

Minutes \*

**Faculty Consultative Committee  
Thursday, November 14, 2002  
1:15 – 3:30  
238A Morrill Hall**

- Present: Dan Feeney (chair), Gary Balas, Susan Brorson, Tom Clayton, Gary David, Arthur Erdman, Marti Hope Gonzales, Marc Jenkins, Mary Jo Kane, Marvin Marshak, Judith Martin, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Martin Sampson, Charles Speaks
- Absent: Muriel Bebeau, John Fossum, Candace Kruttschnitt
- Guests: Senior Vice President Frank Cerra; President Robert Bruininks, Vice President Sandra Gardebring; Executive Vice President and Provost Christine Maziar
- Other: Ms. Katie Stuckert (Office of the Chief of Staff to the President)

[In these minutes: (1) report of the chair (legislative liaison position, committee chair stipends, support service accountability charge, ombudsman, governance policy); (2) discussion with Senior Vice President Cerra (governance, searches, budget, the delivery of education, space); (3) capital projects subcommittee; (4) discussion with President Bruininks (inauguration, undergraduate education, the budget); (5) discussion with Executive Vice President Maziar (academic freedom)]

**1. Report of the Chair**

Professor Feeney convened the meeting at 1:15 and reported on a number of items.

- There was a meeting earlier in the day of the legislative liaison subgroup. Originally the group was going to meet with Professor McEvoy to discuss interaction with the legislature; as a result of her untimely death, the group also dealt with the issue of her successor. It was agreed as well that the University of Minnesota Faculty Association, a registered PAC, would be kept intact; its current members have made the money available to the legislative liaison for political purposes. Once additional discussions have been held, Professor Feeney will bring the name(s) of individuals to FCC for approval for recommendation to President Bruininks; given the breadth of responsibilities the position entails, it may be divided between two people. There is as much a need to rally faculty as there is to have a presence at the legislature. It is clear that University Relations is interested in having someone in the office of legislative liaison as soon as possible.
- The Committee at a recent meeting approved a report from the ad hoc committee on chair stipends; the report called for raising the stipends for (1) those committee chairs who sit on this Committee as ex officio members, (2) the athletic committees, and (3) the Judicial Committee; the last time the stipends were adjusted was 1992-93. The stipend to the FCC chair was also to be changed. (All changes would be effective 2003-04.)
-

In light of the looming budget difficulties, Professor Feeney reported, he had proposed that the increases be phased in rather than adopted all at once. The Committee had been provided a copy of the phasing proposal the day before the meeting; no one present objected. Professor Feeney said he would pursue that option with the President when they discuss the budget for the Senate office.

Professor Erdman said that the stipends for the two faculty athletic representatives to the Big Ten, NCAA, etc., were too low as well. The Committee voted unanimously that the stipends for the two representatives should be set at a percentage (20%) of the same benchmark used to set the committee chair and FCC chair stipends--and, as with those other stipends, adjusted annually by whatever average faculty salary increase the University grants.

- The charge to the support service accountability task force has been sent; the task force will be co-chaired by Regents' Professor Tom Clayton and Vice President Kathy O'Brien. Professor Feeney noted that the Committee specifically requested that Sponsored Projects Administration, Sponsored Financial Reporting, and Patents and Technology Marketing be included in the review.
- There will be a discussion with Vice Presidents Carrier and Maziar about the ombudsman function with Professor Cooper and the Grievance Advisory Committee, who are actively studying it. They want to be sure that there will be support for the effort before it begins work.

Professor Feeney then reported that there will be continuing discussion of the academic governance policy and that the document continues to evolve. There have been meetings scheduled with a number of groups and individuals, including the Academic Health Center Faculty Consultative Committee, the Council of Academic and Professional Administrators, Senior Vice President Cerra, and Executive Vice President Maziar. Following those discussions the policy will be appropriately redrafted. This item touched off considerable discussion among Committee members.

