EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL

DRAFT MINUTES

February 7, 2006


Absent: O’Connor, Potchen, Wurst

Chairperson Sticklen called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. with a quorum being present.

The Agenda was amended adding “President’s Remarks” between items 2 and 3. The agenda was approved as amended.

The minutes for January 10, 2006 were amended, under the Provost’s Remarks, paragraph three, first line should read “Dean’s search for Arts and Letters”. The minutes were approved as amended.

Provost’s Remarks:
Provost Wilcox noted the North Central Accreditation (NCA) team will be on the MSU campus February 27 and 28, 2006. The University self study is on line on the Provost’s web site and Provost Wilcox encourages members to review. Briefing materials prepared by Professor Klomparens are being distributed. The accreditation visit is an opportunity to show our best at MSU. The visitors will be interested in how the University operates in terms of planning and the Boldness by Design is a recent addition to the planning. International issues is an identified theme for the visit and six of the site visitors have expertise in this area which can provide opportunity for consultation.

Provost Wilcox reported on the continuing efforts of the Working Group on Undergraduate Education. The Provost, Professor Sticklen and Professor Youatt met with the group this week and had a good discussion regarding their work.

Chairperson’s Remarks:
Professor Sticklen reported the interaction with the Working Group on Undergraduate Education has been very productive. It is anticipated that the group will have a report within the next six weeks or so. The Faculty Voice Task Force groups are working very diligently at this time.

Athletics and Athletic Council Procedures:
Professor Sticklen invited Ron Mason, Athletic Director, Professor Kasavana, Athletic Council Chairperson and the President to join members around the table for discussion. Professor Sticklen commented that the intent of this meeting was to see how we could build stronger linkages if needed. Professor Kasavana asked the Athletic Council members present to introduce themselves and began with a response to the memorandum from ECAC giving the context for
the meeting and suggested questions for discussion. Professor Kasavana distributed the attached copy of the Athletic Council’s responses to the questions posed. There were various points that were discussed based on the presentation. When discussing a typical meeting format, the question was posed as to why the meetings were not open. Professor Kasavana pointed out that confidential items invariably come up unexpectedly related to students. There were some suggestions of considering scheduling a segment of the meeting as open. The issue of missed classes by athletes was discussed and the protocol that is to be followed according to the guidelines. The Athletic Director does have oversight for the decisions made related to the athletic schedules. The Council has no say over curricular matters. The President cautioned that UCC and others need to be sensitive to all students that have various kinds of conflicts and that athletes are not the only students with major conflicts. A question arose as to whether there are minutes of the Athletic Council meetings. There are minutes now posted on the web. A suggestion was made to include the AC minutes on the Academic Governance web site to be user friendly. The Athletic Council identified some major goals for the future and posed seven considerations in an attempt to meet these goals, listed on page 6 on the attached Athletic Council Responses to ECAC. The President posed two questions, is the structure working and if not what needs to be done to make it work better? Secondly, are there issues that require a different form of communication with the Academic Council? ECAC thanked all of the members for an informative session.

President’s Remarks:
President Simon will announce at the State of the University address that the Capital Campaign has passed the $1.1 billion dollar point. It is the nature of higher education today to need more resources. The President remains optimistic as the early report is that the Governor will recommend a 2% increase for higher education. The headlines were positive on the Federal budget announced yesterday and MSU is well positioned on the STEM disciplines. It was noted Michigan is in a difficult time and we face many challenges. A questioned was raised about a Multicultural Center on campus and the possibility of the Paloucci Building. President Simon reported the building is not habitable but suggested that one way to build a bridge between the city and campus would be to consider the Union Building. Most of the multicultural centers in the Big Ten have been done by private donations. There was some discussion about having an identified facility where faculty and graduate students could meet on a monthly basis.

Name Change for the Department of Audiology and Speech Sciences:
Professor Sticklen reported all of the Standing Committees, namely UCAP, UGC and UCSA, approved the request for a name change for the Department of Audiology and Speech Sciences to the Department of Communicative Sciences and Disorders. A motion passed to send the request to the Provost indicating no further action is needed.

UCSA Proposed Change to the Bylaws for Academic Governance:
Professor Allen, Chairperson of UCAG, reported approval of a proposed change to the Bylaws from UCSA. The proposed change is as follows:
3.2.4.1.2. All undergraduate representatives on University level Academic Governance, including, but not limited to Academic Council Standing Committees, Advisory Consultative Committees, the Executive Committee of Academic Council, and any and all ad hoc committees designated by Academic Governance, be selected by the student government, ASMSU.

A motion passed to send to this proposed Bylaw addition to Academic Council.

Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) U.S. Professor of the Year Award:
Professor Wright presented the proposed procedures for the membership of the review committee. A motion was passed to approve the procedure as a permanent procedure.

Reporting Path for Faculty Voice Task Force Groups:
Professor Sticklen clarified that the Faculty Voice Task Force groups will be reporting to the Faculty Council.

Reports from Standing Committees to Academic Council and Faculty Council:
Professor Sticklen requested that Standing Committees need to be reporting to Faculty Council and Academic Council on a regular basis. There are many issues that could be discussed and the time should be utilized. Professor Sticklen asked the Chairpersons to develop a top list of topics.

Election Practices and Possible Reform:
Professor Sticklen noted this was an issue identified earlier and that an election process is needed to allow the election of chairpersons of the Standing Committees by the end of the academic year. Professor Wright reminded members the issue was addressed the beginning of the year with a proposal to consider election of Chairpersons in August with terms running to August of next year. Members were not in favor of the idea. UCAG also discussed the problem and concluded the Provost’s support was needed when the initial letters went to units in November regarding the Governance elections. The Provost did include a letter in the materials. One reminder went out in January and the second will be going out this week. The Governance Office seems to be receiving a better response. It was suggested that information be gathered from each of the Standing Committees as to when the chairperson election occurs. A motion was passed to table further discussion until the next ECAC meeting on February 28, 2006.

Setting of Faculty Council agenda for February 14, 2006:
There were no agenda items for the Faculty Council meeting scheduled for February 14, 2006. A motion was passed to cancel the meeting.

Setting of Academic Council Agenda for February 21, 2006:
The agenda for Academic Council meeting on February 21, 2006 is as follows:

- University Committee on Curriculum Report – (Action Item)
Proposed Addition to the *Bylaws for Academic Governance* – (Action Item)

- Other Business

A motion passed to approve the agenda.

**Other Business:**
R. Murphy, Academic Assembly, presented a proposal, Bill 14-32, to support the creation of a Fall Break. A motion was passed to refer the proposal to UCAP, UCSA and UGC for consultation and response to ECAC no later than March 13, 2006.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline Wright
Secretary for Academic Governance

**Attachment:**

1. Athletic Council Responses to ECAC Inquiries
AC Responses to ECAC Inquiries

1. Are there any actions that have been taken by the Academic governance system that Athletic Council members wished they had known more about earlier or been more involved in?

No actions come to mind as the recent addition of a UCAP liaison to the Athletic Council (AC) has been effective in expanding communication. Since the liaison attends both AC and UCAP meetings, the presentation of concerns and questions from AC to UCAP and UCAP to AC is inherent in the current structure. The liaison link complements the extensive academic governance experience faculty and student representatives bring to AC. In addition, AC is an advisory committee that routinely interacts with university administrators knowledgeable about academic governance. While the stream of information might appear indirect, it is effective.

Part of what differentiate the AC from other committees or advisory councils is its dealings with internal and external constituent governance matters that uniquely involve faculty, staff, students, and alumni. Given that institutional requirements tend to evolve more slowly than external legislation, which by definition is more stringent, it is beneficial that AC members possess insight and intuition relative to academic governance issues. In addition, MSU has implemented an automated information system for monitoring student-athlete eligibility requirements (i.e., AthInfo links to Degree Navigator) and employs List Services to broadcast timely updates. From time to time, the AC also addresses referrals from the President, Vice President, Registrar, Provost, and others, as well as the Big Ten Conference, CCHA Conference, and NCAA. Suffice it to say that as relevant issues emerge within academic council, AC relies on its UCAP liaison, member knowledge, and information distribution technology to keep abreast of the academic governance system.

2. Are there issues where the Athletic Council would be better served if it were more intimately tied to the governance system (e.g., being aware of when there are major curricular changes or admissions or graduation requirements under consideration)?

While intimacy with the governance system can be accomplished through UCAP (or ECAC) liaison linkage, initial and continuing requirements governing student-athlete eligibility are established by the Big Ten Conference and NCAA (requirements more stringent than MSU). It is important to note that the Big Ten Conference has consistently been at the forefront of NCAA academic reform and strives to maintain its leadership role. While changes in admissions, curriculum, graduation, and related matters certainly can impact student-athlete eligibility, these items often are accompanied by advance notification and often are less stressful. In addition, on-campus student-athlete certification is handled at the college level by an assistant or associate dean and monitored through the Registrar's Office. Since the Student-Athlete Support Services (SASS) office reports directly to the Office of the Provost (dotted line relationship to athletics) contemplated changes to academic programming are typically anticipated and well implemented.

3. If so, do Athletic Council members have any suggestions of structural changes that might facilitate acquiring such knowledge or providing such input?

A major link between the AC and academic governance system was created nearly three years ago when a UCAP representative was added to AC membership. A recent AC Bylaw change formalized the appointment of the UCAP liaison as an ex officio member. This appointment provides enhanced (two-way) communications. From an AC perspective the UCAP representatives has been insightful, knowledgeable, and helpful. Perhaps a change in structure that renders the UCAP liaison part of ECAC would be appropriate.
4. From our end, we would like to hear Council members expound on how the Council operates.

Typical AC Meeting Format (7:30-9 a.m.)*

1. Guest coach and student-athlete – a head coach and student-athlete are invited to share perspective, philosophy, support services, recruiting, academic concerns, and related topics. AC discussion follows the presentations. The coach and student depart the meeting following their participation. [15 minutes]

2. Invited guest presentation – upon request of AC members or agenda topic, special guests are invited to give a focused presentation (e.g. sports medicine staff, business office staff, compliance services staff, support services staff, sports marketing staff, athletic facilities staff, ticket office staff, public safety staff, university administrators, legal counsel, etc.). Guests depart the meeting following their participation. [15 minutes]

3. Sub-committee reports – AC has four subcommittees; three are entirely AC members and one is a hybrid. Subcommittees: 1- Academic and Compliance Services (Chair: Campa); 2- Planning and Equity (Chair: Garety); 3- Communications and Operations (Chair: Gagliano); and 4- Drug Education and Testing Committee (Chair: Maleczka). Each subcommittee determines its own agenda, selects its own Chair (except DETC), and is staffed by athletic department liaisons. Action items emanate from the subcommittees. The Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) and Athletic Director (AD) are not assigned to any subcommittee but serve as ‘by invitation only’ resources. [15-20 minutes]

4. Athletic director (AD) report – the AD presents a report covering policies, legislative items, strategic planning, compliance matters, facility issues, event management, and other items of importance. Discussion follows. [15 minutes]

5. Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) report – the FAR reports on items from the Big Ten and CCHA Conferences, NCAA, SAAC, university administration, and other relevant items (e.g. equity, welfare, compliance, and academic matters). [15 minutes]

6. Around the table – each meeting ends with an open discussion on any topic addressed to any AC member; an opportunity for items of choice. [15 minutes]

*Note: Each meeting has a projected focus:
- September – academic support services
- October – budget and strategic planning
- November – student-athlete welfare
- January – athletic development fund
- February – marketing and public relations
- April – facilities and security
- May – athletic compliance

Urgent matters, pending issues, policy discussions, special interest areas, legislative proposals, special guests, or other issues may result in deviation from the above.

5. Who sets the agenda for Athletic Council meetings?

The majority of agenda items emanate from the four subcommittees of AC as well as the UCAP liaison, referral from university administrators, SAAC (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee), SASS, athletic compliance services, Big Ten, CCHA, or NCAA, as well as the FAR or AD. The agenda always includes an “Around the Table” open dialogue that encourages all AC members to discuss items of their choosing. Faculty members are especially encouraged to place items on the agenda of the various subcommittees, as well as the full AC meetings. The AC Chair distributes an agenda one-week prior to each AC meeting.

Note: subcommittee meeting agendas are determined entirely by the subcommittee.
6. Can you provide some examples of student or faculty concerns brought to the Council by members of the Council and how those issues were addressed?

Three examples of concern from student AC members...

1- Student FB Ticket Distribution – a change in the distribution of student game day football tickets involved an electronic scanning system by the athletic ticket office. Student unrest led to discussion at the AC level which in turn resulted in adoption of a resolution enabling MSU students to transfer purchased tickets to other MSU students. The system, originally slated as a one-season test, was modified at mid-season.

2- Missed Class Excused Absence – student-athletes sought relief for missed classes as “official excused absences” when representing the university in intercollegiate athletics. The AC and SASS staff worked to create guidelines for student-athletes that involved early semester notification to professors and an official letter documenting potential scheduling conflicts. Note: currently a Big Ten SAAC proposal is being circulated to Provosts in hopes of establishing uniformity in application across conference institutions.

3- Confidentiality of Student-Athlete Information – student-athlete rights to privacy emerged as a critical topic as numerous harassment situations were reported to SAAC in Fall 2005. AC research led to suppression of published personal information (including local address) through completion of an authorization form available through the Registrar’s Office and now administered during a team’s orientation session.

Four examples of concern from faculty AC members...

1- AC Rules Education – faculty member request to learn of NCAA legislation applicable to AC members and dealings with student-athletes, prospective student-athletes, and sports boosters. Session recently conducted by Director of Compliance Services.

2 – Exit Interview Survey Instrument – the athletic department conducts end of season surveys of all student-athletes in even numbered years and seniors only in odd numbered years. The survey instrument contains 68 questions, in a variety of areas and was jointly created by AC faculty and athletic department staff. Findings are presented annually to AC.

3- Missed Class Guidelines – AC guidelines limiting missed class time are applied to sports schedules. Coach and sport administrator sign an AC developed form stipulating conformity to AC guidelines. Exceptions are rare -- except for sports scheduled beyond the institution’s control.

4 – Ticket Pricing Proposal – on February 1, 2006 the faculty members on the Communications and Operations subcommittee expressed concern with some particulars of a proposed increase in men’s basketball ticket pricing for the 2006-2007 season. It was agreed to defer a recommendation to the full AC until additional information is reviewed.

7. Does the Council or its subcommittees hold hearings or open meetings attended by non-members?

No, except on rare occasion (see #8 below). The AC is advisory and a university opinion specified that the AC is NOT subject to open meeting guidelines. Unless invited as a guest, no non-AC members are allowed to attend meetings of the AC or its subcommittees. Most discussions include confidential, sensitive, and/or proprietary student or personnel information that must be protected.

8. If so, can you give us some examples of those and how they worked or didn’t work?

Summary of Three Open Meeting Events...
1. Continuation of Varsity Sports Status – AC Open Forum -- an open forum took place prior to the AC formulating a recommendation relative to the continuation of select varsity sports teams. The meeting was held at the MSU Agriculture and Livestock Pavilion and was well attended but emotional/confrontational. Session lasted five hours.

2. NCAA Athletic Certification Legislation – AC Open Forum – public discussion of pending implementation of 10-year cyclical program of accreditation. Conducted at the Kellogg Center; sparse attendance. [MSU completed its second cycle certification review.]


9. How often does the Athletic Council actually meet?

The AC meets in-person each month of the regular academic year except for the month of March (March Madness) and additionally as necessary. December meeting times fluctuate given the academic calendar and potential conflicts with student and faculty commitments. Despite the fact recent experimentation with electronic forums/discussions and balloting have proven effective, the preferred mode remains face-to-face. The number of regular AC meetings average 7-8 per academic year.

AC subcommittees meet independent of regular AC meetings and average 4-6 times per academic year; except the DETC which meets more frequently.

10. How good is attendance from the various constituents?

Attendance at regular AC meetings and subcommittee meetings is exceptionally strong. All constituents have outstanding attendance records.

11. How often are extra sessions held?

Extra sessions are conducted as needed based on the urgency of issues (e.g. drug education and testing policies, athletic certification, gender and minority equity metrics, facilities enhancement, budget revisions, personnel matters, sports programming, etc.).

12. Are issues handled by votes or does consensus reign?

Voting is conducted on action items (ex officio members are non-voting) emanating from AC subcommittees. In general, a subcommittee recommends its position to the full AC and voting follows discussion. Fourteen of nineteen AC members are empowered with vote. Interestingly, the views and votes cast do not always fall into faculty/student/alumni categories.

13. How do the views of faculty, students and alumni differ on the various issues taken by the Council? Can you give us some examples?

Note: faculty nominations are managed by the Office of Academic Governance, student nominations by the appropriate sponsorship authority, and alumni nominations by the Alumni Association. All appointments are by the MSU President.

Faculty (8) – focus tends to center on academic impact, strategic planning, and compliance matters (e.g. gender equity, minority equity, student-athlete wellness, roster management, recruiting, fiscal integrity, budgeting, marketing, public relations, ticket pricing and distribution, goal setting, accessibility issues, university mission, support services, academic reform, student-athlete surveys).
Current faculty appointments:
- Prof. Connie Currier (Nursing)
- Prof. Henry (Rique) Campa (Fisheries and Wildlife)
- Prof. George Eyster (Veterinary Medicine)
- Prof. Fayyaz Hussain (Social Science)
- Prof. Robert Maleczka (Chemistry)
- Prof. Mary Noel (Family Practice)
- Prof. Harold Sollenberger (Accounting/Information Systems)
- Prof. Frederick (Ted) Tims (Music)

Student representatives (3)—various constituencies (ASMSU, COGS, and SAAC) with basic focus on welfare and equitable treatment issues (e.g. fairness of treatment across sports, ticket distribution policies, roster management, scheduling conflicts, missed class time, disciplinary guidelines, team rules, drug testing, compliance, etc.).

Current student appointments:
- Ms. Elizabeth Shimek, WBB, SAAC; All Big Ten Academic/All Big Ten Athletic
- Mr. Eric Hinojosa, ASMSU, Political Science Major
- Ms. Kimberly Yake, COGS, Mathematics Ph.D. Candidate

Alumni representatives (3) -- various constituencies (two alumni at large and one former student-athlete) tend to favor issues related to recruiting, retention, facilities, public relations, graduation requirements, team leadership, coaching leadership, quality of coaching, and departmental operational issues (e.g. overall athletic program image, staffing issues, progress toward degree, academic requirements, retention, etc.).

Current alumni appointments:
- Dr. Elizabeth Turpin, Principal, Forest View Elementary School, Lansing
- Ms. Joan Garety, Business Executive, Former VP Treasurer, Meijer, Grand Rapids
- Mr. John Breslin, Business Executive, Corporate Management, Grand Rapids

14. What roles are played by the various ex-officio members?

Ex officio members (5) -- Serve as AC resources.

Athletic Director — brings issues of policy management, financial management, human resource management, marketing management, public relations management, ticket management, event management, and strategic planning to AC for discussion and consultation. Items might include scheduling, playing/practice seasons, facility maintenance and expansion, safety and security, parking, fund raising, revenue management, operational expenditures, organizational staffing, tuition increases, and role of athletics in the institutional mission. AD is Ronald Mason -- former MSU Ice Hockey Coach; master’s degree and honorary Ph.D.

Executive Director of Alumni Association — brings matters related to student spirit sections, pre- and post-game alumni receptions, post-season activities, public relations, Student Alumni Foundation, strategic planning, and related items. Serves as Secretary of AC. Representative is Keith Williams, Ph.D. -- Executive Director of MSU Alumni Association; MSU Executive Officer and member of MSU President’s Core Group.

Representative of VP Finance and Operations — discusses matters of facilities, security, parking, policing, marketing, strategic planning, budgeting, and operational issues in support of various constituencies, event venues, and neighboring areas. Provides central administration perspective of overall intercollegiate athletics program, proposed legislation, and public relations developments. Representative is Charles Gagliano -- Assistant Vice President University Housing and Food Services.

Faculty Athletic Representative — provides informational and educational materials from conferences and national associations related to all aspects of the athletic program (e.g. financial
challenges, academic performance, graduation success rates, student-athlete wellness, comparative statistics, legislative items, etc.). Representative is Michael Kasavana, Ph.D. -- NAMA Endowed Professor in Hospitality Business.

**UCAP Liaison** -- provides unique insight on matters germane to the university’s academic program as well as student-athlete welfare and student life issues. Attends both AC and UCAP meetings and communicates concerns and questions from AC directly to the policy committee of academic governance, and vice versa. UCAP liaison is Dennis Banks, Ph.D. -- Professor, Animal Science.

**15. Goals** — *We hope to jointly figure out a way for better ongoing communication between the Athletic Council and the Governance system. We hope to ascertain ways for greater student and faculty input in the academic aspects of intercollegiate athletics (perhaps through some sort of periodic public forums or Athletic Council representation on the ECAC or Academic Council).*

Seven considerations:

1. Produce a semester [AC Faculty Newsletter] summarizing discussions/activities;
2. Expand [UCAP liaison] role on ECAC to enhance communication;
3. Explore **alternative presentation format** of annual AC report to academic council;
4. Sponsor **one forum** each academic year on an academic-athletic issue;
5. Promote **awareness of the AC website**; consider creative hyperlinks (ECAC).
6. Link AC website to athletic department websites.
7. Annual **Student-Athlete Advisory Committee** presentation to academic council.

Thank you for this opportunity.