

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
January 18, 1990**

Present: Warren Ibele (chair), Norman Kerr, Lynnette Mullins, J. Bruce Overmier, Ronald Phillips, M. Kathleen Price, Burton Shapiro, Charlotte Striebel, James VanAlstine

Guests: Assistant Vice President Carol Carrier, John Clark (past chair, Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics), Jack Merwin (chair, ACIA), Barbara Muesing (Regents' Office, Kathy O'Brien (President's Office), Maureen Smith (Brief), Rabun Taylor (Footnote)

1. Report of the Chair

The Eldred Smith case Professor Ibele opened the meeting with an announcement that the panel to hear the case of Eldred Smith had been "disempaneled" at the request of Academic Affairs. Professor Striebel said it was her understanding that Academic Affairs may yet pursue termination proceedings against Dr. Smith but that right now the panel was out of business.

On the basis of this experience, however, Professor Striebel reflected, it would be worthwhile for FCC to reach some agreement with Academic Affairs on the ground rules for future panels. The panel, she said, must control its own schedule; several times Academic Affairs had press releases ready which reported that the panel was going to do certain things--when it had not even discussed the matters. If the panels are to have any credibility they must be independent.

Committee members concurred with these comments; Professor Ibele promised to write a letter to Academic Affairs conveying the sentiments expressed by Professor Striebel.

Taping of Meetings Professor Ibele inquired of the Committee whether or not it wished to permit reporters or any others to tape its meetings. Inasmuch as the meetings are open, by Senate policy, unless the Committee votes to close them, and because accuracy in reporting might be enhanced with a tape, Committee members concluded they would not object to taping. They stipulated, however, that anyone taping a meeting must give the Committee notice that it is doing so and that the taping not be disruptive.

Future Agenda Items Professor Ibele reported on items which will come before the Committee in the near future; they include President Hasselmo's Initiative on Undergraduate Education and discussion with the President and Provost about strengthening the arts and humanities. He also informed the Committee that Vice President Kuhi will speak to the Senate at its February meeting.

ACIA By-law Professor Ibele also remarked that the by-law amendment granting ACIA judicial authority over the eligibility of student-athletes would have to be submitted again to the Assembly. The faculty, when they did not vote in large enough numbers to approve the amendment, may have been venting their feelings about the Darville trial and the general disrepute of the men's athletic program--but they deprived the Committee of necessary authority to deal with possible rules violations.

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

It was argued, however, that it would be a mistake not to listen to the message from the Assembly-- that the faculty are unhappy with athletics and with the fiction that the faculty are controlling athletics when they are not. Professor Ibele noted that there would be a committee of some sort appointed by the Board of Regents to examine problems in athletics; reportedly it would consist of regents, the athletic directors, and possibly some coaches. He said that if it were to be any larger, faculty and students must be represented; if not, the faculty will want an opportunity to present their views to it. Ms. Muesing told the Committee that the make-up of the group has not yet been determined; she also distributed copies of the letter from Regent Alan Page which initiated the discussion by the Board as well as the resolution they adopted calling for the committee.

It was pointed out, too, that both the Advisory Task Force on Planning and the Task Force on Support and Service Units had comments on athletics which should be brought to the attention of the Regents' committee. Some of those comments, moreover, were "pungent."

Status of New Grievance Procedures Professor Striebel said she wished to report on the lack of progress in implementing the new procedures. She briefly reviewed the history of events and summarized the sequence as one where nothing happens, she complains, something is promised, and then nothing happens again. The President has accepted the new procedures, subject to a Memorandum of Understanding--but it has not been possible to get action from the Attorney's Office on the Memorandum which has been drafted. The sentiment of the Committee appeared to be that if the Attorney's Office could not or would not respond to the draft presented to them then the attempt should be dropped and the original procedures adopted by the Senate should be put in place as is--and the President should be informed that this is the Committee view.

2. Discussion of Intercollegiate Athletics

At this point Professor Jack Merwin and Professor John Clark joined the meeting to pick up the discussion of intercollegiate athletics once again; Professor Merwin was invited to make introductory remarks. He began by observing ruefully that serving as chair of FCC had in some ways been easier than serving as chair of ACIA. He then told the Committee:

- That ACIA had asked three of its former chairs, plus representatives from the athletic departments, to address the recommendations of the Task Force on Support and Service Units concerning intercollegiate athletics; their report will be present to ACIA shortly and then will be forwarded to the Consultative Committee.
- ACIA is still trying to address the issues in the report to the NCAA. It is still not clear if the hearing by the NCAA will be in February or April.
- President Hasselmo has said that the committee to appointed pursuant to the Board of Regents' resolution will work with ACIA.
- The current status of the University's compliance with Title IX is being reviewed; the results will presumably be forthcoming in the near future. (Title IX is the federal regulation barring federal funds to an institution which discriminates on the basis of sex; there are specific provisions governing compliance in intercollegiate athletics.)

Professor Merwin also reviewed some recent academic statistics for student-athletes (GPAs, average number of credits passed) and noted that ACIA receives this information on a quarterly basis for each men's and women's sport.

Professor Ibele recalled again the faculty vote against the by-law amendment and commented that he could not tell if it reflected a momentary irritation with the Darville affair or a more deep-seated frustration that would not go away. Professor Merwin pointed out that he had written to Professor Ibele on issues which Assembly members had not been cognizant when they cast their votes (for example, that the athletic departments do not admit students, colleges do). He also recounted the Assembly action on the by-law amendment the first time it had been presented to it; the vote in favor had been unanimous. This amendment, he noted, is intended to correct an omission that had been committed when the by-laws chartering and charging ACIA had been completely rewritten a few years earlier; it is intended only to restore to the Committee the judicial function it had always had but which had not been provided for in the rewriting.

It was argued that while there was good reason to be concerned with the omission, there should also be discussion of the underlying message of the vote: There is a group of the faculty who are unhappy with the fiction of faculty control and who oppose an increased role for the faculty in governance of athletics. Athletics, it was contended, is a business, minor leagues for football, basketball, and hockey, and can better be run by others. It should be treated as a business and the University should try to live with it as compatibly as it can. Many student-athletes come to the athletic program not to obtain an education but to play their sport; the University then tries to shove an education down their throats. We should stop pretending to educate them. This is not an argument to eliminate athletics, it was made clear, but rather to stop perpetuating the myth that all student-athletes are students.

Another Committee member mentioned that the report of the Task Force on Support and Service Units found that there is a core group of 20-25% of the faculty who believe that intercollegiate athletics is fundamentally incompatible with education and want it off the campus. The majority of faculty were neutral and a few thought it was worthwhile. The small numbers on either end of the spectrum should not be permitted to drive the discussion; there should be a reasonable middle road. An additional point made was that the University could not change the national philosophy of athletics; for us it is a question of how to act responsibly within NCAA guidelines and how to justify to ourselves our program and our stewardship of it.

A question was asked about the Big Ten requirements for faculty control and the apparent lack of a faculty majority on ACIA; Professor Merwin described the categories of membership and explained that the faculty have eight votes out of a total of fourteen on the committee (the others are three students, two alumni, and one civil service member).

There was also brief discussion about permitting games on study day or the last day of finals week; Professor Merwin told the Committee that ACIA policy prohibits games then but it does occasionally grant exceptions (with attendant provisos about arranging for finals).

There was a comment that student-athletes should be told of their chances to get into professional sports after they have played in college; Professor Merwin said there is no reason to believe that anyone is misleading recruits about those very small chances. He also observed that the NCAA has finally called for something that Minnesota has been doing for some time, which is to make public the graduation rates

for athletes and non-athletes. It was suggested that the new preparation standards might have an impact on graduation rates because one will need an honest high school education to get into the University. Professor Merwin told the Committee that one of the recommendations of the Task Force on Support and Service Units was to admit student-athletes only to the degree-granting colleges; ACIA will discuss whether or not it might be discriminatory to deny admission to a student to General College solely because he or she would participate in athletics.

Professor Merwin also told the Committee, on this subject, that the Big Ten has a commission on problems and opportunities for minority athletes; each institution has a representative on it. The Minnesota representative has argued that if graduation rates are the only measure of a program, then the institution will deny to many minority students a chance to obtain at least some education.

One Committee member contended that while the University wants student-athletes to graduate, it also has built a structure which makes it impossible--because of the requirements and the time spent on the sport. The rules requiring a minimum credit load (12 credits) forces athletes into "baby courses" which will not count towards graduation. The solution is to require fewer courses of substance or to permit athletes to take no courses during their season of competition. Other students have time demands but the University does not force them to take more credits than they can handle.

Ms. O'Brien suggested to the Committee that many of the issues raised are undergraduate experience issues; as the President's Initiative on Excellence on Undergraduate Education deals with them, progress might be made. Other issues, however, are national--and Minnesota has one vote out of over 700. The President, as a consequence, is interested in working with the Big Ten and other conferences to build coalitions to effect change. She also reflected that a unit which makes its own money--this was true of the Minneapolis Water Department and is true of men's athletics--tend to be the most independent. If Minnesota were to make a distinctive change, she said, it would be in financing, as had been called for in the report of a (1986) task force chaired by former Vice President Steve Dunham.

The Committee concluded its discussion by deciding that the ACIA by-law revision should be brought back to the Assembly; it will come back, however, as a new proposal, so will require either a 2/3 vote in favor or a majority vote at two successive meetings. It was suggested that Professor Ibele should inform the Assembly that the amendment will be brought back until it is adopted or until the faculty get out of the business of athletics altogether.

3. Faculty Development Activities

Professor Ibele next welcomed Assistant Vice President Carol Carrier to the meeting to discuss activities in faculty development. She told the Committee, first, that her portfolio of responsibilities includes academic personnel, which has as a part of it faculty and staff development.

There is a lot going on in faculty and staff development, she said. She has looked at the Merwin report of 1984 and the Swan Committee report of 1987 and finds a number of needs in such areas as sabbaticals, the libraries, working conditions, and better-informed administrators. It was suggested that faculty development should not be focussed too heavily on new faculty; the majority of the faculty are tenured, mid-career people, and if teaching is to be kept alive and vital development activities must be directed to them.

The one-quarter leave program is usually oversubscribed; intended for 4% of the faculty, there are always alternates. The financial arrangements for these leaves are made at the department level. The full-year sabbatical program is less successful; few of the eligible faculty apply because they cannot make it on the funds provided or they have too many commitments to their labs or to graduate students. The Bush Sabbatical supplements are now \$15,000 or 30% of salary, whichever is greater (as FCC had requested); 45 faculty have applied for them and up to 20 may be granted (there is \$300,000 available). Dr. Carrier agreed that it is a question whether or not the Bush Sabbaticals should continue to be restricted to those who do undergraduate teaching, inasmuch as the funds are no longer from Bush.

Committee members made a number of comments which were all in the direction of supporting a higher salary for sabbaticals for shorter periods of time; Dr. Carrier agreed that the present program does not work well and that something else needs to be developed.

Dr. Carrier reviewed for the Committee activities on a number of fronts:

- A seminar series for pre-retirement planning has been offered; there were 100 participants last year. At present the seminars have been limited to those over 55 years of age; it has been suggested that younger faculty need to think about these issues as well.
- The Morse-Alumni teaching awards have been greatly enhanced; they are now awarded for three years, with \$2500 to the recipient and another \$2500 to the department (each year) to be used for improvement of undergraduate teaching. An inquiry was made about how many faculty teach students exclusively at the post-baccalaureate level; the answer was Law, most of the Health Sciences, some in Agriculture, among others. It was also suggested that nomination for the Morse-Alumni award should receive recognition, given the fact that few departments or faculty will work on a nomination unless they are convinced the individual is an outstanding teacher--because it is such an onerous task. Dr. Carrier responded that such recognition could be developed by the individual campuses or colleges.
- An orientation program for new faculty members has begun but attendance was disappointing; in inquiring why many who were invited did not attend, her office learned that new faculty were too busy, too stressed, or paranoid about the need to do research. In light of the emphasis to be placed on undergraduate education, Dr. Carrier commented, that may need to be changed. It was said that perhaps an orientation session should be made mandatory so probationary faculty are not isolated; it would perhaps be a good idea for them to learn about the University and its officers. Dr. Carrier concurred but concluded that doing it in their first year of appointment might not be the best time.

Committee members discussed for some while the understanding among junior faculty that research and scholarship is primary and that everything else is secondary. Dr. Carrier acknowledged that department cultures tend in this direction; she was, however, she said, surprised by the intensity of the emphasis on research. One Committee member made the point that it is contradictory to involve non-tenured faculty in undergraduate teaching; that is a recipe for failure because devoting effort to teaching would result in a denial of tenure. Junior faculty are told not to spend time on teaching--they have to do it, but not to spend time on it--and attempts to emphasize teaching is wrong so long as the tenure decision is based solely on research. Dr. Carrier agreed but expressed the hope that the situation would change;

she argued that there is a need for balance so that probationary faculty are comfortable with a variety of tasks. The deans, she added, want more on the evaluation of teaching but are uncertain what to submit to document it; it may be time for some experiments, she said. Another Committee member maintained that if the President's Initiative on Excellence in Undergraduate Education is to succeed there must be evaluation of teaching in the tenure decision as well as in the decisions about raises; the faculty will follow the money. It was also maintained that some departments do take undergraduate education seriously; the culture varies considerably on this issue.

- Funds for TA training, provided in a legislative special, are being used and the program is going well. It was suggested that departments need to do a better job of teaching graduate students in what it is they will be doing, whether they become faculty members or go into private industry; a course on teaching would be appropriate. Dr. Carrier said that next year some of the legislative funds would be used for departments which come forward with initiatives for training TAs; it would be seed money spread all over the University. One Committee member reflected that there is a lot being done and that the diversity of activities is unknown to most; Dr. Carrier reported that her office has recently completed an inventory of precisely these efforts and it will be distributed to the departments as well as to FCC.
- The department head training program has been welcomed by those who have participated. Associate and assistant deans may be included in the program next year. It was pointed out to Dr. Carrier that many department heads would like to feel they are "part of the team"--but that their principal source of information, in many instances, are the minutes of the Consultative Committee; perhaps a better administrative communication system could be established.

Asked about how decentralization would affect the availability of these programs for the coordinate campuses, Dr. Carrier said that some of them are cooperative ventures among all campuses while others can be done independently; in the case of the latter, the campuses are provided the funds to implement the programs in a manner which best fits their needs.

Dr. Carrier invited comments from members of the Committee about any of the programs in which she is involved. Professor Ibele thanked her for meeting with the Committee.

4. Personnel Matters

The Committee moved into closed session to assemble names for a nominating committee which will identify faculty to fill vacancies on the Committee on Committees (which cannot nominate its own members).

The Committee adjourned at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand