

Executive Council meeting  
February 15, 2010, 9:00-11:00 a.m.  
McCue Conference Room

In attendance: Ann Hamric, Bob Bloodgood, Marcia Childress, Bill Keene, Bob Kemp, Susan Kirk, Ed Kitch, Kevin Lee, Pam Norris, Marti Snell, Chip Tucker, Alf Weaver, Gweneth West, Dan Willingham

Guest: Craig Littlepage, Athletics Director

**Ann Hamric** called the meeting to order and opened a discussion with Craig Littlepage; Craig will be addressing the Senate at the next full meeting, followed by an open discussion.

### **Craig Littlepage - Discussion**

A question was raised regarding faculty concern about the accommodation of athletes; some faculty feel they're expected to compromise their academic standards.

Craig mostly hears not about academic standards, but about requests for accommodations because of travel schedules or other conflicts. Craig acknowledged that his staff can do a better job of coordinating and of helping student athletes structure schedules. He agreed to recommend to the Faculty Senate a process for expressing concerns. It was suggested to set up a place on the website where concerns could be registered and would receive a quick response, or at least an acknowledgement, from the athletics department.

Craig was asked to talk with the full Senate meeting about his vision for the new football coach and his academic goals, in light of negative press over the bad behavior of football players. Dialogue between faculty and athletic advisors would be helpful. Faculty need to know athletic guidelines.

Craig said that the great majority of student athletes have routine contact with their academic coordinators. A suggestion was to build a stronger relationship between the athlete's major advisor and his or her athletic advisor. Craig said that at the top of his list of criteria for a new football coach was someone who would pay greater attention to the academic achievements of football players.

A Council member pointed out that most faculty know little about the athletics program and how it is funded and structured. They see the large, high-profile expenditures in the major sports, as well as the large planned capital expenditures, at a time when the academic side has a scarcity of rooms and facilities, and difficulty scheduling classes. It might be helpful to confront that directly when speaking with the Senate. There is a perception that large donors are courted by athletics and give there rather than to academics.

Craig said that there are two ways that athletic programs are funded: a private and a public school model. In the private school model, athletics is a line item in the school's budget, so athletics competes with academics for funding. In the public model, which U.Va. follows,

athletics funding is independent of state and university resources. Athletics are funded through ticket sales, participation in a conference like the ACC, private funding, and student fees. They also have sponsorships and sales of food, etc. They must raise their own money for building projects. Nearly half the budget goes for salaries and scholarships. When U.Va. cuts its budget, athletics do as well. They are down to the bare bones. Because of their dependence on travel for playing and recruiting, a lot of costs are beyond their control. They must fund all those initiatives independent of funding from University or State. If they decide to make a coaching change, they need to generate resources to do that, either from reserves or donations. They have never gone to the University for those funds.

Question: If there were no athletics, would donors give more money to academics, or is it a different sort of donor?

Craig replied that according to Bob Sweeney, interest in athletics, if anything, has helped cultivate major donors. Experience has shown that for major donors who give to both, their interest in academics hasn't been jeopardized by their gifts to athletics.

A member brought up a *U.S. News* article of January 13 that deals with use of student fees in supporting athletic programs. U.Va. was 12th on the list. Craig said that Leonard Sandridge monitors the athletics budget monthly, as well as anything related to fundraising and contacts with donors.

The point was raised that the majority of faculty feel underpaid and face three years with no raises, and they see a coach paid millions a year not to go to work. Craig said that bothers him too. Buyout clauses exist in the current coaches' contracts as well; these will be covered, if need be, by both major donors and the rainy day fund (reserves). Athletics didn't use any reserves, however, for the last two buyouts.

Regarding the University moving to a higher level in big league sports, Craig said that in spring 2001, a task force by an independent U.Va. committee predicted that, if nothing was done differently, the athletics department would accumulate huge debt. The options were to cut sports or go in full bore. The BOV said U.Va. should have a top-20 program. That's when it began to take hold.

### **Report from Planning & Development Committee – Marcia Childress**

Marcia suggested that Bob Sweeney be given time to speak at the April meeting rather than the upcoming meeting. He got a lot of feedback recently from the Planning & Development Committee on how to pitch the faculty/staff campaign. It came down to the fact that faculty would like to be more fully in partnership with development to raise funds for certain initiatives they care strongly about, such as grad student funding. Bob got the message that to simply go to faculty and ask them to be cornerstone donors to the campaign won't fly. A good discussion took place about ways in which faculty would find this an exciting and fruitful opportunity. The idea of a faculty/staff campaign may instead be becoming a way to introduce our purposes into the campaign. P&D wants to work more closely with Bob and follow up on that meeting. They would like Bob at the coming Faculty Senate meeting to hear this discussion.

Ann Hamric proposed inviting Bob to the Executive Council before the April Faculty Senate meeting to discuss with him how to frame his remarks. He has a meeting in April with Development about the faculty/staff campaign. He would get more time at our April meeting. The Council also wants to have James Hilton talk about SIS and the Integrated System.

Marcia said that the new President's goal is to spend more time on Grounds to understand faculty concerns rather than traveling for development. Bob Sweeney is already thinking about the process after this campaign ends; he is planning bridge campaigns to focus on individual needs to put out to donors. That implies that most of the initiatives the faculty cares about haven't been funded through this campaign. But with the new president, there may be different ways of involving faculty to address our priorities. Sweeney and others will be here into the new administration; the Faculty Senate can build relationships with them. Marcia will invite Bob Sweeney to be on the agenda for April's Faculty Senate meeting rather than February's, and to come talk to the Executive Council in April.

### **Regarding James Hilton Addressing Senate**

A Council member suggested that James Hilton be invited to the March Executive Council meeting instead of the full Faculty Senate meeting, perhaps at the same time with Lou Bloomfield, who went around SIS and created his own system, which students are now using.

### **Discussion of the Faculty Senate Agenda**

Discussion centered on the amount of time needed for the Open Access vote, President Casteen's report, and Provost Garson's remarks. Susan Kirk agreed to make a motion to close discussion on the open access resolution if needed.

### **Proposed Revised Classified Research Policy - Pam Norris**

The existing Classified Research Policy had been on books for a long time, but not invoked. Under that policy, the Research & Scholarship Committee was in charge of approving classified research. Pam wasn't comfortable with that role for the Senate. Rather, its appropriate role is to protect students and faculty that would potentially be involved in research, and to maintain the academic integrity of U.Va. Now the R&S Committee works with Tom Skalak, the Vice President for Research, to make sure the proper procedure is observed and proper safeguards are maintained. The R&S Committee simply reviews the procedure followed by the University; committee members who lack security clearance cannot read affected proposals, much less approve them. VP for Research is the person to approve research.

The question was asked whether the University has guidelines about acceptable classified research. Pam said it does not; this is the only policy, and as now revised it approves only the procedures for the proposal.

A discussion followed about the appropriate wording in the new policy document. Ann Hamric said that this will go to the Policy Committee as well; she tasked each Council member with reviewing the document and giving Pam specific suggestions for improvements.

Bill Keene, chair of the Policy Committee, said it would be helpful if a parallel policy existed about approval of classified research projects.

Tim Garson asked if every student and faculty needs to sign a consent form. If so, that will solve this. He said that the Senate could approve a consent form.

Ann asked if it would be helpful if the Policy and R&S Committees got together. Pam reminded the Council that this was modification of existing policy, not new policy.

Bill Keene said that if someone argues that it should be a new policy rather than revised, that would be okay. The larger question he sees is what oversight the faculty has over research that goes on. It's a moral and ethical issue; there should be a specific statement.

The revised draft policy addresses issues specific to faculty, staff, and students engaged in classified research. It does not address the larger issues involving the nature or approval of classified research projects per se. As such, Bill recommended that the title of the revised draft policy be changed to something like "Faculty, Staff, and Students Engaged in Federal Classified Research."

Pam said that the VP of Research wants a speedy solution. There are proposals that need to follow procedures. Does the Senate want to take on the issue of whether we want to accept classified research?

Ann suggested that that discussion be built into the March working meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 11 a.m.

Submitted by Kevin Lee, Secretary of the Faculty Senate.