Minutes[*]

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, October 14, 2010
1:00 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Kate VandenBosch (chair), Melissa Anderson, Peter Bitterman, Thomas Brothen, Nancy
             Carpenter, Carol Chomsky, Chris Cramer, Shawn Curley, Nancy Ehlke, Barbara Elliott,
             Michael Hancher, Caroline Hayes, Jeff Kahn, Russell Luepker, Jan McCulloch, George
             Sheets

Absent: Elizabeth Boyle, Colin Campbell, Marti Hope Gonzales, Michael Oakes

Guests: Vice President Karen Himle, Vice President Kathleen O'Brien, General Counsel Mark
             Rotenberg; Assistant Vice President Ann Aronson, Ann Freeman (both University
             Relations)

Other: Patricia Franklin (President's Office); Matt Sumera (University Relations)

[In these minutes: (1) lessons from light-rail transit; (2) internal communication; (3) the nature of policy;
(4) "Troubled Waters" review process]

1.   Lessons from Light-Rail Transit

Professor VandenBosch convened the meeting at 1:00 and welcomed Vice Presidents Himle and
O'Brien and General Counsel Mark Rotenberg to discuss the lessons learned from the University's
interactions with the Metropolitan Council and other governmental bodies during the discussions about
the location of the Central Corridor Light Rail Transit (CCLRT) route.

Vice President O'Brien began by telling the Committee how she and her office came to be the
lead player in the light-rail negotiations and how she and Mr. Rotenberg were the ones who led the
negotiating team. This is her ninth year as Vice President for University Services, she said, and her office
is responsible for the non-academic operations of the University, systemwide. In 2004, when Vice
President for University Relations Sandra Gardebring was leaving, she suggested to Vice President
O'Brien that she take on CCLRT responsibilities. She volunteered to take responsibility for light rail
because of her experiences in transit issues while at Minneapolis when she was City Administrator.

The Board of Regents has approved statements since the 1930s asking that public transportation
be taken off Washington Avenue because it was creating a dividing line on the campus. So there has been
a concern about public transportation through the campus for over 70 years.

The Metropolitan Council took over responsibility for light rail in 2005 and established the
CCLRT Management Committee; since then she has served as the University's representative on it, Vice
President O'Brien related.

One question this Committee has been interested in, Vice President O'Brien said, is how the University took the position it did and why it needed to spend so much political capital to protect it. In 2000, the Regents were already at odds with other political entities on the alignment of the Central Corridor because it preferred the northern alignment through Dinkytown on the existing rail grounds. The Board also took the position that if the CCLRT must be on Washington Avenue, it should be in a tunnel—and further took the position that if the light rail must be at grade, then other traffic should be removed. Even then the representatives from Ramsey County were accusing the University of being elitist and wanting to spend too much money on light-rail transit through the campus. As the University raised issues, it was seen as the problem, not that there were problems that needed to be solved. It came to be seen that way by other public entities as well, even though the University has supported public transit and has been one of public transportation's best customers. No matter how the University defined the issues or described the impact on the research enterprise that uses highly-sensitive equipment in 80 labs along the CCLRT corridor, or described the importance of the research on energy, public health, and for the economy of state, and even though it had research faculty give presentations, the University was still seen as the problem or the hurdle, rather than as having problems that needed to be addressed.

Today if one were to stand back and quarterback the effort, one would say that people were so supportive of public transit that the University could not make the case without spending political capital, Vice President O'Brien said, to get an agreement that protects University research. The University perhaps could have spent less political capital if it had started earlier on making its position known and used its political capital with its allies.

The negotiations ended with a 40-page document with 166 pages of exhibits, after 27 days of court-ordered mediation, Vice President O'Brien said. The agreement protects University research and it is a durable, enforceable agreement that will stand the test of time after those currently in office are long gone.

Mr. Rotenberg agreed with Vice President O'Brien that the CCLRT route was a political struggle. They studied mass transit through other academic centers around the country and in Europe; in other cases, the state and local governments worked much more closely and cooperatively with the academic institution. In this case, the University's objectives (including protection of research that is critical to the success of the Minnesota economy and public safety) were not fully appreciated, or were downplayed, by a number of political leaders, so the University got into struggles.

The University's objectives were these:

--   Optimize the transportation system
--   Enhance campus functionality
--   Ensure the safety of faculty, staff, students, and visitors
--   Strengthen relationships with the neighborhood
--   Protect the research enterprise (the most difficult objective to achieve)
--   Achieve an enforceable and durable obligation (also very difficult)

Mr. Rotenberg said the University enters into thousands of contracts, but few of them have the characteristic that the University will do something on day one (turn over land worth millions of dollars, without which the CCLRT could not be built) and the partner to the contract is obligated to do something

on day 10,000 of the contract. They expect the agreement to protect the University's resources in 2020, 2021, and beyond. For this reason, they have built incentives into the contract so that the institutions can avoid going to court.

In the end, the reason the Metropolitan Council reached agreement with the University is because without such an agreement, the project would have been severely delayed because of litigation brought by the University, and because of Federal Transit Administration approvals that were needed. They signed the agreement not because there was big support for the University by outside political leaders but because they realized the project would be undercut if they did not sign up the University as part of it. The University had said what its objectives were, and the University community can be proud of what was accomplished.

The agreement also came about because they has an excellent team of University professional staff who worked hard and relied on research faculty and expert consultants to define University requirements, Vice President O'Brien said. They went into the negotiations knowing what they needed to achieve. One major factor in the University's success, Mr. Rotenberg added, was the high degree of support from the faculty and students of the University. They stood behind the negotiators and the objectives that needed to be accomplished.

Professor VandenBosch said that a couple of things stood out. One, the University had to spend a large amount of political capital, and two, the agreement was reached because it was expedient, not because of any of the University's arguments. To what extent will there be a trailing effect on the University's relationships with the Metropolitan Council and the legislature? Vice President O'Brien said the negotiations ended with good professional relationships with other organizations.

Professor Cramer said he believed this sequence of events to be a great example of the administration talking to the faculty. He said he had the feeling that the administration took a stand and never wavered with respect to noting and protecting the concerns of the faculty. One unintended outcome, Vice President O'Brien said, was that many of the people in University Services better understand research and can better serve researchers.

Professor Hayes commented that because of the challenging political climate, the University had to accept a lot of risk, but they expect great things from the relationship with the Metropolitan Council in the future. She also commended Vice President O'Brien for doing an amazing job in a difficult political situation. Professor Chomsky commended the administration for the information it provided to the University community: short, clear, direct emails so that everyone would know what was going on.

Professor VandenBosch congratulated Vice President O'Brien and Mr. Rotenberg and thanked them for joining the meeting.

2.   Internal Communications

Professor VandenBosch next welcomed Assistant Vice President Ann Aronson and Ann Freeman, who joined Vice President Himle at the table, to discuss internal communications at the University.

Vice President Himle said the genesis of this presentation to the Committee was a conversation she and Ms. Freeman had last spring with Professor Gonzales, the chair of this Committee at the time, about doing a better job of making decision-making more transparent to faculty. She and Ms. Freeman then began to talk about the entire range of communications across the institution, a topic in which Professors VandenBosch and Cramer expressed an interest.

In 2007, when President Bruininks asked her to come to the University as Vice President for University Relations, she inquired why he wanted her, Vice President Himle related. The answer was that he wanted better internal communication. She accepted the position in part because she had experience in internal communications in the private sector. The attention to internal communication emerged in the 1990s because of changing employment expectations: It used to be that it was expected one would stay in the same organization one's entire working life, while now one is questioned if one stays in the same position more than five years ("aren't you good enough to get a better job?"). Internal communication was seen as a way to help retain valued employees.

Vice President Himle commented that "what is said inside is heard outside." If members of the public read/hear something about the University in the media, faculty and staff members are asked if it is really true. It is important that there be open and transparent communication inside the University, especially with the faculty—and that the faculty receive what they need but are not overloaded. With that as the backdrop, she hired Ann Freeman, who has done pioneering work in internal communication in higher education.

Ms. Freeman distributed copies of slides and walked Committee members through the content. She said that in response to the perceived need to improve internal communication, in 2007 Vice President Himle created a strategic internal communications function within University Relations. That department, led by Ms. Freeman, launched an inclusive two-year initiative to "reinvent" internal communications. After that they created a formal University-wide internal communications network, they are developing a web-based toolkit for internal communications and a single web interface for faculty and staff, and they are establishing benchmarks to measure progress and success.

The Internal Communications Network consists of (1) monthly forums to discuss issues of interest to the University community; they are open to faculty, staff and students. The most recent forum was on changes in graduate education; the next one will be on the University's biennial request. How do they choose the topics for the forums, Professor Chomsky asked? They receive suggestions and scan the environment, Ms. Freeman said. How many have they had, Professor Hancher asked? Six. Are they publicized, Professor Hancher then asked? Ms. Freeman said they use listservs and lists of people and encourage sharing of information about the forums. Professor Carpenter said she had never heard of them; are they open to the coordinate campuses? They use UMConnect, so all can participate, Ms. Freeman said. Professor Hancher agreed that it is an interesting initiative but said he had also never heard of them. Professor Chomsky agreed. Ms. Freeman said they need to improve the target audience list and said she would forward notices so that committees could be informed.

(2) is development of work teams and interest groups to provide informal opportunities to collaborate, Ms. Freeman continued. (3) is an infrastructure work team that is working to develop a faculty-staff web page and to assist in the umn.edu home page redesign; this team (3) includes Professors Gonzales (CLA) and Gatewood (Medical School).

Ms. Freeman noted next a copy of the web page with resources for internal communications, created to assist communicators and others with more effective internal communications. She also highlighted a draft new Faculty and Staff website, which drops down from the University's homepage. In response to a question she posed, only one Committee member had visited the page. Ms. Freeman said she was not surprised; the page has not been advertised as it has been under development. The goal is to create an easily used site with aggregated information for faculty and staff, bringing together content. They have learned since development of the site began, however, that faculty and staff needs are very different and they are considering different strategies to meet the needs of the two groups. They would like suggestions for improvements.

Professor Kahn asked what the difference is between this new page/these new pages and the One-Stop. They are similar, Ms. Freeman agreed, and said their proposed page(s) is a work in progress. They are working with units that have different reporting lines to get buy-in for the new faculty/staff pages. One-Stop is mostly for students and with a lot of information related to teaching, with a lot of other material added over time that has no owner. There is a question about how to work with One-Stop and my.

Professor Curley observed that the University started with One-Stop, then added MyU, and now they propose this. This redundancy is not helpful. Vice President Himle said it is a question of ownership and agreed there is a need to step back and ask if there is too much. The more advanced offices become in technology, the more likely they are to create services to important groups—and a lot of offices are doing just that. One result is silos. They are respectfully asking if it would be more appropriate to do all these things in one place, Ms. Himle said. They are working with the right people to try to address that question. Professor Curley commented that with One-Stop and MyU, there are already one too many options. Now there is a third. Professor Luepker said, for example, that he has to deal with his department website, his college website, the Academic Health Center website, and now this—one does not have time to get through all of them, and each effort requires staff and the collection of information. How much of this is duplicative?

They think about those questions all the time, Ms. Freeman responded. The issues are similar to those that arose with printed materials, Vice President Himle recalled. University Relations reviewed all the materials being printed by University units and has managed to persuade units to reduce significantly the quantity. They need to do the same broad overview of websites to see if there is a way to reduce overlap and duplication, she suggested.

Ms. Freeman went on to report that they also conducted a survey of faculty and staff last February and March; from a random sample of 8,993 (47% of the total population of faculty and staff), they had responses from 14% for staff and 15% for faculty. The executive summary (the language in bold was emphasized in the presentation):

--   **Faculty and staff reported communication from college-level leadership as the most trusted and relied upon source.** Also, faculty and staff rely upon interpersonal communications for University information more than various University electronic, print, and website sources.
--   However, there is a positive relationship between the extent to which faculty and staff feel informed and their use of University electronic, print and website sources, particularly *Brief*. The more they rely upon these sources, the more informed they feel.

--   Respondents rated highly the importance of community. They feel fairly connected to the
        University and very loyal to their place of work. **Overall, however, they described the
        University's sense of community in neutral terms – neither warm nor cold.**

        The key findings were these:

--   The most effective ways to communicate with faculty and staff are through leadership and staff
        meetings. **Faculty value department head or dean emails more than staff, and staff value
        president and other University administrator emails more than faculty. However, both
        groups similarly value staff meetings and word-of mouth communications.**

--   While respondents feel a strong sense of trust in the information received from their supervisor,
        there is a sense that information shared may be limited or incomplete – **this is especially strong
        for staff.** Respondents, in general, feel University communication could be more thorough.

--   Beyond these more interpersonal communications, *Brief*, second only to department or college
        electronic publications, represents the most relied upon vehicle for University communication.
        The majority read *Brief* weekly and find it to be accurate, trustworthy, useful, easy to read and
        replete with interesting topics.

--   **Respondents rely on department or college electronic communications twice as much as
        department or college print publications for University information.**

--   **The four most popular University topics are: financial decisions; workplace technology;
        research and discovery updates; and notices of events, seminars, and workshops.**

--   **While the most popular topic centers on finance decisions, results suggest an opportunity to
        improve this area by: (1) better explaining the University's decisions and (2) providing
        faculty and staff an opportunity to share ideas to address these challenges.**

        In terms of a sense of community and engagement, they found:

--   Three-quarters of respondents reported that feeling a sense of community on their University
        campus is important.

--   Also reported as quite strong were respondents ratings of how connected they feel to the
        University.

--   However, respondents were more neutral describing sense of community on their University
        campus, with the majority reporting in the middle of the cold to warm scale.

--   In a significant-difference finding, staff more than faculty described sense of community on their
        campus as warm.

--   The majority feels loyal toward the University and would recommend it as a good place to work.

--   Two-thirds reported that their job provides them an opportunity to do their best every day.

--   Most respondents reported the University responds well to the needs of faculty and staff.

--   Staff reported significantly higher agreement than faculty to the statements of loyalty,
        recommendation, and the University's responsiveness to the needs of its faculty.

        They concluded that "in terms of receiving University information, the top two communication
methods preferred by faculty and staff are face-to-face communication and email." They advise "when
deciding between these two, match the purpose with the method: Use face-to-face communication to
convey complicated information and to build trust and relationships, and to provide opportunities for
feedback; use email to be efficient and transmit factual information in a timely manner."

In their "conclusions and recommendations" they note differences between the two groups and suggest using "an audience-focused approach":

--   Topics: Faculty – honors and profiles; staff – technology, community news, work-life tips
--   Sources: Faculty – email from chair, print publications; staff – web sources and meetings
--   Trust: Staff tends to trust University information more than faculty do
--   Budget information: staff report receiving more of it
--   Community: staff reports a "warmer" atmosphere
--   Loyalty: staff say they are more loyal

They also reported that faculty and staff mention the following areas of discomfort:

-         Being "too busy" to build community
--   Feeling out of the decision-making process
--   Perceptions of fragmentation described as "silos"
--   Staff feeling underappreciated

The last point came out very strongly in the qualitative results, Ms. Freeman reported, and many report feeling treated as second-class citizens.

Their final conclusions and recommendations were these: "When asked how communications might improve the University's atmosphere, faculty and staff said they wanted more:

--   Communication – in terms of amount and preferred method
--   Detail – especially on budget and finance decisions
--   Transparency – the full story
--   Opportunities to provide feedback.

Apropos of the first point, Ms. Freeman commented, the point is that even though people complain about the volume of information, communication is acceptable if is what they want to know in the right format.

Professor VandenBosch said that the last four bullet points in particular coincide with what this Committee has repeatedly heard over time.

Professor Sheets returned to the subjects taken up at the monthly forums and said he has the sense that some faculty are disaffected and in some cases are semi-organized. Is there a way to address this disaffection through a forum, in an attempt to engage faculty and recover their trust? How to increase communication with faculty is on their list, Ms. Freeman said, and they could offer a forum where there are holes.

Vice President Himle said this is an important question and that they would welcome a small group of faculty to help create a forum born of mutual respect for the faculty and administrative roles required to make this a great university. It is a matter of the administration not only talking to the faculty but also listening to them. There is no Cliff's Notes version of how to enter higher education for those coming in from the outside, she observed, such as she and Ms. Freeman did. Interface with a group of faculty would be very helpful.

Professor VandenBosch noted that the Committee will take up later the question of establishing a new Senate Committee on University Relations, a proposal that has arisen from within governance and that has the very strong endorsement of Vice President Himle.

Vice President Himle said there appears to be an appetite for improvement in communication but also a need not to overload people so that the important information is diminished, which is a delicate balance.

Professor Hayes said the survey findings resonated with her, especially the findings about face-to-face communication and silos. She was recently in a meeting where one faculty member did not know the University was searching for a new president. One question is about where the President and Provost are; some faculty members will say they talked to the president and provost at their last college. The second question is "where are the faculty?" The institution does not value service; what can change that service and community engagement are valued? That was a question that existed before she came to the University, Vice President Himle said; the data suggest people are hungry for conversation. They need to revisit the reports from the faculty culture and institutional culture task forces; that is old news, but the trajectories are positive. A change in culture is not just policy, it is also the reward structure, Professor Hayes commented.

Professor Chomsky told Vice President Himle that the Committee has heard from a few people expressing dismay at the expenditure to resume the "Driven to Discover" campaign. The members of this Committee understand its impact but others do not; that is a case where talking internally is important. A separate survey on impact of external communication has indicated that the "Driven to Discover" campaign had a positive impact on public perceptions. Although time did not permit a full discussion of the external survey, Ms. Aronson provided a summary that explained the background to "Driven to Discover" and a summary of the results (which can be viewed at http://www1.umn.edu/twincities/faculty-staff/prod/groups/ur/@pub/@ur/@internal/documents/asset/ur_asset_198696.pdf (pp. 18-19).)

The handout explained the background to "Driven to Discover":

For several years prior to 2006, external research showed a high level of understanding and value in the University's education mission, but a lack of knowledge and understanding of the research mission.   Driven to Discover was created in 2006 for these reasons:

- To communicate the value and distinctiveness of the University
- To make the case for believing in and supporting the University in terms of advocacy, philanthropy, volunteerism, recruitment, engagement
- To reach a diverse set of stakeholders in a cost-efficient manner
- To make the case for investment in the University
- To offer a strong identity that can be leveraged by all colleges and units

The campaign ran from 2006 - 2008 and took a hiatus in 2009.

In 2008, Driven to Discover was officially recognized by the Board of Regents as the University of Minnesota brand.

During the campaign, awareness increased and opinion became more positive with regard to:

--   Opinion of how well the University is performing in related areas (high-quality education, world-class medical school) became more positive during campaign and declined after campaign stopped in 2009.

--   Awareness of Driven to Discover messages (cures for chronic diseases) increased and peaked in 2008, and then declined after campaign stopped in 2009.

--   Overall positive perception of the University has increased somewhat, but steadily, since the campaign.

Vice President Himle quoted A Bartlett Giamatti: "Of all the threats to the institution, the most dangerous come from within. Not the least among them is the smugness that believes the institution's value is so self-evident that it no longer needs explication, its mission is so manifest that it no longer requires definition and articulation." What they in University Relations do is guard against adverse public opinion; if they go silent, public perceptions drop.

Professor Hancher agreed on the need for improved communication and observed that some has been top-down; the term "community" (which figures in the handout) implies that it is not all top-down. The term "feedback" (near the end of that handout) is a weakened version of consultation. There is a double obligation: Communication must be robust and bilateral. Vice President Himle agreed that "feedback" lacks the deeper meaning of "consultation." The term "forum" (also used in the handout) has a long history, Professor Hancher added, and it means discussion.

Professor VandenBosch thanked Vice President Himle and Ms. Freeman for joining the meeting.

3.   The Nature of Policy

Professor VandenBosch reported on a discussion that has taken place among some of those responsible for reviewing policy: Should the University only adopt policies that it will monitor for compliance, or should it adopt policies that in some cases will not be actively enforced and monitored? She provided draft language that the Committee could consider adopting as advice to the President's Policy Committee, the group that has final authority over adoption of administrative policy at the University. The language reflected the sentiments several Committee members expressed in email messages in the days preceding the meeting.

The Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) advises the President's Policy Committee that it (FCC) does not believe every administrative and regental policy requires regular monitoring and enforcement. Some clearly do, such as those covering the receipt and disbursement of funds and those covering health and life-safety working conditions. Others, such as those governing instructional time per course credit or expected academic work per credit, set standards expected of the academic community and that can be "enforced" when deviation is discovered. Some policies are "enforced" by routine actions of University offices or technology systems, such as conversion of Incompletes to an F after a specified period of time. We do believe that policies need to be "on the books" in order that they can be enforced when the need arises, and we are aware that there can be difficulties in requiring compliance when language is labeled a "best practice" or a "guideline" rather than an institutional policy.

We are aware of the recent discussions surrounding risk aversion at the University and we generally concur with the directions that those conversations seem to be taking. We thus

recommend that the PPC take the position that while some policies require monitoring and compliance mechanisms, not all do, and that monitoring/compliance mechanisms be established only for those policies the violation of which puts the University at legal risk, puts faculty, staff, or students at physical risk, or which for some other compelling reason require regular monitoring for compliance.

What does "monitor" mean, Professor Bitterman asked? There is an intensity value that needs to be attached to the word. Professor Chomsky said it tends to mean ongoing and constant and keeping track—as opposed to responding only when something happens. Professor Cramer noted that crimes are only dealt with after the fact. Professor Chomsky agreed but pointed out that these are not crimes and that the issue is communication: People know they are not supposed to do certain things and they don't have to receive a communication about it. But there are issues associated with some policies that people do not know about that they need to; in other cases, it is important that the policy just be there.

Professor Sheets said he thought this was an absurd question. He said it seems self-evident that policies can stand on their own. Community buy-in is important; if a policy requires monitoring, it is probably one the University should not have. He said he did not understand where the concern arose; there are a number of policies that exist for good reason that can be invoked after the fact. When there is community buy-in, the policies reflect shared values, Professor VandenBosch agreed. Why do people obey the law, Professor Sheets asked? It is not because they fear the sanctions, it is because they want to obey the law, even though there are those who do not believe they will be punished and can get away with things. Professor Curley agreed with Professor Sheets's point that he thought this was a non-issue.

Professor VandenBosch said that the term "policy" should not only be used when it refers to something that can be monitored and enforced; policies should reflect community standards. One of the broadest policies, the Regents' Code of Conduct policy, is not monitored, Professor Chomsky pointed out, but it is given to new faculty and it sets out principles. One thing to think about, she said, is "what is the sanction if the policy is violated?" The criminal law has sanctions. When policies are reviewed, that question needs thought, as does the result when there is an intentional violation versus an accidental violation. There is a need to retain policies that no one watches, she added.

Professor VandenBosch asked if there should be a policy that everyone is responsible for knowing the policies that apply to him or her. Committee members expressed strong views that there should not be. There should be a distinction between an intentional and accidental violation, Professor Chomsky reiterated. She said she did not know if the provision should be blanket—there are some things that do not require a policy for people to know them, such as copying someone else's paper.

Professor Luepker pointed out that there are clear sanctions in some cases; if one does not take responsible-conduct-of-research training, one cannot get grants. Should sanctions be included with every policy? There are a lot of policies and they should be looked at in this light. Part of this is employer-employee relations, Professor Chomsky said, and a memo can go in a personnel file if someone violates policy—there are "background" mechanisms for enforcing policy and sanctions do not need to be put in every policy. Professor Hancher inquired if anyone is reviewing the appropriateness of sanctions that go with the many policies. Are they considered as policies are reviewed? Do they vary with the degree of malfeasance? Who monitors sanctions?

Another background mechanism for the tenured and tenure-track faculty, Professor Sheets said, is that one reason for dismissal for cause is a refusal to perform reasonably-assigned duties. That could include complying with policy, and failure to do so could lead to sanctions.

Professor VandenBosch said she would revise the language of the Committee's advice in light of the discussion.

4.   "Troubled Waters" Review Process

Professor VandenBosch said she would like the Committee to define the issues it believes the institution must follow up on and who should be involved. None of the Committee members who have expressed an opinion believe there should be an external investigation, but this group as a committee of faculty can highlight the areas it believes the University should focus on.

Professor Chomsky asked if there will be a formal statement. If there will be a report that is not personnel-specific, the Committee should have a discussion about it. The Committee is not an investigative body but it can discuss the administrative process and the thoroughness of the review and conclusions (which can be touchy because they can be about employees, and thus about personnel matters protected by the Minnesota Data Practices Act). Professor McCulloch agreed there is no need for an external review but said the Committee should advocate for some independence in the review; if the Provost leads a review, how is that independent? Professor Bitterman agreed that the Provost "has a horse in this race." That is true of every administrative decision, Professor Chomsky rejoined. Professor Bitterman agreed but said the administrative process and product in this case should be critiqued by the faculty. Professor VandenBosch said there are outstanding questions that need to be answered and the Committee also needs to look at the report that comes out of the process.

Professor Cramer said he believed there are two issues. One fundamental question could be a charge to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee: to whom does academic freedom and academic responsibility extend? The second question is more procedural and need not focus on any individual: which offices are asked to make what decisions and with whom will they consult? It may be that existing policies were not followed.

Professor VandenBosch said she would put together a draft of questions to frame the discussion, and adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota