to be the right balance.

Professor Erdman specifically suggested removing the word "cost" in the paragraph about demanding accountability from athletics parallel to that demanded of academic programs. All academic programs in the University are subsidized; does that language mean that athletics should also be subsidized? It could also be dangerous language in that it might mean athletic programs would be even more driven to raise revenue than they are now. The Committee concurred.

Professor Marshak said it would be interesting to see what proportion of the escalating costs of athletics are associated with what proportion of athletics. Most athletes are good students; one suspects that most of the money goes into a few sports. There is also little thought given to opportunity costs for the University, such as using land for athletic facilities (which takes parking) or how the priorities of housing and dining programs can be skewed by athletics.

Professor Rabinowitz said, with respect to Professor Erdman's comments, that the Pac-10 resolution is directed at administrations, not student-athletes. One of the main concerns of the committees has been how badly the athletes are treated. It is incumbent on the faculty to keep reminding the University that athletes are students and it is the faculty's responsibility to educate them--and if athletics is impeding that education, something must be done. The resolution is innocent enough; perhaps something will change or be discussed.

It was moved, seconded, and voted unanimously that Professor Massey should support the Pac-10 resolution at the upcoming CIC faculty meeting.

4. Senate Research Committee Bylaw

Professor McConnell noted that the proposed bylaw change, enlarging the membership of the Senate Research Committee, had been tabled at the last meeting because there was discussion about faculty representation from the Duluth campus.

The Committee decided it supported the proposed bylaw amendment.

5. Faculty Legislative Liaison

Professor Massey announced that there would be a new faculty legislative liaison beginning on January 1, 2002, and asked Committee members to suggest the names of individuals who might fill the role.

6. Representation from Duluth

The Committee concluded it wished to speak at greater length with Professor Drewes on this subject.

Professor Massey adjourned the meeting at 3:20.

-- Gary Engstrand