

Minutes\*

**Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee**  
**Friday, April 30, 2010**  
**9:30 – 11:30**  
**300 Morrill Hall**

Present: Barbara Elliott, (chair), Yusuf Abul-Hajj, Tracey Anderson, Arlene Carney, William Craig, Joseph Gaugler, Barbara Loken, Linda McLoon, Christine Marran, Gary Peter, Terry Simon, Carol Wells

Absent: Karen Miksch, Paula O'Loughlin, Paul Porter

Guests: Professor Tom Clayton

[In these minutes: (1) syllabus statement on academic freedom; (2) role of the instructor in deciding how a class will be delivered; (3) School of Dentistry personnel plan; (4) academic freedom for administrators; (5) issues for next year]

**1. Syllabus Statement on Academic Freedom**

Professor Elliott convened the meeting at 9:30 and welcomed Professor Clayton. She reported that she and Professor Miksch had been in email contact with Professor Clayton about the draft academic-freedom syllabus statement. Professor Clayton had read the minutes of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) discussion of the draft statement and raised questions about it, so they invited him to join the Committee to help sort out the issues. The proposal for such a statement, she reminded Committee members, came out of a conversation the Committee had with Vice Provost Rinehart and Ms. Savage from Student Affairs about how to orient families and students to the idea of academic freedom.

Professor Clayton said that he read the SCEP minutes, saw the proposed statement and the procedure being followed, and wrote to Professor Wambach, chair of SCEP, to express his thoughts. He did not expect a response. What he thought was if there is to be a statement on academic freedom, he would prefer there be a link (because faculty are coming to feel put upon by all the requirements for materials to be included in the syllabus). [It was noted that Vice Provost McMaster's office has developed or will develop a website with syllabus statements that instructors can either download or provide links for on their syllabi.]

Professor Clayton said that there was language in the draft that caused him concern. (The draft language read as follows:

Academic Freedom: Academic freedom is a cornerstone of the University. Within the scope and content of the course as defined by the instructor, it includes the freedom to discuss all relevant matters in the classroom. Along with this freedom comes responsibility. At the University of Minnesota, students and instructors should expect their views to be challenged and we all have a responsibility to respectfully discuss divergent points of view. Reports of concerns

---

\* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

about academic freedom are taken seriously, and there are individuals and offices available for help. Contact the instructor, the Department Chair, your adviser, the associate dean of the college, or the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs in the Office of the Provost. [Customize with names and contact information as appropriate for the course/college/campus])

The language about "expect their views to be challenged" and "responsibility to respectfully discuss divergent points of view" will invite challenges from all directions. If having a statement about academic freedom is desired, Professor Clayton suggested the Committee consider referring people to the AAUP's "Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students" (1967, and it has been ratified a number of times over the years). He read excerpts from the statement that, he said, would be more appropriate for a reasoned syllabus statement on academic freedom. When he read the statement reported in the SCEP minutes, however, he thought it more akin to the "Academic Bill of Rights" being promoted around the country, the function of which is to try to get conservative views inserted in every class because, it is claimed, universities are hotbeds of liberalism. It is not the University's business to support that approach to academic freedom.

Some of the language before the Committee, from the AAUP statement, was as follows (between the \* \* \*):

\* \* \*

Academic institutions exist for the transmission of knowledge, the pursuit of truth, the development of students, and the general well-being of society. Free inquiry and free expression are indispensable to the attainment of these goals. As members of the academic community, students should be encouraged to develop the capacity for critical judgment and to engage in a sustained and independent search for truth. Institutional procedures for achieving these purposes may vary from campus to campus, but the minimal standards of academic freedom of students outlined below are essential to any community of scholars.

Freedom to teach and freedom to learn are inseparable facets of academic freedom. The freedom to learn depends upon appropriate opportunities and conditions in the classroom, on the campus, and in the larger community.<sup>1</sup> Students should exercise their freedom with responsibility.

...

#### In the Classroom

The professor in the classroom and in conference should encourage free discussion, inquiry, and expression. Student performance should be evaluated solely on an academic basis, not on opinions or conduct in matters unrelated to academic standards.

##### 1. Protection of Freedom of Expression.

Students should be free to take reasoned exception to the data or views offered in any course of study and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion, but they are responsible for learning the content of any course of study for which they are enrolled.

The full statement can be found at

<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/stud-rights.htm>

\* \* \*

Committee members discussed how the language of the AAUP statement might be used or adapted for the University's purposes. Professor Elliott thanked Professor Clayton for bringing it to the Committee and inquired if it would address the issues on the table. She recalled that Committee members are aware of settings at the University where students had raised specious issues and taken over classroom conversations, and challenged faculty that elements of the curriculum were missing.

Professor Anderson said she liked the language about student accountability: it allows students to disagree but holds them responsible for learning the course content. This is an issue that comes up biology, she noted. Professor Loken said she agreed with Professor Clayton's point that the original statement may encourage students to disrupt class discussions with views not relevant to course material. Professor Simon agreed and said that there is a lack of clarity in the draft the Committee approved earlier because it fuses discussion and being respectful with concerns being taken seriously. It is in the passive voice; by whom are they taken seriously?

Professor Wells asked what the response should be when a student vehemently advocates something in class that is factually wrong. Must instructors accommodate erroneous statements? Professor Gaugler said he did not see the draft statement as opening a door for students to challenge facts or giving the classroom over to them. Any instructor uncomfortable with language about it being acceptable to be challenged should reconsider being an instructor. Professor Clayton agreed but said he did not expect to be challenged on every point; the kind of case Professor Wells alludes to can disrupt a course. Professor Gaugler repeated his view that that is a behavior issue and the instructor can take other steps to respond to it.

Professor Loken said she agreed with Professor Clayton's view about the "should expect" language in the draft: It is not a good idea. Students can keep challenging time after time. She endorsed the idea of using language that has already been created. Professor Wells said she did not believe that students have the same kind of academic freedom that faculty do and the statement should not create the impression that they do.

Professor Elliott said the Committee would consider the language in the AAUP statement and revised its draft syllabus statement at its meeting on May 7. Committee members discussed whether the statement should be included in any link, in whole or in part. Dr. Craig said he agreed with Professor Clayton that parsimony and brevity were desirable, perhaps with a punchy statement that catches attention, but without expectation that students would read the entire AAUP statement. Professor Abul-Hajj said that how to use the statement should be left up to the instructor.

Professor Marran said that the "freedom to learn" language in the AAUP statement takes the Committee back to the original problem. Do students have the freedom to not learn? Dr. Craig recalled that an issue that arose early in the discussions about the teacher-training program in the College of Education and Human Development focused on whether it was an attempt to indoctrinate students; the AAUP statement addresses that concern. He said he would like to see SOME text required for syllabi. Professor Marran said she liked the AAUP statement as well and that it would be better to rely on a

statement that has been more widely used. It taps into a structure that creates a model for pedagogy. She said she also likes the phrase "respectfully discuss" because she wishes students to remember that they are not being indoctrinated and are encouraged so speak their own minds. She said the AAUP statement has the aspect of encouraging the expression of divergent ideas. That part is acceptable, Professor Abul-Hajj said; the problem is with the language about challenges.

Professor Elliott thanked Professor Clayton for joining the meeting.

## **2. Role of the Instructor in Deciding How a Class Will be Delivered**

Professor Elliott reported that a question about the role of the instructor in deciding how a course/education will be delivered has been raised. Do the faculty decide on the delivery mode or does the administration decide if a course will be delivered online? Faculty members have been told that a previously in-class course was now to be delivered online beginning in the fall of 2010. The faculty members responsible have been told they are responsible for teaching the course in a way that is available to other campuses. Can the University tell a faculty member how he or she must deliver a course? The only document one can find that might be related to this issue is the Regents policy on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. Professor Elliott wondered if this might not be a more appropriate issue for the Committee on Faculty Affairs, but it has been brought here.

Are there resources available to the instructor to make the change to an online course, Professor Anderson asked? Professor Elliott said she did not know but observed that these courses do take a considerable amount of money to prepare. Professor Anderson said she has had frustrations with online courses, and this Committee has discussed them in the past in connection with copyright issues (if staff members put a course online, there are copyright questions).

Vice Provost Carney said that the faculty member never loses the copyright to the materials in a course. If a course uses substantial University resources, the University and the faculty member co-own the copyright—but only if there is a written agreement. If there is no written agreement and no substantial use of University resources, the faculty member owns the copyright.

Professor Gaugler said that "where" and "how" questions sound more like administrative matters, not academic-freedom issues. Professor Wells said she was not so sure. Faculty define the curriculum and how to deliver it; the administration provides buildings and the infrastructure. Where does one draw the line? Faculty decide if a course should rely on small groups, lecture, and so on. How is this different? First there has to be a definition of "online," and it does not mean lectures on the web. An online course can mean a student in pajamas elsewhere is taking it, a student who never sees the instructor in person. That is different from web delivery of parts of a course. If the administration can tell faculty members how to deliver a course, can it also direct whether the course will use small groups?

Vice Provost Carney said that the term "administration" needs to be clarified. There are many layers of administration. The tenure code provides that a department chair can assign courses. The term "administration" covers a lot, but the Provost is never involved in course teaching. The Committee needs to be clear that these are collegiate decisions. The College of Pharmacy made decisions about offerings at the Duluth campus. Professor Abul-Hajj said that it is ITV and the delivery is the same. Usually these decisions are made at the college level, not the department, he said. The chair assigns a course and the faculty member decides how to teach it. The college could decide if the course must be delivered

elsewhere in the state and put it online. Dr. Carney observed that Pharmacy is different from CLA, which has 30 different departments, and there may not be a college decision.

Professor Elliott agreed that there are a wide variety of possibilities encompassed in the term "online." She said that Dr. Carney's point needs to be taken seriously, as do the question of resources and the ability of the instructor. This will be more of an issue because the faculty will turn over in the next few years. Encouraging faculty to put courses online is saving resources (or a thumb in the dike) because the University can then charge tuition to students wherever they are. This is a quagmire of issues, she concluded.

The question for today is the one raised by a faculty member, Professor Elliott continued. Resources are key, Professor Wells said. In her program they have learned that ITV is very expensive so they are drawing back from it. She has spent 40 hours getting one lecture prepared for online presentation, and that, according to the research, is about mid-range in terms of the time required. But those are the trends, Professor Abul-Hajj said, and the faculty probably cannot stop them. It took him a great deal of time to transfer handouts and materials to PowerPoint slides. The question is how the administration is imposing on faculty; could it jeopardize their job? Dr. Carney said that this issue would not jeopardize anyone's tenure.

Professor Marran said she wants pedagogical control over materials for which she is responsible. She would go online if she if she believed that were the right choice but she would have to have technical support. She has not made that choice but she might in the future. The core issue, she said, is control over her own course. She concurred that she might not necessarily worry about copyright ownership, though certainly that is a concern for some, but it seems rushed to expect such a dramatic change by fall of 2010 for a course.

There are faculty members who have been asked to do so, Professor Wells observed. What is not clear is whether there is sufficient technology support, Professor Marran responded, and the copyright questions are not clear. She also asserted that this is an academic freedom question, contrary to what Professor Gaugler contended, because it is about what one does in the classroom. Professors Elliott and Wells agreed with Professor Marran; Professor Gaugler asked if the Committee is saying that course delivery is an academic-freedom issue.

Professor Elliott commented that the faculty and administrators who are negotiating these issues for next fall's course work need to work together creatively and thoughtfully. Resources are limited and in order for the courses to be taught as planned, they must have this conversation and reach a solution that can serve the students' needs, allow faculty control over the syllabi, and stay within the resources available.

Professor Marran said that there are methods of pedagogy that cannot, under certain conditions, produce the images or body of knowledge that students need; in her case, forcing the content into a certain delivery method would lead to a very skewed presentation. That has to be part of the conversation, Professor Elliott said; a faculty member has to be able to say "I can't do it this way." Professor Marran said that one must recognize differences across disciplines and there cannot be a one-size-fits-all approach. Professor Gaugler agreed that whether materials can or cannot be taught using certain modes of delivery is a relevant issue.

Professor Gaugler said he was thinking about the long-term viability of the University and who it must compete with. The University needs to catch up with the for-profit organizations, which means it has to deal with the question of how to diversify the mode of teaching in order to reach students. There is concern in some units that the University is losing Ph.D. students; he said he would agree that one cannot deliver Ph.D. programs entirely online.

In response to a query from where the Committee is now on the issue, Professor Wells said that the entire question is a slippery slope and multi-factorial, and one the Committee cannot answer today. To say that faculty members do not have primary responsibility for the mode of delivery of a course is dangerous. She has been faced with people who do not know her subject but who attempted to tell her how the material should be taught—and who were wrong.

Could a faculty member decide to put a course online if he or she were to be away for a year, Professor Loken asked? The department head should have the ability to say that someone must be here to teach a course.

Vice Provost Carney observed that there is a big push in the direction of e-education, and particularly among health professionals in Minnesota because there are a lot of rural areas where the University provides much of the training and it trying to reach out. The pressure for e-education is not coming from CLA, by comparison, and there faculty do have a choice about delivery mode. CLA would be unlikely to decide that 20% of its courses, for example, must have an e-delivery mode. That is not the way the target audience is taught. There has not been any push from the deans or the Provost that says X% of courses must be online; that would be an academic-freedom issue. What is different about the health professions, contrasted with CLA, is that the Academic Health Center is responsible for delivering material to people across the state; the issue is complicated by its mission. When one accepts a position in the Academic Health Center, that is part of the job because it is part of the mission.

Professor Abul-Hajj said that many faculty members who have been at the University a long time do not like such abrupt transitions. The change needs to be a process. In their case, in Pharmacy, there were technical problems to start with but over time they have been taken care of. Most faculty members in Pharmacy now accept the need for online delivery. Professor Elliott said that some of what they are hearing is about problems that others have already encountered, and the Committee can encourage those who have dealt with them to work with the administrators of other units.

Is this a resource issue, Dr. Craig inquired? If an administrator is going to decree that courses must be online, there have to be resources provided. That is not the only infrastructure matter, Professor Gaugler pointed out; there is also faculty time. If one is to do a good job, one must spend A LOT more time than one does on an in-class course. And must design the course, Professor Elliott added. There has to be consideration of faculty time, Professor Gaugler emphasized, and that question has not been well-addressed. As well as the effect on the faculty member's ability to do research, it was said.

There are a lot of misconceptions about what an online course is, Mr. Peter commented. He stressed the point Professor Gaugler had made: It is more than just putting everything in an existing course online. It requires a huge amount of time to develop an online course, and he said he is sometimes fearful—because of all the time it will take—that he will be asked to teach an online course. Moreover, Professor Elliott said, the technology changes fast. Another potential disadvantage to online courses, Mr. Peter said, is that one can put everything on WebVista, and then students think they can read everything

and not come to class. Another Committee member agreed that there is a perception among students that they need not come to class. Professor Abul-Hajj said that his lectures are videotaped and available; to deal with the problem of students not coming to class, he started giving pop quizzes. Students need to engage in the discussions, not just be provided materials.

Professor Simon reported that he has taught two online courses on UNITE, which includes both a live broadcast and in-class instruction. The first time, perhaps 10 years ago, both the in-class and remote students complained, because when he taught to one group, he lost the other. The technology has changed a lot and there isn't the need for transition between the two groups. He said he does not put everything on the web because he does not believe students can read what is available and skip lectures. In terms of academic freedom, the engineering programs have ABET accreditation to deal with, and ABET says what a good engineering program should have. They try to decide what to do about the ABET requirements, but those requirements do cut back on academic freedom while also leading to a more coherent program. They also have a lot of prerequisites, other courses, that restricts their freedom to decide what will be in a particular course. They can decide how to deliver a course, but that decision is made in discussion with faculty colleagues.

What if the goal is a site license for a course, Professor Wells inquired? That makes a difference, because it is a business goal, not a faculty-driven goal.

The Committee reached no conclusion about what it should do next.

### **3. School of Dentistry Personnel Plan**

Professor Elliott turned now to the data provided for the School of Dentistry faculty appointments and noted that the number of contract faculty has increased considerably in the last five years, from 7.35 FTES to 21.6. There needs to be a supplemental plan that is reviewed by this Committee and approved by the administration if the percentage of contract faculty (plus P&A faculty) exceeds 25% of the number of regular faculty.

The problem with the 2009 data, Dr. Carney said, is that with the University's hiring pause, 2009 data will not look like other years for several units. [The number in Dentistry increased from 15.4 to 21.6 from 2008 to 2009.] Some have hired contract or P&A faculty to cover teaching needs because they could not hire tenured or tenure-track faculty. She said that she was not arguing there had been no increase, but noted that the School did not exceed the 25% threshold until 2008. But there is a trend, Professor Abul-Hajj observed.

Dr. Carney suggested that if the Committee perceives a problem, it should invite Dean Lloyd to a meeting. Is that the role of the administration or this Committee, Professor Elliott asked? It is a Committee role to say that there is a concern and raise it with the dean, Dr. Carney said. The Committee should discuss it with the dean, and perhaps with Vice President Carrier, and then ask for a report back.

Professor Elliott said that she and Professor Miksch would write to Dean Lloyd and Vice President Carrier and invite them to inform the Committee.

Professor Wells said that her interpretation of the concern is that the School of Dentistry has so many contract faculty that their college committees do as well, which weakens the position of governance

because the contract faculty do not have the same independence as regular faculty. It was noted that the Academic Unit Governance policy [<http://www.policy.umn.edu/prod/groups/president/@pub/@policy/@senate/documents/policy/acadgovpol.html>] provides that the tenured and tenure-track faculty have final authority over governance recommendations. Does the dean assign committee members, Professor Abul-Hajj asked? This was a big problem in one of the colleges a few years ago, when affiliated faculty were given voting rights on the curriculum, and the tenured faculty came to be at the mercy of outside faculty. That problem was solved.

If faculty governance in a college is weakened, that gives more power to the dean, Professor Elliott pointed out. Professor Abul-Hajj concurred and said that Committee members have seen instances of deans using the contract faculty because they cannot say no.

#### **4. Academic Freedom for Administrators**

Professor Elliott now noted a recent article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* in which the author contended that administrators as well as faculty should have academic freedom. While academic freedom is traditionally affiliated with tenure, it should not be limited to individuals who have tenure. The University decided, through its Regents policy on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, that academic freedom is not limited to those who have tenure.

Professor Abul-Hajj agreed that instructors and administrators should have academic freedom, but the question boils down to whether bosses will accept a contrary point of view without tenure. Are there administrators without tenure homes, Professor Elliott asked? Most P&A staff are not tenured, Dr. Craig observed (about 2% are on continuous appointments, Dr. Carney reported). Dr. Carney said here are administrators without a tenure home; a number of assistant deans, for example, are not faculty, they are P&A staff and have true administrative jobs (in contrast to the "assistant to" and "associate to" positions)—but not tenure. Most P&A staff who have continuous appointments are in the libraries and the Law School, and a few are sprinkled across the system. There are also assistant vice presidents who do not hold faculty rank.

Is this an issue, Professor Elliott inquired? It is, Dr. Craig said. He said he knew of one department that was reorganized, and the P&A staff in it had things to say but were told not to say them. Is that grievable, Professor Elliott asked? It is not, Dr. Craig said. Even if it were grievable, Professor Abul-Hajj said, anyone who grieved would suffer if he or she did not have the protection of tenure.

The Committee has pointed out that academic freedom is separate from tenure, Professor Elliott commented, and that academic freedom extends beyond the tenure track. Both Professor Wells and Dr. Craig said that is the ideal. Dr. Carney said the atmosphere varies by unit; there are units where the P&A staff would not have been told not to speak up.

Professor Wells said that if someone's appointment must be renewed every year, they are at risk. During the tenure wars, there was a view that tenure equals guaranteed salary. If tenure covers only 20-30% of salary, what does tenure mean?

Dr. Craig related that when he was asked if he would be interested in serving on this Committee, this is the issue that interested him. His position is not protected and he worries about colleagues who had contributions to make who were shut down. What recommendations would he make, Professor Abul-

Hajj asked? Light a fire on this issue, Dr. Craig responded. Just because someone has a one-year appointment does not mean he or she might not have good ideas. Mr. Peter agreed. Dr. Craig clarified that he was not proposing any change in the rules, only that the Committee be more outspoken about the ideal.

Professor Simon asked if the perception is that one can lose one's position when renewal time comes up. Dr. Craig said that the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators is pursuing this issue, because at present someone can face non-renewal without any reason given. To change that would require a rule change. It would nice for someone to know that a department is out of money, or the individual did not support the department, or for whatever reason, just so the individual knew.

The situation is even more complicated when there are visas attached, Professor Marran said. No matter how much the Committee may support such individuals, there is self-censoring. She asked if there are limits on the number of years one can work in language contracts. There are no limits, Dr. Carney said, and some are renewed indefinitely. She also noted that after a certain length of time as an employee, P&A staff do have a one-year notice provision.

Professor Wells asked if the question is really whether or not administrators have academic freedom when they make administrative decisions. If it is, she said she would then vote "no" on any suggestion that they have such academic freedom. There are decisions to be made about buildings and infrastructure; the decisions made by people in roles where decisions about such things are required have nothing to do with tenure. She said she did not support the concept of administrative academic freedom, which is intended for faculty doing research and teaching.

The article in *The Chronicle* was inspired by scholarly productivity, Professor Anderson commented. Her question is about the job description: What about a P&A staff member who wants to teach but was not hired for that purpose? If the person is teaching, what part of the job for which the person was hired is he or she not doing because of the teaching? Is this a question of giving someone the time (freedom) to do scholarly work if he or she was not hired to do so? Some have First Amendment freedom of speech, Professor Elliott observed, and the question is about the line between the First Amendment rights and academic freedom. That, in turn, goes to the question of where there are protections within employment. That is why academic freedom is specific to those who teach and do research.

Professor Elliott said she did not believe the Committee needed to do anything with this issue. It can acknowledge the issue has been raised but it does not point to any decision the Committee needs to make. But it is something to keep in perspective because it helps denote where the edges of academic freedom are. Professor Wells said that academic freedom applies to individuals in their roles as protectors of a body of knowledge that has evolved over the centuries, something that is very different from administrative decisions.

Professor Abul-Hajj agreed but pointed out that some administrators are also faculty members; if they are doing research, are they not allowed academic freedom because they are administrators? He expressed doubt about that proposition. Dr. Carney noted that she holds a P&A position as vice provost and is annually subject to non-renewal in that position. But she is also a tenured faculty member, and can return to her faculty position if she were no longer vice provost. How does she feel about that, Professor Loken inquired? Much of what she does is confidential, Dr. Carney responded, such as coordinating the

promotion-and-tenure process for the Provost (who is the final decision-maker). If she personally disagrees with a decision he makes, it would be inappropriate for her to say something to others because she is part of the process. It is not an academic-freedom issue, in her view. Professor Abul-Hajj agreed. If an associate dean (who is also a tenured faculty member) expresses a view inconsistent with that of the dean, the person is let go from the associate dean position. Associate deans are appointed to be lieutenants for the dean. Dr. Carney said she is free to express her opinion to the Provost. But at any point, a dean or provost has the right to assemble a team he or she can work with. If she felt tension with the Provost, she would resign as vice provost, but she's a tenured full professor so has nothing to lose. That is different from the situation in which P&A staff find themselves. So she has no more academic freedom than someone in the business world, Professor Simon concluded—she loses her job if the boss is unhappy with her. Dr. Carney agreed but said there are cases when she can do something in a meeting, but she is not free to interfere with decision-making.

Professor Marran agreed with Professor Wells that academic freedom is primarily related to bodies of knowledge, ideas, curriculum, and scholarship. It goes to the job description.

## **5. Issues for Next Year**

Professor Elliott asked Committee members for their views about what should be on the agenda next year. There were several suggestions.

- P&A culture
- Online courses, especially in times of financial constraint; no one has articulated faculty rights in a time of a lack of resources (and even if the Committee does not take the lead on the issue, it is close enough to its role that it should keep an eye on it)
- Syllabus statement on academic freedom
- Whether or not a student is provided legal protection (if on the payroll, they are; if not, they are not?)
- If someone is funded by a foreign government, he or she cannot be reprimanded, which is frustrating; one ends up treating instructors differently
- Subcommittee on section 12 of the tenure code (Professors Chomsky and Clayton and Vice Provost Carney): the Committee does not proposed to open the code for amendments at this time, but it can consider what changes it might recommend whenever there are amendments to be made
- Tangentially related to the Committee's charge: Students and free speech and the Facebook comments made by the Duluth students; the Chancellor responded with strong words and the students have been charged under the University's Student Conduct Code; this is a freedom of speech issue. This is at the edge of the Committee's purview.
- Review the Strategic Positioning report on culture and invite Professor Kahn to join the discussion; Professors Elliott and Miksch can pursue this.

Professor Elliott adjourned the meeting at 11:25.

-- Gary Engstrand