Professor Kane reported that two P&A staff in her department are very concerned about the policy and want to meet with her about it. What is the major narrative about the policy, she asked? There is no document that talks about the rights and responsibilities of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, Professor Feeney said. In earlier days the distinction among groups at the University was easy: there were faculty and there were civil service staff. The situation has evolved and there are now a lot of people who occupy middle-ground positions. In some units those individuals are treated as absolutely equal to the tenured and tenure-track faculty; in others they are not. In some units, the non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty outnumber the tenured and tenure-track faculty--and in those places the tenured and tenure-track faculty cannot get done what they believe necessary.

The question is "who are the shepherds of academic freedom?" Professor Feeney said. It is tenure that ensures continued academic freedom and the objectivity that a university can offer.

Who is the ultimate decision-maker with respect to the policy, Professor Kane asked? The Faculty Senate and the administration, Professor Feeney said.

The way some are talking about the policy is that it is intended to eliminate the involvement of some people in decision-making, Professor Martin said. Some see it as a power-grab, Professor Kane agreed. But it is intended to define rights and responsibilities, Professor Martin explained; strengthening

the tenured and tenure-track faculty will ultimately help all other faculty. The tenured and tenure-track faculty must keep their eye on academic freedom; it is academic freedom that is central in giving the tenured and tenure-track faculty the positions they occupy. If the tenured and tenure-track faculty do not have academic freedom, no one else will, either.

In addition, Professor Sampson pointed out, the policy allows for up to 25% of the non-tenured-tenure-track faculty to be voting members of a unit. He said he understood the perception about reducing the involvement of some people but that is contrary to the intent. He agreed, however, that some units will be particularly affected by the policy if it is adopted.

The policy will be very inflammatory in the Medical School, Professor Jenkins said, and will be seen as contrary to efforts to make clinical scholars part of the units. The policy says that the tenured and tenure-track faculty have a lot of power--except that they cannot empower more of their non-tenured-tenure-track faculty than those who would make up 25% of the voting members of a unit.

Professor Feeney said it is not possible to tell at this point what the document will look like. But the issue has been festering for a long time. Some deans seem to be telling the P&A faculty that they are the same as the tenured and tenure-track faculty; they are not.

## **2. Discussion with Senior Vice President Cerra**

Professor Feeney welcomed Senior Vice President Cerra to the meeting to talk about the state of the Academic Health Center and to bring any concerns he might have to the attention of the Committee.

Dr. Cerra, who had been sitting in the room listening to the last part of the debate about the academic governance policy, said it was an excellent discussion. He said he believes a decision about the role and responsibilities of the tenured and tenure-track faculty needs to be made and that he strongly supports the central ideas in the proposed policy.

Dr. Cerra then turned to comments about the Academic Health Center. Almost all of the things happening in the AHC are because of the strategic plan, which is a living document that is updated every six months. His status report for the AHC for 2002 touched on the following points.

-- In their searches to fill faculty positions, they are getting their first choice 90% of the time. Morale has palpably improved. They have 156 active searches underway; the problem is that they may not have space for all these faculty. They have had to deal with more retention cases in the last six months than for some considerable time and they have successfully retained most faculty.

-- They have balanced the budget of the Medical School; reallocations and cost reductions are being implemented and deficits are being cleared. The AHC Education Endowment, funded by the tobacco settlement, is helping replace lost patient revenues that support the school's academic programs. They have maintained current enrollments of primary care physicians and specialists and will fill 16 vacant positions by the end of the year. Clinical practice revenues increased from \$90 million in 2000 to \$114 million the current year; University of Minnesota Physicians will assume management of the clinics next January (2003). Fairview-University continues to increase patient volume and remains profitable and able to support the Medical School education and research needs.

-- They want to gain legislative and community support for increased funding for health professional education and research. They seek state funding for the translational research facility approved last year but vetoed by the Governor. They are also expanding national and federal relations effort and have seen an increased presence in Congress as well as greater exposure of faculty nationally.

-- They seek to increase implementation of interdisciplinary health professional education. They have received federal planning money to support training sites in medically under-served communities in northeast and southwest Minnesota (e.g., Hibbing); they are developing an Intercollegiate Education and Resource Center with a state-of-the-art clinical skills training lab; they have opened a Health Careers Center for interested undergraduates and secondary students. They are also partners with Walker-Methodist nursing home to create a geriatric transitional care unit that serves as an interdisciplinary training site. Planning is underway to develop the University of Minnesota Physicians primary care clinic into an interdisciplinary practice and education site.

They are very dependent for health professional education on non-tenured faculty who teach and provide care, and on community practitioners, Dr. Cerra told the Committee; that raises the question of how to control the quality of the education. His view is that that is the role of the tenured and tenure-track faculty--and those faculty must have a final say if something comes to a vote. At the same time, the non-tenured faculty must have an important role in education, and the community practitioners must be recognized for their contributions to educating and training the next generation of health professionals.

-- They aim to develop and implement plans to meet health professional workforce needs of Minnesota and adjust enrollments to meet those needs. They have increased nursing enrollments by a third through a new post-baccalaureate certification program and expansion in Rochester, in collaboration with the Mayo Clinic and MNSCU; there is a heavy concentration on distance education--and they have learned that the University's infrastructure for distance education does not work well. They have begun a pharmacy program at UMD, to open fall, 2003, expanding the class by 50%, and opened a rural dentistry clinic in Hibbing.

-- They also intend to improve access to AHC research, information, and new technology through a variety of initiatives and will rebuild the AHC's research capacity.

Dr. Cerra then reported that the AHC has initiated an Academy for Excellence in Research, which grew out of the strategic plan goals of increasing research and rewarding research excellence. Nominees must be current members of the AHC faculty; nominators must be current or emeritus members of the AHC faculty. The AHC Faculty Consultative Committee will screen nominations and will forward a limited number to an external selection committee, via the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences, for final decision. Four faculty will be selected the first year and up to four each year thereafter; each recipient will receive \$10,000 per year for five years that can be a salary augmentation or used for research; the title and membership in the academy continue as long as the individual remains at the University.

Next Dr. Cerra distributed copies of a set of principles "for managing research (laboratory and office) space" in the AHC. He noted that he had had to rent an entire building because the AHC needed space, in part because the Molecular and Cellular Biology (MCB) building did not replace all the space that had existed in the Owre-Millard-Lyons complex (they lost about 100,000 square feet). And that is partly because MCB has a lot of classroom space, needed to combine the biological science programs on

the Minneapolis campus. It is a wonderful building (on time and on budget, Dr. Cerra pointed out)--and it is partly why the AHC is seeking the translational research building again.

Among the principles for space management in the AHC are these. Space is owned by the Board of Regents; authority for space management is delegated through the president. Tenured faculty and active faculty emeritus should be assigned a guaranteed a certain amount of space for scholarly work; they should receive additional space as needed for scholarly work and as funding is available. Faculty who have sponsored research and faculty retention offers take precedence over space for new recruits. They are doing an inventory of all space in the AHC so they know who has what space.

Is there space tied up for new faculty who will come from the 156 searches, Professor Marshak asked? There is not, Dr. Cerra said. Then how will they deal with the need, Professor Marshak asked? By good management, Dr. Cerra replied. The unit has to identify space before an offer is made and the dean(s) and department head(s) must agree. They have been able to do that thus far, and in doing so have promoted interdisciplinary programs and promoted cooperation between schools. They have solved the problems so far, but Dr. Cerra allowed that if 10 or more searches all produced appointments at the same time the space question could be a problem.

Do they charge for space, Professor Balas asked? They do not, Dr. Cerra said. Professor Balas recalled that the Senate Research Committee had heard from Assistant Vice President Bianco about security; it sounds like there is not enough money for security, especially for the connections to the hospital. They do not charge for space, Dr. Cerra reaffirmed, but it is not assigned departmentally; it is considered a common good. On the issue of security, he serves on an all-University committee on the subject and can say that the institution is making progress; about \$2 million was spent last year and there is a lot to show for it (including, for example, TVs and monitors in high-risk areas). The University is not where it would like to be; it may need to move to a card identity system (both students as well as Judy Yudof were attacked). Dr. Cerra said he does not like ID systems any more than anyone else but he feels they may have to adopt them.

Would there be any possibility of using space in a joint-use football stadium for research, Professor Speaks asked? There would, Dr. Cerra said. Would the space be even attractive if it were not covered by a football stadium, Professor Sampson asked? Dr. Cerra smilingly declined to answer that question.

Professor Erdman said he thought the recent DAILY article on animal facilities (that included a picture of Mr. Bianco) was excellent and he hoped it would tone down the animal rights activists. Dr. Cerra said the University made a policy decision when the activists were more active that people would be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. They obtained restraining orders and got some people put in jail. But people also need to be responsible for protecting their own research; if they see someone they do not know, they should do something. The University has come a long way in terms of security and access--which is difficult because this is not the culture of a university. They have also completed the "select substance" review--there are things in labs that can hurt people and they must be protected. The question is how much to restrict access and openness, Dr. Cerra concluded; "this is a university, for God's sake."

Professor Sampson asked Dr. Cerra if the AHC had done any revenue predictions for the next 10 years. They have, Dr. Cerra said. They have tracked state funds, clinical revenues, NIH funds, they can

project what institutional taxes will be, and they can develop reliable coefficients so they know what revenue streams they will have--and how many faculty they can recruit. The faculty have done a good job of defining where programs will grow and where they will not; these decisions appear in the college compacts and they have affected where space and funds will go.

Is it possible there will be an explosion in space needs, Professor Sampson inquired? The NIH money is at a plateau, Dr. Cerra said--and only two schools (Birmingham and Emory) have ever substantially changed their ranking in receipt of NIH funds (and they were able to do so only spending millions and millions of dollars). Otherwise, "them that has, gets" for the last 15 years. If an institution is in the top 25, it will receive significant NIH funding; if not, it will not. The University is in the top 25 and seems to be moving up in the ranks. That, of course, brings additional problems, Dr. Cerra pointed out, since only 85%--at most--of direct and indirect costs in sponsored research are covered by the research grant. That problem requires good management, review of spread sheets, analysis of cross-subsidies, and good dialogues. The management systems in place at the University now are the best they have been since he has been here, Dr. Cerra told the Committee.

Professor Martin noted that she, along with Professors Erdman and Speaks, have been involved in discussions about the stadium site and have been trying hard to preserve space closest to the campus. The Academic Health Center is high on the list of needs for that space. They have taken the position that is a non-negotiable item. Dr. Cerra related that he has finally gotten a picture of the size of the proposed stadium: it would reach from the far side of Northrop Auditorium (the back side) to the far side of Coffman Union (the river side) and would be the height of the Phillips-Wangensteen Building.

Professor Balas asked, apropos the future of research at the University, if there needs to be a policy on the purchase of large-scale equipment and investment in the infrastructure so the University can stay on the list of top 25 recipients of NIH funds? Does there need to be a bigger vision? That is on President Bruininks' list, Dr. Cerra said. There is no way for the University to stay competitive without having the infrastructure that can support research and without knowing where its cross-subsidies are occurring.

Dr. Cerra then drew the attention of Committee members to the "State of the AHC" speech he recently gave. It provides an overview of where the AHC is and what it is doing. The emphasis is on students (he reviewed new classroom and instructional activities, career development plans, and the bio-medical graphics site).

Professor Martin commented that it is very helpful for this Committee for Dr. Cerra to join it and provide a report such as this; she said she and the Committee know a LOT more about the AHC than they did five years ago. It also helps the AHC learn about the rest of the University. Dr. Cerra said his revelation has been that there are two extremes in educational paradigms: (1) those units with a lot of students, that have low educational costs, that are tuition dependent, and are not dependent on non-tenure-track faculty, and (2) those units that have fewer students, are very expensive educationally, that are not dependent on tuition but on other sources of revenue, and rely heavily on non-tenure-track faculty. It is from this point that the dialogue needs to move forward, he said.

One question related to this division is whether the practice plans should have non-regular faculty physicians whose entire purpose is to generate revenues? His position is that they should not--but the question arises as state funds decline. There needs to be an open discussion on these kinds of issues.

Why does he oppose having such appointments, Professor Kane asked? Because it is revenue generation for the sake of profit, Dr. Cerra said. It could be seen as exploitation. His argument is that the ONLY reason the University has faculty who practice is to train the next general of practitioners. If there are faculty who do nothing other than practice, and who have no research, fellows, etc., that is not fulfilling the University's mission--and the practice plan becomes just like any other health care system. In addition, Professor Marshak said, a few entrepreneurs could make a lot of money; the University's infrastructure should be used for the University mission, not to produce cash. Besides, he added, if properly costed, ALL units at the University probably lose money.

Professor Feeney thanked Dr. Cerra for joining the meeting.

### **3. Capital Projects Subcommittee**

Professor Marshak noted that he chairs the Subcommittee on Capital Projects and reported that one of the Subcommittee members has stimulated a lot of discussion. The topics that have been raised include the need for a business model for every building, the fact that some areas are essential to the University's mission and will require subsidies, and taxes are a fact of life: the University has overhead and common goods to which all must contribute.

President Bruininks, who had entered the room but not joined the discussion, commented that he and Dr. Cerra took to the deans a couple of years ago a new requirement that units had to raise some of the money for capital projects. They were told by the Foundation that Minnesotans do not give money for capital projects, but they convinced the Foundation to include capital items in the capital campaign. The goal was \$50 million; they raised \$176 million. That is not a panacea but it is possible to link building remodeling to private donations. Some buildings have not been fully renovated for 100 years--but they contain classrooms and spaces that colleagues must teach and do research in, he said.

### **4. Discussion with President Bruininks**

Professor Feeney now welcomed President Bruininks and Vice President Gardebring formally to the meeting. It was reported that the lead stories on CNN and Fox were about the four missing college students in Minnesota and Wisconsin. The University has provided space in the YMCA building for the families. Professor Martin said the University needs to let students know that there are places in the city (Minneapolis, the warehouse district late at night) that they need to be VERY cautious about who they are with.

President Bruininks said he asked Vice President Gardebring to join the meeting to talk about Founders' Week, the last week of February. The inauguration will be included in the events of the week (and will be very simple and less expensive than recent inaugurations). He said they need advice from the Committee on working committees that will focus on events for the week.

Committee members discussed with President Bruininks and Vice President Gardebring the events that could or might be held. One may be a "great conversations" between Robert Jones and the Reverend Desmond Tutu. The President said he wants the week and the inauguration to be linked to the historic role of University research, why it is important, and what the University has meant to the state.

The President said he found the interview process invigorating and informative. The discussion with FCC members was one of the most stimulating. [That discussion focused largely on undergraduate education: graduation and retention rates, acculturation of transfer students, undergraduate education at a research university, and related topics.] He has tried to keep the biennial budget framework simple. Three of the four foci are compensation (which the University will have to fight for), helping students, and investment in academic priorities. With respect to the latter, there is need to think more comprehensively about this part of the budget, and not just about the first-year experience. What are the real goals and what should be changed? Retention and graduation rates and the quality of student life should be the emphasis--and the attention should be on outcomes, not inputs, and on the four-year graduation framework. He said the University has to move beyond a laundry list of items and said he has asked Vice Provost Craig Swan to develop a list of what can be done and what the priorities should be. He said he was glad that FCC had reopened this discussion as well and that he wanted the Committee's perspective. He said he is concerned about what happens to transfer students as well as about the unusually large drop in credits students enroll for when they make the transition from the sophomore to the junior year. The administration will bring some ideas to the Committee on Educational Policy. The University must be prepared to tell the legislature what is most important and the request must focus on achieving outcomes.

Professor Kane asked the President if he had any hypotheses about the credit drop. One is that students begin to get into the workforce and take fewer credits as a result. The research on disengagement from higher education suggests the process is similar to that which happens for high school students: it is a gradual process. He said he did not believe the tuition "sale" was enough; it might have a 2-3-5% impact on graduation rates but there may also be structural discontinuities in the curriculum as well that must be addressed.

The transition from sophomore to junior is also the point at which students are asked to declare a major and to think about where they will invest their time, Professor Gonzales pointed out. If that is one of the reasons for the drop, students may need to know more in order to help them decide what they will do once they leave the University. That kind of help should be provided from their first day at the University.

Is the drop across the board or something that varies from college to college, Professor Kane asked? It is more likely in students that do not have a "forced march" quality to their degree program, Dr. Bruininks said; the drop is more apparent in places like CLA than in places like Pharmacy and IT. There needs to be work done to understand what is happening, Professor Marshak maintained. There is both a need for education research and a need to do something in the next few months. His perspective is that there is not just one thing to do but rather a lot of things. There are internal barriers (e.g., students to go to St. Thomas to get a business degree because they cannot get into the Carlson School) and there are a lot of requirements that can be hard to understand. There is a climate of disengagement as well, the sense that the University is not committed to the student, so they take fewer courses, and then they don't finish unless they finish fast. The President, he said, should coordinate the research and immediate steps based on anecdote and educated guesses.

The Swan-Rinehart report had two components, Professor Speaks said. One identified the extent to which the fault rested with the students; one outcome was the tuition sale (he agreed that it was not likely to have a highly significant impact on graduation rates). The other element the report identified was the culture of the institution, which in general holds that there should be no bar to the student having

complete control over his or her life. It took forever to get the 13-credit minimum rule adopted. IT and Pharmacy are different, he said; there is no reason CLA could not be "different" as well. The transfer student problem also has to be examined; perhaps it is transfer criteria. Are Minnesota's transfer criteria different from Michigan's? The effort must look at the institution as well as the students, he concluded.

At this point Executive Vice President Maziar had joined the meeting. She commented that she has had a number of conversations in different venues: the sense is that the University has made a good step with respect to the first-year experience but the problem is with the junior and senior years (not just one of them). Her worry is that the University does not engage students enough so that they understand the value of completing a degree. A lot of students leave in good academic standing but without finishing. In the case of the more rigid curricula, the path to the degree is clear, as are the benefits of completing it. Professor Marshak agreed; the University's statistics for first-year students are better than for many institutions; it is the junior-senior years that are the problem.

The Committee on Educational Policy is interested in what the second wave of efforts might be, Professor Sampson reported. The junior year may be a good target. If the University is to have a 50% graduation rate, as recommended by the Pawlenty Commission, it must retain approximately 84% of students from freshman to senior and those students must be on track to graduate. There is also too much emphasis on choosing a major, he said; there are many in CLA who change majors and still graduate in four years. Some of the lock-step majors, he reported, are also dropping their credit requirements from 128 to 120 credits. Some of the degree programs are too demanding, the President agreed, and said that Dr. Swan is working with selected departments to reduce the demands. Every department is also supposed to have a 4-year graduation plan, Professor Sampson noted; what do departments do to help a student who may have gotten behind?

The first-year emphasis is different (it is adjustment) from the emphasis later (which is commitment), Professor Ratliff-Crain said. In the case of the University, commitment seems to disappear after the second year. There may be a need to focus on the sophomore year because often juniors will move off-campus. Many may discover, after a year or two, that they lack the necessary academic ability to get through a major and complete a degree; those students need academic assistance. There may be, he said, three or four different groups reducing their commitment after the sophomore year, each for a different reason. The transition from the freshman to the sophomore year may be more important than the one to the junior year.

What is important is that the University return to this issue soon, Dr. Bruininks said. He said he wanted to see most of the funding for students go into areas that would pay off for them in terms of outcomes such as better student learning, progress toward degree, and high levels of identity and satisfaction with the University.

Next month it will be time to start the discussion about budgetary goals and possible trade-offs if the waters become difficult, the President told the Committee. There may be a need for early decisions if there are reductions. His goal is to maintain as much employment at the University as possible. The easiest recourse in budget cuts is to cut lines but there could be other ways to respond as the institution rides out a tough financial period. These options will need a fulsome discussion, he said; if the budget is to move the University forward there must be a discussion with the University community.

There is also need for a long-term framework, Dr. Maziar said, because she doubted the economy will turn around soon.

The President thanked the Committee for its support, as well as the support extended by the Regents, deans, alumni, and Foundation. The University previously experienced trouble when there are problems in the relationships between the faculty, the administration, and the Regents. Committee members gave the President a round of applause; Professor Feeney thanked him for joining the meeting.

#### **5. Discussion with Executive Vice President Maziar**

The Committee continued its discussion, now with Dr. Maziar. Professor Feeney recalled that he and Dr. Maziar and other committee chairs had talked earlier about working with the Regents' Professors and the McKnight Distinguished Professors on a couple of issues.

Dr. Maziar said she was concerned, as new generations of people become part of the University, that it has lost the conversation and language about the importance of academic freedom and what it means to the institution. In the external community there is a lot of misunderstanding of what academic freedom is--and that lack of understanding puts the University at risk. The University also has an obligation to help students understand the crucial role academic freedom plays in high-quality education and a high-quality future for higher education. She has suggested that the Regents' Professors and McKnight Distinguished Professors be asked to help develop a program (that could be a white paper or seminars, for example) that engages the discussion of academic freedom. Asked if this resonated with Committee members, there appeared to be widespread nodding of heads.

As part of the effort, Professor Marshak said, after the on-campus portion is finished it should be extended off-campus, perhaps to places like MRP and Channel 2. There is a lack of understanding outside the University about why academic freedom is so important and why it is a fundamental base for a university. The discussion must also indicate the impact of academic freedom, Professor Ratliff-Crain said, to demonstrate that it is not just the impact on the individual faculty member and that it is not just to help people keep their jobs.

There must also be discussion of academic freedom for students, Dr. Maziar said.

Dr. Maziar noted that with respect to controversial issues there is sometimes an expectation that the University will play a role it cannot: it is not the courts, it is not the policy process. What it can do is expose ideas. It would be frightening if society lost the ability to do social research that is not tied to finances, Professor Sampson said. It is important that there be a place where society can discover that ideas are wrong and can discover things that may not have popular or private payoffs. And if something does not pay off, others may get ideas from the work. That is the role of a university.

Bringing together the Regents' Professors and the McKnight Distinguished Professors could help think about the benefits of a discussion on campus and what risks the institution might be facing, Dr. Maziar said. There is also a continuing learning process that new faculty must imbibe in, Professor Ratliff-Crain observed; they have to discover the meaning of academic freedom as they make their way in their careers. There are different disciplinary understandings of academic freedom, Dr. Maziar pointed out, and it is important for the WHOLE University community, as a community, to understand the importance of academic freedom to the role that higher education plays in society and how important

autonomy is. Another element of academic freedom is that all take for granted that what they study will be without interference. The role of the faculty in defining the discipline is part of academic freedom, Dr. Maziar said; so are the responsibilities that go with academic freedom, Professor Ratliff-Crain added.

The wealth of experience in the University has not been tapped for these discussions, Dr. Maziar said, and it is time to make use of the tremendous talent that is available. There is no incentive to be self-conscious about what a university is, Professor Sampson said, and it is important that what it is be communicated to other audiences. Research universities occupy a special, privileged place in higher education, Dr. Maziar said, and the autonomy of other components of higher education has been threatened or lost in some states. If they do not identify the links between their responsibilities and freedoms, research universities could also be at risk. But, she observed, the situation is better in Minnesota than in many other parts of the country. It cannot be taken for granted, Professor Martin rejoined.

This should be a joint effort between her office and the Committee, Dr. Maziar suggested. The Committee concurred.

Professor Feeney thanked Dr. Maziar for joining the meeting and adjourned it at 3:30.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota