

Minutes*

**Senate Consultative Committee
Thursday, January 24, 2013
3:00 – 4:30
Room 300 Morrill Hall**

Present: Sally Gregory Kohlstedt (chair), James Cloyd, Chris Cramer, Nancy Ehlke, Ann Hagen, Joe Inhofer, Russell Luepker, Elaine Tyler May, Alon McCormick, Cynthia Murdoch, Amy Olson, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, Moshe Volovik

Absent: Ben Baglio, Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman, Brandon Breuer, Nicole Conti, Will Durfee, Gyaltsso Gurung, Michael Hancher, Adam Matula, James Pacala, Thomas Sondreal, Richard Ziegler

Guests: Vice President Pamela Wheelock (University Services)

Others: Elizabeth Eull (Office of the President)

[In these minutes: (1) administrative policies consultation matrix; (2) University administrative costs; (3) Board of Regents alcohol policy]

1. Administrative Policies Consultation Matrix

Professor Kohlstedt convened the meeting at 3:10, called for a round of introductions, and then asked Committee members for comments on the revised matrix indicating which senate committees are to be consulted on specific administrative policy amendments. She noted that Professor Cramer had chaired the ad hoc committee that proposed the revisions and that the primary impetus for the changes was the recognition of the P&A and Civil Service senates and consultative committees, which did not exist when the matrix was first created.

Professor Cramer said that the ad hoc committee took the attitude that micromanagement was not a good idea and that some policies do not require committee review. If an issue arises, this Committee can refer it appropriately. That is why, on the matrix, for the categories of consultation with a committee and consultation with a senate, for some policies the entry is "none" and "none." In a number of cases, there is no correspondence between the subject of a policy and a senate committee; in those cases, the matrix provides that it comes to this Committee. Professor Cloyd asked what happens when new policies are proposed, or policies are proposed for elimination, or there are amendments—who makes sure the appropriate contact is made? It is the staff to this Committee who has that responsibility.

In response to a query from Professor Ratliff-Crain, Professor Cramer said that some policies are assigned to senate committees for historical reasons, or were thought appropriate when the matrix was first developed; the ad hoc committee did not revisit every decision that had been made earlier.

Professor Ratliff-Crain asked if senate committees had had a chance to review the proposed matrix. It was not circulated to committees, Professor Kohlstedt responded; the goal was to get the matrix in place

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

with the appropriate consultative committees identified and to prune back somewhat the proposed consultation. While they did not want to expand what was already in place, they also did not intend to eliminate any appropriate consultation. Professor Cramer expressed a reluctance to ask all senate committees to indicate all the policies in which they might have an interest because everything "sounds" interesting, and there would be a tendency to ask to be consulted on everything, making the process most unwieldy. It was noted that this Committee, or the Faculty Consultative Committee for committees of the Faculty Senate, may always refer policy issues to appropriate committees. Professor Kohlstedt also suggested that because the Committee on Committees is now asked to review the performance, charge, and membership of all senate committees, perhaps it should also be asked to look simultaneously at the consultation matrix to determine if there are policies on which a committee being reviewed should consult.

Professor Hancher suggested sending the matrix to senate committee chairs; Professor Kohlstedt said she would do so.

The Committee voted unanimously to endorse the revised consultation matrix. It can be found on the policy library website at http://policy.umn.edu/prod/groups/president/@pub/@policy/@op/documents/policy/upolicy_senmatrix.pdf

2. University Administrative Costs

Professor Kohlstedt inquired if Committee members had any comments on the December 29 article in the *Wall Street Journal* about University administrative costs. There is a sensitivity among University staff (as there was among faculty members about a year ago, for other reasons). How can faculty and staff help position the University? What she has heard is that faculty and staff have not been active in explaining what they do; should they be? It is a complicated question.

Ms. Hagen said that she has thought about these issues quite a bit, and Mr. Rohloff, Special Assistant to the President for government relations, will speak to the P&A Senate.

Professor Cloyd said he recognized the difficulty of getting good news out (e.g., someone receives a large grant and hires 20 people). It is important for the University to point to the ways in which administrators are needed because there are new projects that require oversight. Can they get the news out?

Later in the meeting, Professor Cramer recalled a suggestion he had made earlier about making the work of P&A staff more apparent: Each week University Relations could make a random selection of a student, a P&A staff member, a Civil Service staff member, and a faculty member and highlight their background and the work they do. He suggested the Committee explore the possibility with University Relations. Part of the intent would be to build up an archive that could be used as needed. Professor Kohlstedt reported that she and Professor Hancher had discussed with Ms. Harvey the possibilities with respect to faculty members and agreed that it should be expanded to include the staff in order to explain the nature of work at the University. Ms. Hagen said it is important to reach ordinary people who do not know what University staff do.

Professor Kohlstedt said she would put this item on the agenda of the next meeting.

3. Board of Regents Alcohol Policy

Professor Kohlstedt now welcomed Vice President Wheelock to the meeting to discuss proposed changes to the Board of Regents' policy *Alcoholic Beverages on Campus*. [The current policy may be found at <http://www1.umn.edu/regents/policies/administrative/Alcohol.pdf>]

Vice President Wheelock said she was glad to join the Committee and distributed copies of proposed changes to the Board's policy. The only section of the policy that would be amended is this language, in Section IV (new language in CAPS):

Subd. 5. Promotions and Marketing. The University shall not accept alcohol PROMOTION, MARKETING, advertising and sponsorship at its venues and in its publications. EXCEPTIONS MAY BE MADE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THIS POLICY AND ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY FOR NON-UNIVERSITY ACTIVITIES, AS DETERMINED BY THE PRESIDENT. University trademarks, trade names, service marks, logos, slogans, mascots, and other official identifiers or symbols shall not be used in conjunction with alcohol advertising, promotion, marketing, distribution, or sale.

Vice President Wheelock pointed out that this change is not about allowing alcohol at University-sponsored events. It is, instead, recognition that the University has facilities that are attractive for non-University events (e.g., concerts at TCF Bank Stadium). In thinking about the opportunity to host premier events in University facilities, and generate revenue for the University, one question that came up was about events that have companies that produce alcoholic beverages as sponsors. The University might have an opportunity to rent to someone or a group that has alcohol sponsorship, so the proposed policy change provides that some promotion and marketing of events with alcohol sponsorship may be allowed, subject to approval by the president. There will be requirements about what organizations can and cannot do—this is still a university and it does not promote alcohol consumption—but it does need to be savvy about sponsors. So, in order to have premier events (e.g. athletic, musical), Ms. Wheelock concluded, the institution needs more flexibility.

Professor Kohlstedt observed that the proposed change expands the exclusions to include promotion and marketing for University events.

Professor Luepker asked how this change relates to the potential contract with the Minnesota Vikings to play in TCF Bank Stadium. Ms. Wheelock said that there is no agreement yet with the Vikings, although conversations have been held and she expects there will be a contract. These considerations will come up in the lease agreement. There are a number of issues to be addressed and the Vikings will bear the costs for any changes they require. Will the contract likely be three years, Professor Luepker asked? Ms. Wheelock said the University has the capability to host the Vikings as long as they need a stadium but both the team and the Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission are highly motivated to make the time as short as possible, perhaps only two years.

Professor May inquired about language in the policy providing that the "sale of alcoholic beverages on University property is prohibited, except when authorized by license or state law and approved by the Board of Regents." Vice President Wheelock said that the Board of Regents has approved sale of alcohol and the University does have a liquor license. What about a student at a concert found guilty of underage drinking, when the University facility has been rented to a non-University group, Professor May asked; would that student be dealt with through the Student Conduct Code or some other process?

One question could be where the behavior occurred, Ms. Wheelock said. Was it on campus or elsewhere? She said that she generally refers such questions to the Office for Student Affairs and this would be no exception. Ms. Eull suggested that the Committee speak with Vice Provost Jerry Rinehart. She said the University is aware that there has been alcohol at non-University events in the past, that students brought in, and Vice Provost Rinehart would know how students are dealt with in those circumstances. Mr. Volovik observed that the Student Conduct Code applies to students whether on or off campus, so this issue may not be relevant.

Professor May said her question was about University liability. If something terrible happens, is the University responsible or is the concert promoter? Ms. Wheelock said the University would have indemnification provisions in any contract. It could be a visitor to the campus attending an event, not a student, Professor May added.

Professor Hancher asked who was involved in drafting the policy revision. It was intercollegiate athletics, the Office of the General Counsel, and University Relations; it was the attorneys who drafted it, Ms. Wheelock reported.

Professor Ratliff-Crain said he could understand the intent of the last sentence in subd.5, but with the ubiquity of beer banners (e.g., at Vikings games), it seems inevitable the "M" will show up next to a beer sign. Ms. Wheelock said she did not want to get ahead of a contract, but the intent is that the two will not be in a line of sight in the telecast of a game or to a passer-by. The details will have to be worked out on a case-by-case basis.

Professor Cloyd said the definition of a "student" is quite broad. What happens with a 75-year-old alum who's taking a continuing education course and is nabbed for over-indulging? The person would be a student, Professor Kohlstedt surmised. Professor Cramer noted the language of Section III, "Subd. 3. Health and Safety. The University is committed to promoting a health and safe living and learning environment for its employees, students, and visitors."

Vice President Wheelock pointed out that all of the provisions being mentioned are in the policy now; she is only bringing for discussion the change. Nothing in it affects the consumption or sale of alcohol, it is only about marketing, promotion, and the use of the University's mark. The questions being raised now should be taken up by those in Student Affairs, she suggested.

Professor McCormick inquired how the proposed language compares with other Big Ten schools. Ms. Eull said that her recollection is that it is not inconsistent with other policies if the school allows major events in its facilities, but she will confirm that with the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics.

The Committee voted unanimously to endorse the policy change.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Vice President Wheelock for joining the meeting and adjourned it at 4:00.

-- Gary Engstrand