

Minutes*

**Senate Consultative Committee
Thursday, September 18, 2003
3:00 – 4:00
Room 238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Judith Martin (chair), Jean Bauer, Susan Brorson, Charles Campbell, Tom Clayton, Joshua Colburn, Art Erdman, Mary Jo Kane, Levi Kary, Scott LeBlanc, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Martin Sampson, Charles Stech, Daniel Weiske, Carol Wells

Absent: Derek Brunsberg, Kim Canfield, Dan Feeney, Emily Hoover, James Kanten, Marvin Marshak, Ryan Osero, Teresa Wallace, Jessica Weaver

Guests: Professor Dian Lopez (Committee on Committees)

Others: Lynn Holleran (Office of the Chief of Staff)

[In these minutes: (1) review of the Equity, Access, and Diversity committee; (2) a football stadium]

1. Review of the Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee

Professor Martin convened the meeting at 3:00 and welcomed Professor Dian Lopez, last year's chair of the Committee on Committees, to report on the review that the Committee on Committees had conducted of the Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee (EAD). Professor Lopez recalled that this Committee had decided the Committee on Committees should review EAD; she now brings the report to the Committee.

EAD is new, and for a time had no chair, then had an interim chair, and is now ably chaired by Professor May Lay. The review was conducted during the second half of 2002-03 and was required by the Senate bylaw creating it because it replaced the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women--because there was a concern that women's issues would get lost in the larger concerns of the EAD committee.

Professor Lopez described the process used to conduct the review. They looked primarily at two areas: accomplishments and concerns. In terms of accomplishments, EAD has continued to address women's issues, but it is concerned enough about this in general that it will establish a specific subcommittee on women's issues. In terms of concerns, identified by EAD itself, it intends to solicit ideas from the campus community and it wishes to have a role when new policies are developed or when decisions are made.

The review made several recommendations. First, EAD should continue to solicit administrative units and Senate committees before decisions are made in order that the impact on equity, access, and

* 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.

diversity can be evaluated. Second, it agreed there should be a subcommittee on women's issues. The Committee on Committees also took some actions to help EAD. It recommended a Rules change to add the Director of the Office of University Women as an ex officio member; that change was adopted. It will send all committee chairs a reminder that they should be mindful of EAD issues and should consult with EAD when concerns arise. Third, they will seek the assistance of the Provost to make administrators aware of EAD and that it needs to hear about relevant issues before decisions are made.

Professor Ratliff-Crain said he was concerned that the review did not address student issues. There were two other matters, Professor Lopez responded: EAD is looking for ways to address coordinate campus and student issues. The charge to EAD is silent on who comes under it; presumably the Committee on Committees deals with that, Professor Ratliff-Crain asked? That is perhaps something it could do, Professor Lopez agreed.

Professor Wells asked how EAD interacts with the Office of Equal Opportunity. Professor Lopez pointed out that EAD is a Senate committee while OEO is an administrative office. EAD deals with policy issues, not with individual cases. It tries to change how the University acts.

Professor Brorson asked if the review had included any contact with someone responsible for women's issues at the Crookston campus. Professor Lopez said it had not because they had not been able to identify anyone with that responsibility. That is a problem, Professor Brorson agreed.

The Committee voted unanimously to approve the review committee report and to send it to the Senate for information. Professor Martin thanked Professor Lopez for her good work.

2. Football Stadium

Professor Martin turned next to the issue of a possible on-campus Gopher-only football stadium. She noted that the Faculty Consultative Committee had developed a set of principles when there was a proposal for a joint-use Gopher-Vikings stadium. Are the students talking about the stadium, she asked?

Mr. LeBlanc reported that last year the Minnesota Student Association passed a resolution that it wanted football back on campus. They have had no discussions about the Vikings or how a stadium would be funded. Mr. Colburn said it should be a collegiate stadium, which the joint-use proposal was not. The students wanted a Gopher stadium so there will be a lot more support now than there was for the joint-use stadium. They are looking into the idea that students might support financially a Gopher-only stadium. There are no hard numbers and nothing about what would be expected, Mr. LeBlanc added; nothing formal has happened.

Mr. Colburn said that the students' principles align with those of the faculty: staff and students should not have to pay for stadium parking facilities, it should be a multi-purpose facility that has educational uses, and there should be a revenue stream to support it.

Mr. Weiske said that this is a difficult time to ask students to support a stadium, given the tuition increases they have faced and the tight University budget. The students' biggest question is about the financial impact of a stadium. It is possible there will be more strings attached to student support, Mr. Colburn added. Mr. Weiske said they do not favor using O&M funds for a stadium.

Professor Kane asked if the students believe that the Director of Athletics, Mr. Maturi, has listened to their concerns. Mr. Colburn said he was very open; Mr. Weiske said they need to have a great deal more discussion; the semester has just started. Professor Erdman pointed out that there are students on the Advisory Committee on Athletics, which is another way for them to influence the system. Professor Campbell added that there are also four students on the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning.

Ms. Holleran reported that she has spoken with the students as well. They have asked good questions that will be addressed by the feasibility study [which Associate Vice President Pfitzenreuter reported on to the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning].

Professor Clayton said he has interviewed students on an impromptu basis; one novel suggestion was that the roof be removed from the Metrodome if one wants an open-air stadium. Mr. Colburn said they had looked at that possibility. At Rutgers that plan was halted because it was not financially feasible. The strongest argument IN FAVOR of the Metrodome was that it had a roof, Professor Campbell recalled. He remembers suffering in Memorial Stadium in November. Mr. LeBlanc said that the open-air stadium creates camaraderie; he heard that about the time that the football team moved to the Metrodome there was a drop in alumni donations. Are there data on that point, Professor Campbell asked? Mr. Colburn said he did not know if there were data but that he has been told that membership in the Alumni Association at that time began to drop; the numbers were from the Foundation. At the same time, Professor Martin observed, the \$1.6 billion just raised in the capital campaign is more money than the University had raised before in total. Professor Kane said the alumni/donor data were suspect; unless one asks people if they stopped giving to the University because the football games were moved to the Metrodome, one cannot assume a cause-effect relationship.

There was divided opinion on whether it would be possible to conduct a defensible survey of students about the stadium; Mr. Colburn said that it would be an all-student-body decision to support a new stadium with student funds. Internal Research and Reporting can do surveys for departments, Mr. Weiske said; is it time for the Senate to do a survey? Professor Martin recalled that the Faculty Consultative Committee had talked earlier about surveying the faculty, and there is an all-everybody-list at the University that the President uses; it would be possible to send out questions on the stadium. If they do so, she said, the goal would be to obtain a sense of the preponderance of the feelings, not just a technical majority.

There is still the issue of the continuing cost of staying in the Metrodome, Professor Ratliff-Crain said, especially if the University is the sole proprietor. Both sides of the issue have to be presented. [It was said at this meeting that the annual operating costs of the Metrodome are about \$11 million. The figure presented to the Finance and Planning Committee was \$7 million.] If there will be an issue about how much fiscal responsibility the students will bear, then they should be asked where they would prefer the money to go, he said.

It will also be necessary to secure other events to generate revenue, Mr. Colburn said. But not on campus during classes, Professor Martin cautioned.

How important is it that the campus does not have a place that seats more than 4000 people, Mr. Colburn asked? Professor Erdman said one advantage to a larger place is that it would not be necessary

to have a lot of different graduation ceremonies. At some institutions they are all scheduled in the stadium--and they hope the weather holds out.

Is there any chance that there would be financial support from local businesses if the stadium is located near Huron Street, Mr. LeBlanc asked? That was not likely because there are only six or seven football games a year.

Ms. Holleran said that the administration will share information with the students when it is prepared. Few students are well-informed about the stadium, Mr. Weiske said, and it will be necessary to get information to the entire student body.

Professor Martin adjourned the meeting at 3:45.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota