

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting

March 19, 2014

*Submitted by Senate Secretary, Catherine Seta, Professor of Psychology
Prepared by Amalia Wagner and Catherine Seta, Ph.D.*

Caveat: Comments recorded are not necessarily verbatim. In addition, the identity of most senators making comments or questions are not recorded, in order to facilitate open discussion. The identity of comments from Senate Officers and Senate Ad Hoc and Standing Committee Chairs are given, as is the identity of persons commenting in their official administrative capacity (e.g., CFO, Provost and College Dean.)

NOTE: SEE ADDENDUM FOR ADDITIONAL REPORTS

In attendance: Umit Akinc, Edward Allen, Sarah Bodin, Daniel Bourland, Kevin Cox, Carol Cramer, Jacquelyn Fetrow, Will Fleeson, Samuel Gladding, Michael Hughes, Leslie Kammire, Hank Kennedy, Rogan Kersh, Linda McPhail, Hof Milam, James Parker, James Schirillo, Peter Siavelis, Gale Sigal, Michelle Steward, Lynn Sutton, Mark Welker

Welcome from President Hank Kennedy (4:00 pm)

Professor Hank Kennedy deferred the approval of the minutes from the previous meeting on February 19, 2014 due to Cathy Seta's absence.

Hank announced and encouraged everyone to attend Provost Kersh's annual address to the faculty. At the invitation of the Faculty Senate, this will take place on Wednesday, March 26 at 4:00 p.m. in Pugh Auditorium.

Report from Faculty Senate BOT Representatives:

Administration Committee: Professor Mike Green reported on the recent Board of Trustees meeting held in February. The primary responsibility of this committee is operations throughout the university, which are related to Human Resources, Facilities, and Capitol Projects. Below are highlights from the meeting:

- Human Resources now has a system in place to prevent errors from recurring on retirement accounts. All of the accounts have been corrected. Internal audits have been done and will continue on a regular basis.
- HES is moving to the law school. Also a lot of movement between Reynolds Gym and the Miller Center.
- Discussed the issue surrounding the older dorms that have serious mold issues. Still trying to determine how to solve this problem on a permanent basis. Conflicting concerns between safety of students and costs.

Q & A followed:

Comment: (CFO Milam) The perfect solution is very expensive so we are trying to explore avenues that are more economical. Within the last year, we spent 2 million dollars in mold remediation by going into the dorms and doing things that will take care of the problem for a

while but it is not seen as a long-term solution. We think we have the health concerns taken care for the moment. Additionally, we are getting different opinions from the Trustees. One committee says hurry up and do something, and another says, this is so big slow down and make sure you make the right decision.

Q: What is the long term solution.... to tear down the buildings?

A: (CFO Milam) The problem is that we cannot control the humidity within the building, they were not planned to have air-conditioning. Fan coil units were installed and bring in a lot of cold air into the room and we have no way of controlling the moisture that comes into the building. You get warm moist air, you get the cold air from the fan coil unit, and it creates condensation. Additionally, there are other issues with the building being sixty years old along with problems with gutters and drainage away from the building. There are other things that contribute to this but primarily we can't control the relative humidity in the building. Certainly, if we were to tear down and replace we can take care of that but it is a very expensive way to go. Short of that, we need to figure out how to condition the air going into the building. Because the rooms are so small, it is hard to put anything in the rooms themselves. Trying to figure out how we could install some ductwork into the attic. We have our normal team that works on our residence halls and some experts from a firm in Chicago looking at solutions.

Athletic Committee: Associate Professor Nina Lucas was not present at the meeting but provided the written report below from the BOT meeting on January 30, 2014

Associate Professor Nina Lucas met with the Board of Trustees Committee on Athletics on January 30, 2014. The meeting was held in Charlotte, NC, Wake Forest University Center. Chair Dr. L. Bisette handed out a copy of the Athletic Committee Charter for the members to review. Bisette will set up conference call to discuss at a later date. Hope to have them set before the April meeting.

Agenda

- **Academics** – Ron Wellman reported that is has been a good year and strong semester and will send a complete report on Academics. We lost 4 athletes in Football who were disqualified academically and were removed from school.
- **Competitive Review** – Wellman gave a handout report on the Division I final fall standings – Wake Ranks 27th – not so high in the Fall because we only have two sports, but we have a good chance at the Directors' cup.
- **Football Staff** – Coach Dave Clawson was able to bring in some of his staff and keep two of our coaches Warren B and Derrick Jackson.
- **University Proposal** – basically there are no changes; they will be submitting a proposal on Admission process in preparation they have been looking at other comparable institutions and their admission process; most institutions follow the NCAA guidelines for admission; Wake currently is not using those guidelines; most institutions are doing well academically with their athletes.
- **Capitol Campaign** – the Campaign is going well ...pledges are coming in.
- **Sports Performance Center** – PPT
 - Wellman presented a comprehensive and detailed powerpoint presentation which included comparisons of other institution's training facilities in terms of square footage to Wake who currently has the lowest 7,000 compared to other

institutions who have 29, 000 square feet which reflects the need for a Sports Performance Center. Additional slides included the 4 Story Strength Building – located next to Miller Center, 100 yard Indoor Practice Field (prefers 120 yards) located next to Strength Building, views of the main entrance to the new facility and slides of each floor within the Strength building. Discussion covered the relocation of weight and lockers rooms and sports medicine. Wellman and the Board are sensitive to the needs of the students, faculty and staff who were reassured that to know that the entire process needs to happen in phases, and in order to renovated Reynolds Gym for the Wellness Center breaking ground would have to begin first for the SPC in order to have place to move the current programs from Reynolds Gym. Wellman hopes to break ground in the Spring 2014 and anticipates the process would take 2 years.

Senate Committee Updates:

Sexual Harassment Policy: Professor Mike Green gave some background information about the history and formation of this policy. This has been a rather lengthy process and the faculty senate has felt some frustration due to the time it has taken to develop a written policy. The first draft of the policy was shared with the executive committee in January 2013. Views from the executive committee have been taken seriously, there has been extensive dialogue between the executive committee, and with general counsel's office regarding this policy. Most recently, the ad hoc SJ policy committee of the senate and the senate EXCOM worked through the second draft. The EXCOM met with Dina Marty last month and are in agreement with everything except two items, one of which may have been resolved. These are the two points of disagreement:

1. Whether there should be a statute of limitations in the policy. This limitation would prevent stale claims against an alleged violator. There are concerns on the part of the legal office that the students may be reluctant to come forward. The EXCOM is concerned that the faculty may not have adequate basis for defending against stale claims given an unlimited time for bringing such claims. This issue has yet to be resolved.
2. Students may bring claims of sexual harassment against a faculty member for classroom activities that may be perceived by students in the class as harassing, and which fall under the definition of sexual harassment in the policy. The plan for resolving these complaints is to have a student, an administrator, and a faculty member be members of a panel addressing such claims. There was concern that a panel of three would not be the right mix of people to decide if the faculty member's activity was legitimate pedagogy even if students were uncomfortable with it. Professor Green believes that where we are now is proposing a five person panel. If the harassment stemmed from something that occurred in class, the panel would be expanded to insure a majority of faculty members (i.e., three faculty members.) The other two would be either a student and an administrator or two students with an *ex officio* administrator participating but not voting.

There will be a third draft, which will come to the faculty senate for approval. Additionally, it will require BOT's approval before it becomes a policy.

Senior Appointments: Professor Umit Akinc is serving on the search committee looking for a new Dean for the School of Business. The committee has met on several occasions and is working with a consultant. They have prepared a prospectus and it has been published in numerous places. The committee is waiting to get the nominations, applications, and recommendations from the consultant. The committee hopes to fill the position by July 2014.

Professor Mike Hughes mentioned that the main task of the Senior Appointments Committee is to confirm honorary degree nominees; unfortunately, we just received them this morning at 12:11p.m.

Q: (HK) Do you think it would be appropriate for us to comment on the short time period given to consider these candidates?

A: (Mike Hughes) Yes, I know we worked with the Provost to speed up the process last year and it still seems to be lagging.

Comment: (Provost Kersh) Each individual school nominates their own honorary degree candidate and we tend to wait until we have a full slate before submitting them. We did start earlier but it is difficult to obtain all of the necessary information sooner since the recipients must be able to attend graduation. I will urge the schools to expedite their submissions next year.

University Integration: Professor Dan Bourland reported that he would like to submit a report prior to July 2014. Overall, Professor Bourland feels the committee has been successful in removing barriers toward campus integration, although there have been as still are remaining challenges, including leadership changes.

Resources: Professor Jim Cotter mentioned the three primary topics the Resources Committee focused on this year.

- Investment Strategy
- OPCD
- Financial discussions around major capitol decisions

Professor Cotter will provide a more detailed report on the committee's accomplishments.

Tenure and Promotion policies of medical school: Professor Hank Kennedy reported that there has been continued activity and meetings regarding this topic. The goal is to have a formal resolution to the Senate by May.

Professor Dan Bourland mentioned that there is a FRC meeting tomorrow. Several policies coming to the committee for review during this meeting.

Fringe Benefits: Professor Peter Siavelis not present to report.

There were several questions and comments regarding Fringe Benefits:

Comment: Fringe benefits were discussed at length at the last SAC meeting and concerns along similar lines with the senate were raised. The Benefits department is scheduled to make a presentation at the next SAC meeting on March 25, 2014.

Comment: (CFO Milam) Human Resources has done a lot of work on benefits and spent a significant amount of time doing an in depth analysis of our medical plan. HR is close to sending the joint Fringe Benefits Committee a letter with the changes. We looked hard at our goal, not as large as we previously thought. We are going to be looking at dependent eligibility, which could save us approximately \$200,000 by carrying out an audit. We are willing to put the reserve at risk hoping to achieve that number. By not placing as much weight on last years' experience, we have closed the gap by about \$300,000. We will need to increase premiums along with some changes to deductibles and out of pocket max. I do not know the details on those but once finalized we will let the Fringe Benefits Committee know and their co-chairs can report to their respective areas.

Comment (HK) I think we have made progress on this and it has been an important discussion we have had on this issue. I know at times the discussion becomes contentious but that is the nature of people disagreeing.

Comment: (CFO Milam) If I could add to that, even though the changes will still be significant in those areas I mentioned. What we have done is taken those changes and looked at them against other plans from schools that have formal resources and we compare very favorably against them.

Q: (Mark Wellker) Do other schools that self-insure keep a reserve and roll it over from year to year. That account had been in the black for years and years.

A: (CFO Milam) I do not know exactly what other schools do. At the school I previously worked at, it fluctuated some years we went into the reserves, other years we had a surplus. We have enough surplus now to gamble on some of the things I talked about.

Q: It seems like part of what you want to do is not deal with this again. If you have a year where ten people have a terminal illness and a typical year is two. It seems you have to deal with those through a reserve mechanism and as other things change in the health care system, you deal with those via a premium increase. How do you disconnect those two, so you do not face it again?

A: (CFO Milam) The only way to insure that we do not face it again is to have an ample reserve.

Q: Do other universities go to the universities' reserves rather than a specific health care reserve?

A: (CFO Milam) It is probably a mixed bag. Most universities set aside a reserve for it and we do. However, I cannot guarantee that we will not run into that problem again unless we set up a very ample reserve. We are putting a little more at risk this year in order to keep the changes in the premium to a modest increase.

Q: (HK) The reserves are made up of money paid by the subscribers. What is the size of this reserve?

A: (CFO Milam) Maybe one million for the benefits reserve account, not sure the exact amount at this moment.

Q: When you send the letter, will we still have time to make suggestions, or is it at the end of the process?

A: (CFO Milam) It will be at the end, we presented the opportunity for that. We did get good input from the SAC. For the most part, I will be surprised if you are going to have problems with the changes. There was a lot of give and take and we did listen to the comments people had here. Time moves on when you have to make changes.

Q: Do reserves build up or must they be spent in the year that they are earned?

A: (CFO Milam) The reserves fluctuate, we would not let it build up too much. That would mean we were charging people more than we should. You want a reserve that you feel comfortable carrying you through the rough spots. But you do not want to over reserve. I am sure we will not be over reserved by any substantial amount next year.

Committee of Collegiate Senators: Professor Ed Allen handed out a draft report regarding college enrollment increases (Addendum A). Ed noted that this might be to college centric. In the event that WFU decides to increase student enrollment as a solution to generate additional revenue this committee wants to take a proactive approach instead of a reactive approach. This report addresses the items that the committee would like included in the next model. Below are some of the topics addressed:

- Resources to hire enough faculty to maintain optimal class sizes
- Identify the number of additional staff required to support the increased enrollment
- Is enough money set aside for competitive salaries and benefits?
- The relationship between the college and athletics needs to be explored

Please feel free to provide Ed with any additional input for the report. The committee plans to present a formal request to the Faculty Senate, then send to the college faculty, and ask the Dean to make a presentation to the college faculty about her staffing model.

Will Fleeson and Ed, in conjunction with the collegiate senators, have been working on the second report, which is about tenure and teaching professionals. In particular, the teaching

professional model that we are currently implementing does not satisfy the AAUP guidelines. The question is we as faculty ought to talk about that and try to see what are the issues, what are the benefits and detriments of the model we are heading towards. This will be a good discussion after we have a presentation by Dean Fetrow about faculty staffing model. What are these positions, what are the goals of these positions, what is the best way to protect the individuals in these positions? What is the possible problem about going away from AAUP guidelines? What we are looking for in both reports is trying to set up a discussion that the faculty can have in a proactive manner. The issue with the teaching professionals is in some respects that it is a bad assumption that the president of the university is always going to come from a liberal arts background. At some point, the president might come from a medical school background or business school where the cultures are very different. It might be helpful for us to be proactive and not wait for a problem to be introduced and ask why we have two different types of permanent faculty.

Q: What type of different culture are you envisioning?

A: For example at the medical school, tenure as it has been described to me has been a series of three to five year contracts. This last year at the medical school, some faculty received 20% pay cuts. The administration was attempting to dismiss them even though they had tenure. Regarding the business school, they have professor of practice on three to five year contracts who may not be tenured. There are quite a few of those positions in the business school, more than we would want in the college faculty in terms of percentages. We are trying to make sure that we protect the meaning of tenure in the college.

Comment: I think Dean Fetrow is on our side with these issues, not adversarial.

Comment: I think there is a linkage between these two issues. The number of students that have been admitted have not correspondingly been met by increased faculty size. I think there is some linkage between the idea of having teaching professionals who would be paid less than those on a normal tenure track would. That might be a way to cover some of the short falls that exist. I think we are under staffed in terms of faculty and that has happened at the same time that there has been a significant increase in non-faculty staff.

Comment: (Dean Fetrow) I want to dispel some of the rumors. First, with student enrollment growth the college has increased the number of faculty. Are we still short staffed? That is an issue Ed and I have been discussing, it depends upon what your goals are for class sizes. We have not increased the number of contingent faculty over the last five years, during the time I have been Dean. In my opinion, we have followed AAUP guidelines, which express inclusivity and rights for contingent faculty. What we had in the college when I became Dean was 20% of our faculty were visiting faculty. That means they had one year contracts, their salary was \$45,000 and sometimes as low as \$40,000 a year, they never got merit and they were done at the end of four years. They would come in with a series of one year appointments and move on.

Some of those faculty expressed interest in clearly staying and were qualified. I feel what we have done with these faculty appointments is make a real career path and given them rights of a faculty member. So they have three levels of regular career path, they have longer contract as they move up the career levels and have expectations set for them and most importantly part of the merit pool and protected with the rights and academic freedom of faculty. They do have a higher teaching load; they have chosen this career path and are quite happy not to have the scholarly activity imposed on them. When you say that we have more contingent faculty than we did five years ago that is not correct. If you include all visitors and all career teaching professionals from earlier until now it is about the same. We have shifted from the one year visiting appointments to giving people permanent career positions.

Comment: (Ed) I agree with Dean Fetrow on that point and what she has done is a market improvement. My issue is that we need to have a discussion about what this means long term if we were to have a president from a different culture. What is it that we can do long term to protect that we have a consistent message.

Comment: (Dean Fetrow) Ed you and I have talked about this and I totally agree with that. Right now, the academic planning model says that 75% or 80% of the faculty should be on the tenure track. We want to make sure that we are in agreement across the institution and have common goals on that.

Q: I think that is the issue and where the slipperiness is. It is not just a matter of somebody coming in and being draconian. We are going to have some of these professionals most likely and the question is what percentage? Is it going to be 10% or 90% and right now, we are not able to keep to our 10% goal that we have all agree to. If we can't agree to stick to the current goal of 10% when we are in favorable situations, then what is going to happen when we have slightly unfavorable situations?

A: (Dean Fetrow) I think we have kept to the goal that is in the academic planning model that I presented to some of the faculty groups four years ago. I have very specifically kept to that goal.

Comment: Ok, then maybe those numbers are something different from our meeting but maybe we can discuss this later.

Comment: (HK) One thing that has happened is student faculty ratio has increased from 11-1 up to 13-1. Particularly if you include that the Arts and Science faculty teaches the graduate students as well. This is an environmental issue. Teaching load has gone up. We are all on the same page that we need more faculty.

Best Practices in Faculty-Board of Trustees Communication (Addendum B, see attached):

HK discussed the article from AAUP, Faculty Communication with Governing Boards: Best Practices. Hank pointed out that there was a report in 2009 by the Association of Governing Boards and what they did was look at the relationship with faculty and governing boards in a

broad way. They make recommendations to increase the interaction between the faculty and the governing boards. Perhaps WFU is a little less proactive than a large number of other institutions involved. Professor Kennedy shared the three recommendations in the report:

1. Every standing committee of the governing board, including the executive committee, should include a faculty representative.
2. New faculty representatives to the governing board should participate in orientation for new trustees.
3. Direct communication between the faculty and the governing board should occur through a liaison or conference committee consisting only of faculty members and trustees and meeting regularly to discuss topics of mutual interest.

The later point is something the senate is in a position to consider. To establish some kind of mechanism in which there would be a more direct regular kind of communication from faculty members elected by the faculty and trustees directly. I think it is something we should begin to consider.

Comment: (Provost Kersh) Thanks for providing this article. A couple of observations, one there is a wonderful cache of old WFU newsletters on the website. It is interesting to look back and when you go back 12 years, there was no interconnection between the Senate or the Faculty and the BOT. It was ten or so years ago that we created these faculty representatives on the standing committees. There was a period of a couple years where the faculty representatives and the trustees meet directly unmediated. The newsletter says this practice seized at the request of the faculty. You should imagine what might come from this type of exchange. It is also the case, that until this year we did not have regular reports at Senate meetings from the representatives. Secondly, we do include the faculty representatives in new Trustees orientation.

Report on Annual Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA):

Jane Albrecht went over COIA's revised Mission Statement and gave a report to the membership regarding the Steering Committee of COIA and a summary of the annual COIA meeting (both are included below). A complete report to the membership from the steering committee of COIA is attached (Addendum C) and complete report on the COIA 2014 annual meeting is also attached (Addendum D).

Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics Mission Statement

The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) is an organization representing elected faculty governance bodies of FBS universities in activities related to the administration and governance of intercollegiate athletics.

COIA's mission is to promote the academic integrity of our universities, and to represent the interests of our faculties, non-athlete students and student-athletes in matters related to

college sports that can significantly affect the health, sustainability and educational missions of our institutions.

COIA aims to accomplish these goals by assisting the governance of intercollegiate athletics on our campuses through data collection, information sharing, and the development of best practices, partnering with peer-faculty and other organizations in areas of common interest, and also by providing a constructive, responsible and informed representative faculty voice at the conference and national (NCAA) levels.

Report to the Membership
The Steering Committee of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics
March 2014
Executive Summary

The context of college sports, 2013-14. The past year saw an abrupt rise in pressures for professionalization, especially of the revenue sports, and increasing dissatisfaction with the NCAA. The ongoing O'Bannon lawsuit, rising revenues from media contracts, and continued questions about NCAA enforcement procedures have generated increased public demand that athletes share in revenues, and an attempt to form a unionized team was initiated. The largest conferences pushed for autonomy to respond to these pressures, leading the NCAA to pivot from its decentralization focus to a Division I restructuring initiative. COIA and FAR groups responded by lobbying for a greater faculty role in the NCAA, to strengthen the priority of academic values in decisions and sustain the collegiate model against pressure to professionalize.

The Coalition in 2013-14. After early efforts to advocate its plan for increasing faculty engagement at campus and conference levels in response to the NCAA's decentralization plan, COIA shifted focus to raising faculty presence in NCAA decision making, once the D1 restructuring process began. On both issues, the Coalition has worked to partner with FAR groups to increase faculty leverage, and COIA has had a seat at the table in NCAA meetings held on restructuring. The Coalition also began a partnership with the NCAA to learn more about campus approaches to concussion-related issues, promote information sharing, and raise faculty awareness.

Faculty engagement. COIA's proposal for increasing campus and conference faculty engagement met with mixed response: neither the NCAA nor 1A FARs backed an approach requiring campuses to support faculty senate engagement. Reactions of individual senates and campuses varied widely, but the general goals of the proposal did have broad support, and COIA's effort moving forward will be to assist senates interested in using the plan as a model.

The 2014 national meeting. The major topics of the national meeting were the faculty role in NCAA D1 restructuring, the viability of plans to bring athletics spending and pressures for professionalization under control through an antitrust exemption protecting the collegiate model, the NCAA's view of the COIA concussion survey preliminary findings, and the impact of academic fraud scandals.

Leadership changes. The Coalition has shifted, on an ad hoc basis, from a co-chair leadership model to a structure involving a single chair and a supporting three-person leadership group. In addition to its Steering Committee, the COIA leadership plans to strengthen the engagement of continuing COIA representatives appointed by its 62 member senates.

Preliminary agenda, 2014-15. The major focus of COIA for the next six months will be partnering with FAR groups to enlarge the faculty voice within the NCAA. Building faculty capacity on athletics issues in campus senates through implementation of the faculty engagement model will complement this effort to raise the faculty profile. Completing the concussion survey and creating an informational online resource will be a priority over the next three months, and COIA will explore possible areas of expanding this partnership with the NCAA. In partnership with the NCAA Research Division, a subcommittee on athletics governance will survey current campus practices.

Report on the COIA 2014 Annual Meeting
February 28 – March 2, University of South Florida
Executive Summary

This year's annual COIA meeting included five major topic sessions, followed by the Coalition's regular business meeting.

Academic integrity. Bob Malekoff, a member of the commission that investigated academic fraud at UNC, reflected on the lessons to draw from the case. Lack of clear accountability, or "ownership," in college sports, failure of faculties to take responsibility for monitoring faculty conduct, and lack of financial transparency in athletics are key problems that must be addressed.

NCAA restructuring. Jean Frankel, who is facilitating the NCAA D1 restructuring process, provided an overview of the goals and history of the restructuring process. Organizational goals include moving NCAA legislation from a constituency-based to a knowledge-based process, and clarifying accountability. A focus on basic questions of mission and governance principles has been added. The restructuring initiative was prompted by pressures from the Big 5 conferences for greater autonomy, itself a response to growing public pressure to professionalize some or all college sports. Discussion focused on the role that faculty should play in a restructured NCAA, including expanding faculty influence, both FARs elected senates representatives, since strong operational pressures for success on the field and revenue generation that shape athletics require strong faculty advocacy of academic values as essential to decision making in collegiate model.

Concussions. NCAA Chief Medical Officer Dr. Brian Hainline provided an overview of issues related to sports concussions and student-athlete health, and of essential features of concussion-related policies and management. Dr. Hainline analyzed in detail the preliminary findings of the COIA concussion survey. The results indicate that schools have generally instituted careful concussion-related protocols and have well informed policies in place. Areas with room for improvement include baseline testing instruments, coach education, and return-to-classroom protocols, suggesting ways to improve NCAA best practice guides.

Athletics finances. Amy Perko, Executive Director of the Knight Commission, presented data showing that athletics budgets were growing much faster than academic spending, on a per student/student-athlete basis. While enhanced media contracts allow a few programs to operate athletics programs in the black, almost all rely on subsidies from general funds and student fees. For a few conferences, media contracts will generate enormous new revenues in coming years, but schools seem already to have designated this money for enlarged athletics expenditures.

Antitrust issues. Allen Sack and Gerald Gurney of the Drake Group leadership presented a draft of the College Athlete Protection (CAP) Act, for which sponsors are being recruited in the US Senate. The Act would provide the NCAA with an antitrust exemption, and details a regime that would ensure future NCAA regulation in accord with the academic priorities of higher education. Discussion focused on the practicality of the Act's design.

COIA business session. Leadership for 2014-15 was confirmed. A plan to work on implementing the Coalition's faculty engagement blueprint on individual campuses was endorsed. A decision was made to undertake a study of current campus athletics governance practices, in partnership with the NCAA research division. A new mission statement for the Coalition was approved.

Q & A session followed:

Q: Does COIA have an opinion about unions?

A: (Jane Albreicht) COIA is against unions.

Q: (HK) Was there any discussion about the individual liability that universities have regarding concussions?

A: (Jane Albreicht) That question was added late to the survey. That will be followed up on and applies mostly to private schools.

Q: (Michael Hughes) I guess I'm somewhat of a cynic whenever I see something that says the College Athlete Protection Act I assume it is not about protecting college athletes. Are we to take serious the regime that would ensure future NCAA regulation in accordance with academic priorities?

A: (Jane Albreicht) I know it is hard to imagine turning this over to the US Congress.

Q: Do you have any sense of why NCAA changed their direction about faculty involvement?

A: (Jane Albreicht) I honestly do not know. The NCAA dominated our meeting last year and stressed faculty engagement but they retrenched this year. Our own President Hatch is driving this. I do not know why they changed course.

Q: Do you think there is any connection between a formal antitrust exemption and the idea of setting some kind of guidelines of expenditures.

A: (Jane Albreicht) The antitrust exemption would allow universities to cap salaries for coaches. That is one route to control costs.

If you are interested in the concussion report, please contact Jane and she will provide it to you.

Announcements:

Professor Kennedy encouraged everyone to attend Provost Kersh's annual address to the Faculty and Staff on Wednesday, March 26, 2014 at 4:00pm in Pugh Auditorium.

Hank indicated that there is merit in having a May meeting and asked if there was any objection to this? No opposition was expressed.

Adjourned: 5:35p.m.