

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, March 28, 1996
10:00 - 12:00
Room 238 Morrill Hall

Present: Virginia Gray (chair pro tem), John Adams, Carole Bland, Victor Bloomfield, Dan Feeney, Virginia Gray, James Gremmels, Roberta Humphreys, Laura Coffin Koch, Harvey Peterson, Michael Steffes

Regrets: Carl Adams, Lester Drewes, Fred Morrison

Guests: Professor Judith Garrard, Professor Warren Ibele [former chairs, FCC]

Others: Professor Gary Ballis, Professor Charles Campbell, Professor Roger Fosdick, Professor David Hamilton, Professor Leonard Kuhi, Martha Kvanbeck (University Senate), Maureen Smith (University Relations)

[In these minutes: tenure]

[NOTE: In this set of minutes, "Professor Adams" refers to Professor John Adams, since Professor Carl Adams was unable to attend the meeting.]

1. Tenure

Professor Gray convened the meeting at 10:00 and explained that Professor Adams had a commitment to students. She informed the Committee that she and Professor Adams had invited some former FCC chairs of the Committee to discuss how to better communicate with the faculty about tenure issues and to get advice on how to navigate the shoals. She thanked Professors Garrard and Ibele for agreeing to join the Committee on short notice, and asked Professor Garrard if she had any opening comments.

Professor Garrard began by saying there is a fundamental difference between changing the administrative structure and changing the fundamental constitution of the academic community. The constitution--the tenure code--is something that both the people it covers as well as those who carry out its provisions must think about together. This cannot be accomplished in a two-month discussion. There is a role for efficiency in the University's actions, but the constitution should not change without discussion; that subverts it.

Professor Gray recalled that she made a similar argument in her testimony before the legislature: that changing the tenure code is talking about the constitution, and faculty get upset when there is loose talk about changing it. Some legislators jumped on her for the argument. She said she agreed with

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

Professor Garrard, but not everyone does.

Is the constitution in the eye of the beholder, Professor Garrard asked? Society needs an island in which research can be generated by the individual investigator, without outside influence of economic or political groups with their own agendas. This is not a corporation. Tenure is not equal to a guarantee of job security; it provides a place for people to do unfettered research in a society that is going crazy, she said. Professor Gray agreed, but pointed out that not everyone understands that.

Professor Ibele then related that he had called Professors Gray and Steffes to relay information that had come his way, information that was sufficiently serious he thought it should be communicated to Committee members. The items concern the debate about the tenure code. One point of contention is the misperception that the debate was faculty-initiated; Professor Ibele said he could find nothing in writing that confirmed that this was the case. He was also concerned, he said, because the individuals who voiced alarm are people whom he respects, people who are usually calm, who have a sense of equilibrium, and who can put events in the context of long experience; they are concerned about the misleading information on tenure that is being distributed, such as who is leading, what the process is, and the nature of the problem.

His chief concern, Professor Ibele emphasized, is the credibility of the faculty governance system. That it is being questioned is alarming. A generation ago the faculty of the University earlier faced a collective bargaining vote. The majority of the faculty opposed collective bargaining at that time. Its leadership fashioned the present faculty governance system, which has served pretty well. Such divisions of the faculty inevitably leave some scars and should be avoided if possible.

There was a financial shortfall in the early 1970s, Professor Ibele recalled. Due to a reduction of federal capitation grants for medical students, it became necessary to find funds from other University units, an exercise which cost the equivalent of 70 assistant professor positions. No one questions the need for a strong Medical School; indeed, its strength over the years has materially benefited other sectors of the University. Certainly the Medical School should be assisted by every prudent means, but in solving its current problems care must be taken to minimize damage to unrelated programs, Professor Ibele said.

Are these problems temporary, he then asked? Must the solutions be "carved in stone" by radically revising the tenure code? When he saw the proposal to separate tenure and compensation, he thought it might make sense in some parts of the Academic Health Center (AHC), but the tenure code applies to the entire University. He said he was worried by the implications of this change for the rest of the University. Will departments appoint faculty and tell them half their salary is fixed and the other half they must raise themselves?

Professor Ibele also said he was worried by the fast pace of the discussions. One understands the concerns and perceptions of the Board of Regents, the legislature, and the public. These concerns require a response, but tenure was won over a long period of human experience; it should not be casually changed or lightly cast away. To do so will harm the entire academic enterprise.

One Committee member expressed agreement with Professor Ibele, and said it was still hard to understand where the idea of separating tenure and salary came from. That point must be addressed

quickly; it is the most disturbing item in the summary of the March 14 tenure forum prepared by Professor Garrard. There is no dispute that augmentations, identified separately from faculty salary and provided when individuals take on administrative appointments, should be withdrawn when they return to the faculty. It is also clear, it was said, that the portion of income for any faculty member with clinical responsibilities should be separated from tenure. But it is a grave institutional mistake to take the exigencies of managing the clinical side of the Medical School and extend the response across the entire University.

To separate salary and tenure will dampen the entrepreneurial drive of the faculty. If faculty were recruited here five years ago, and got a lot of grants that paid 90% of their salary, funding that will now that be separated from tenure, what is the incentive for those faculty to stay at the University? This makes no sense.

There are only two issues of separation that should receive attention, it was argued vigorously: administrative augmentation and clinical income. All the rest should be part of the faculty member's base salary and covered by the tenure appointment. There is a need for this Committee to address this issue; there has been widespread lack of understanding and misinformation about it.

Another Committee member said that the point Professor Ibele raised about academic freedom should be the guiding principle for the health sciences. Academic freedom is needed for teaching and research responsibilities, but it is not needed for patient care responsibilities, so it is not unreasonable to take that part of income out of the tenure commitment. The University has a large number of highly-trained, highly-paid professionals to do its work and who do not have teaching or research responsibilities, but they are not given tenure. The same holds for those who do clinical work.

Whether the language of tenure code amendments will stand the test of faculty scrutiny, Professor Ibele observed, can only be known when the professor of mathematics and the professor of philosophy can examine the language of the amendments to test if it can be interpreted to their disadvantage. That process has begun, Professor Gray noted. There is concern about the language, it was said.

That is becoming very clear, said another Committee member. The two items generating the most animosity are the proposal about separating tenure from salary and the provision that the AHC provost can overturn tenure recommendations that he decides are not in the best interest of the health sciences. In the latter case, one cannot let the process go all the way to its end and then have it overturned for that reason.

One Committee member noted that Professor Ibele also raised questions about the credibility of the process and the information being provided to the faculty. The Committee also needs to be concerned about that.

The Committee needs to take strong leadership in how this is discussed, Professor Garrard urged. It should identify what changes are logical, what everyone will agree on and what should not take up time, and then expand the time for those items that are controversial, and let senators talk to their colleagues. The original plan, to circulate amendments five days before the Senate meeting, has wisely been changed and the amendments made public early, even though the text may be revised. It will be important, she said, to get any revised language out as soon as the committees have dealt with them.

The Committee expressed concern about the schedule to Regent Reagan last December, Professor Gray recalled. He said he would understand if it must be delayed. The problem is that many faculty leave in the summer, so it would be more than just a month of delay; the faculty could not take up the issues again until October--which will be seen in some quarters as a long time later. She said the legislature was also told that the faculty are working on the issues and that there would be results. The faculty do not want to make rushed decisions, but there is an urgency to deliver something. If possible, the faculty should try to get this process finished by June.

Two months discussion of something as fundamental as the tenure code is not sufficient, Professor Garrard maintained.

Professor Gray reminded her colleagues that this and other committees of the Senate have been talking about this subject since last fall; some people, however, have only now realized it and begun talking about it themselves. The speed of the conversation depends on one's perspective. This Committee told Regent Reagan that the faculty would try to deliver by June; if it cannot, however, he said he would understand.

Professor Feeney said that he and Professor Dempsey, chair of the Tenure Subcommittee, agree that amendments should be grouped as housekeeping (accommodating the provostal system, etc.), as other reasonable revisions, and then a third group that are the most controversial. There are changes proposed that he vehemently disagrees with, he said, but once there are modifications made, maybe most faculty would find them acceptable.

In general, the faculty are not exercised by the governance system until it touches them, Professor Ibele remarked. FCC should make a statement about the process that will be followed, by email and with an ad in the DAILY, pointing out that amendments will go to the Tenure Subcommittee, the Committee on Faculty Affairs, the Judicial Committee, the Faculty Consultative Committee, and the Faculty Senate. The names and email addresses of the members of each of these groups should be included in the notices to the faculty.

Professor Ibele recalled that after the Big Ten and Pac Ten signed the agreement to send each of their football champions to play in the Rose Bowl, the University of Minnesota had to vote on whether or not to allow the team to go to the game, since allowing it to do so would reverse a long-standing policy against post-season athletic events. The colleges met to discuss the matter, and faculty senators were sent to the Senate meetings instructed by their college colleagues how to vote. If that was done for a single football game, he asked, could not something similar be done for a far more important subject?

Now that there is specific language, Professor Gray observed, it is possible to engage people in debate. It may be desirable for the Professors Adams to go college by college to discuss the proposals. Something other than a forum is needed; would that work?

Following up on Professor Ibele's suggestion, the Committee endorsed the idea of meetings within the colleges, to be generated and led by the senators and which John and Carl Adams would attend. Such a process would be less driven from above and would be more likely to encourage participation by those in the trenches. People feel isolated from the process, it was said, and that something is going on about

which they have not been consulted.

Another possibility is a "Monday Bulletin" or something similar, Professor Garrard suggested. FCC could issue a weekly report on the tenure process, noting upcoming meetings (including time and location) and progress on the amendments, and a constant reiteration of where the process is going.

The key people in the process are senators, Professor Adams agreed; if they do not favor the changes, the changes will not occur through the normal process. They could still occur, but imposed from the top, which would lead to other disasters one does not even want to contemplate.

He recalled that one faculty member recently approached him and said he understood he-- Professor Adams--has something to do with tenure. One would think that any faculty member alive and breathing would know about the discussion of tenure, he said, but apparently there is a large percentage who do not. When they discover it is going on, and that it touches them, they ask where it all came from.

He and Carl Adams can meet with the faculty senators by college, he said; the senators must be informed or the Faculty Senate debate will go nowhere. Having an informed discussion at the college level is important, he emphasized, because it is critical to understand how the proposed tenure code changes play out with different groups of faculty; the reaction of the professor of surgery may be very different from that of the professor of English.

Some believe that no change is appropriate, Professor Adams observed. That is stonewalling. Some people do not understand the anger of the legislature at the University and at MNSCU. Some legislators appear to think higher education is unresponsive to the needs of the state--and that many in the legislature are saying this, not just a group of cranks. One can believe that that opinion is right or wrong, but the University must respond to the realities of that perception--and must do so in a fashion that does not give away the store.

The Regents have a variety of views, Professor Adams continued; some want to impose change, some do not care about the issue, some see analogies with industry. The faculty must inform them. The question is how to talk to the Board of Regents between now and June. He said he is personally troubled by speaking directly to the Board; the more FCC does so, the more it dilutes the effectiveness of the administration in representing the faculty. Some disagree with that view, he said, but he personally judges that strategy risky.

There are six to seven weeks to discuss the issues with the senators and interested faculty before the May Senate meetings. The meetings need to be early enough that they can consult with their colleagues about the language of the proposed changes, it was pointed out.

How, repeated one Committee member, did the language about removing all soft money, no matter the source, from the tenure appointment? That is the most divisive issue, and must be removed from the document. Others agreed.

One source was the administration, Professor Adams commented. Another source is the group of lawyers who drafted the language. Another source is this Committee; FCC talked about this for the last

couple of years. Soft funds get into this in a complicated way; it is the increasing view of the administration that ALL funds are soft. Legislative funding is no more fixed than tuition or NIH money; the University has enough experiences that it cannot be sure about any source. Some are more fixed than others, but even with tuition, there was a miscalculation last year of several million dollars. The significant majority of the last legislative appropriation was non-recurring. One thought being given attention by the administration is how to estimate with reasonable certainty the flow of funds to the University that can reasonably be called fixed. Whether based on grants funds in Public Health or tuition in the Carlson School, the appointment devices may be different. Some grants are more secure, over five years, than other sources of funds.

The question is what is to be done about the University's exposure? That is the question. The administration doesn't have an answer and is hoping the faculty can identify one, because the faculty are more informed about this. The administration does not feel legislative funds are firm, and there is competition with the private institutions in the face of the reluctance of the public institutions to raise tuition. The Board of Regents feels it must craft a solution to reduce the exposure of the institution and identify ways to compensate faculty. He recalled once having turned down a five-year grant that would have entailed significant additional responsibilities, because there was no way to compensate him for the work apart from summer salary. Perhaps, he said, this can be addressed by changes in the compensation policy.

This discussion of the uncertainty of funding is going on at all universities in the country, Professor Gray pointed out, but they are still offering permanent tenure.

No one is arguing against that, Professor Adams responded, or that base salaries should not go up. The wording calls for providing a stable base salary, that may increase, plus augmentation based on performance; that might affect some and not others. It is not being read that way, commented one Committee member.

Another Committee member agreed that there is a communication problem, and the faculty need to be educated about the proposed changes, but there is an external problem as well. Information has to be communicated to the rest of the country. It was reported that in one unit, a candidate offered a position at the University was reluctant to take it because of the debate on tenure.

One Committee member commented that Professor Adams' comments accurately reflect the realities of the University, but the question of funding muddies the tenure question. The discussion of tenure should be separated from compensation, it was argued; trying to solve all the problems at once gets everyone into quicksand. There appears to be agreement that administrative augmentations and clinical income should be separated from tenure. The other questions are longer-term and need not be dealt with by June.

Another Committee member reiterated that there is widespread concern about separating tenure and compensation or use of some X-Y-Z matrix for salaries. There seems to be an assumption that if faculty are given incentives, they will raise money. Where is that money? Federal agency funding is declining, and where will the professor of French raise money? The basic assumption is wrong.

In terms of communication, it was said, if the real world, the corporations, the Board of Regents,

the legislature dislike tenure, why not communicate with them? Discouragement with this process began with the Board of Regents, where there seems to be a lack of understanding of what faculty are and what their job is. It is the job of the administration to educate the Regents about the University.

One Committee member supported separating the issues and making more sure academic freedom is linked to tenure. Discussion about how to fund the University can come later. Events in the AHC have led to a review of the literature on industry downsizing; that literature is mixed, but it leans to finding that downsizing does not lead to long-term profitability or innovation. MONEY magazine is advising people not to invest in corporations that are downsizing. What most helps incentive is continued employment along with internal changes to accommodate new organizational needs.

The analogy is a good one, responded another Committee member, but there is a difference: corporations downsize because they want to maximize shareholder profits; the University is downsizing because it will go bankrupt if it does not. That is true, but in terms of the employees, the University is going to "bet the farm" if it makes substantial changes in the tenure code.

Why is the issue of incentives being raised now, inquired Professor Garrard? There have been research grants for 50 years, since World War II, and this faculty has been among the top in the nation in obtaining them. Why does this faculty need incentives?

That is a very good point, Professor Gray agreed. The Committee and Senate have talked about base salaries and bonuses since the report of the Compensation Working Group several years ago. This issue could have been solved then; the administration was given a platform, but did not take advantage of it. She said she also agreed that the clinical income for faculty should be separated from tenure, but that the principle need not be carried any further.

Professor Fosdick said he could not understand why there has been all this serious discussion of tenure and money and the connection between them. Why is the Committee so tied up with tenure and money? The administration should worry about money; why are the faculty not devoting their attention to scholarship?

The Committee is composed of the 10 elected faculty who are supposed to worry about whatever the administration is worried about, Professor Gray laughed; the administration is worried about money, so the Committee does as well. The Committee would much prefer to worry about scholarship, but this is the group of designated victims to worry about money this year.

This is a good example of a well-informed faculty member who does not follow the national debate, said one Committee member. Tenure involves a commitment to salary, so involves money. In the 1970s, commitments to clinical faculty members had a big impact on the ability of the rest of the University to hire faculty. This is an effort to try to figure out how to change the rules, as modestly as possible, so there are sufficient resources to meet obligations.

But one hears nothing about scholarship, Professor Fosdick repeated. Professor Gray said it was taken for granted; they do not talk about excellence, either, for the same reason.

There are two reasons to change the way things are done, Professor Adams the said. One is to

reduce the present and future financial exposure of the University if it is unsure it can meet its commitments with the revenues it has. At present the University has a large exposure in the Medical School and in other AHC units with declining clinical income; that jeopardizes the entire scholarly enterprise of the University, because funds from those activities have supported it. How is that problem to be dealt with?

There are over 300 tenured clinical faculty who have substantial salaries, Professor Adams pointed out; the amount of money involved is substantial. When the finances behind those salaries decline, the problem must be dealt with. One possibility would be to chop off a big portion of the University, but that possibility has been buried with the proposal that tenure will remain institutional, not be departmental. That being the case, the \$10s of millions in commitments must be paid. This is a scholarly/educational problem, because one-half the employees of the University are in the AHC, as are one-fourth of the faculty and more than one-fourth of the resources. What happens in the AHC affects everyone else, now or later, he concluded. Either there is one set of rules for the University, or there is a separate set for the AHC, and no one is discussing or favors the latter possibility. The discussion started because of the financial problem in the AHC, but other economic problems are coming, down the road.

The point about scholarship is an important one, said another Committee member. Once the discussion of the issue goes outside the University, people see tenure as protectionism, and the issue of academic freedom is totally lost.

Professor Campbell then inquired why the present tenure code is inadequate for dealing with financial exigency. If the problem requires the termination of tenured faculty, the decision should be accepted. Who is it that makes the hires that violate the tenure code by placing salaries on soft money? It is not the faculty. The proposal to separate salary from tenure is the "death spiral" of tenure, he argued, and encourages the same management that put the University in this situation to repeat the mistake.

It is also shocking to see that incentives would be so tightly tied to what is brought in in grant money, Professor Campbell continued. People do not become academics because they want to make a lot of money. This is the only country in the world that asks its research establishment to work only nine months of the year. His own incentives are that he wants to do research and produce knowledge, to support research assistants, and has never turned down a grant because it would not pay him a salary--although he would turn one down because he could not do it.

It is not clear what the problem with the present structure is, he said, except that it was not followed by those who want to make changes in it.

Professor Gray said she had the same reaction, but has been struck by how different the views are: deans and administrators claim their hands are tied, while faculty see that they have all the tools they need. There is a difference in the amount of management flexibility that people think exist; perhaps the tenure discussion will help clear it up.

As for who was hired, FCC has made the point repeatedly that the faculty should not be made to suffer for bad management, she said.

Professor Adams said he has tried to emphasize that there is a big difference in incentives between the core business of the research university and what is done in outreach, for example. What has not been thought through is the relationship between core work and outreach, and how cross-subsidies should support activities. There is no doubt that what was done in the AHC was done when there was a money machine over there, with activities generating money to support other programs. There was so much money, the Radisson Hotel was built for outpatients and those visiting patients.

Professor Adams commented that with respect to incentives, why do people consult? Some to bring new problems into their classrooms for discussion; others are quite blunt that they do it for the money. What about overload teaching? Some do it because they like to teach; others, again, do it for the money. Incentives vary with where one sits, he pointed out. Those of a basic scientist are different from a contract employee.

There is the solution, Professor Campbell observed; hire people on contracts, not on tenure. That is done, Professor Adams agreed, and one solution may be to not give tenure so often. The question of what kinds of different work should be supported by what kinds of dollars is tied up in how people are appointed.

Professor Fosdick maintained that young faculty should not be encouraged to seek tenure by getting grants. Thought must be given to the long-term; this encourages people to think funding is important to tenure.

This is an important point, Professor Adams said. It is curious how in the last thirty years in higher education, money has gotten in the way of work. Sixty years ago, in the literature on public administration, it was written that job security was offered to civil service employees in exchange for below-market wages. During the 1950s-1970s, when higher education was expanding, the faculty negotiated and obtained a generous financial situation that was unheard of previously. The consequence of increasing salaries and benefits while also retaining job security has created a financial problem with unionized employees in the government that must be dealt with.

Professor Fosdick said that the answer is to be tougher with granting tenure. Professor Adams said that if Professor Carl Adams were present, he would argue that to be competitive, compensation must be dealt with.

Professor Gray then reviewed the suggestions that had been made to improve communication with the faculty, Board of Regents, and the rest of the world, including a Monday bulletin, meetings with colleges. The latter, Professor Ibele cautioned, should not be restricted to the Adams professors; other FCC members should be involved in those discussions as well.

When Commitment to Focus, Retrenchment and Reallocation, and U2000 reports were prepared, there was extra participation by FCC members, Professor Ibele recalled. They went to the colleges to discuss issues, and got senators in the room when the discussions were held. Professor Gray noted that FCC members have been meeting with Senators and Deans; it might be appropriate to continue those discussions, focused on tenure.

Moreover, Professor Ibele told the Committee, if the approach is to be one of "no surprises," the

faculty should talk often to the administration (it would be less important to do so with the Board of Regents); the administration, in turn, should inform the Board about the likely timetable. If the Board wants to ask individuals to speak to them, that is their prerogative, of course, but FCC should interact primarily with the administration.

Professor Garrard disagreed, and maintained that the faculty should speak for themselves with the Board of Regents. FCC is empowered to do so, and it does not serve faculty well not to speak to the Board. The Committee should talk to the Board, and represent faculty interests more. FCC, she added, is the ONLY body that can do this, and it is elected to do so. And the effort should not be behind the scenes; the administration should be urged to lay out the budgets, and not confine the discussions to senators and department heads. All faculty must be educated--and that is a charge FCC should give to the administration.

The financial details are forthcoming, Professor Feeney reported, and will be widely available.

Professor Feeney then reviewed once again the process that will be used to bring tenure code amendments to the Faculty Senate; the Tenure Subcommittee will be the driver, and will take up the amendments that have been drafted by the four attorneys. The Judicial Committee and Committee on Faculty Affairs will consider the recommendations, and then FCC will take them up. He affirmed that the procedure will include bringing ALL proposals to the Faculty Senate, including some that will probably carry a recommendation of a "no" vote.

If IT had wanted to have its lawyer involved in the drafting process, could it, asked Professor Campbell? The obvious question, said one Committee member, is why one personal lawyer brought into the process to help write tenure code amendments? Why not other provosts and deans? Why was that done?

The option was open to anyone, Professor Feeney replied. Professors Farber and Morrison were committed to the process, and the General Counsel's office had to be included or it would later raise objections, and no one objected to Provost Brody's lawyer participating. There is a difference, Professor Garrard observed, between not objecting and approving. This is a very sensitive issue, observed another Committee member.

It was agreed that reminders would be sent out to all faculty about the schedule of Tenure Subcommittee, SCFA, and Judicial Committee meetings that would deal with the tenure code.

Professor Gray invited Professor Kuhl to comment on the issues. He began by saying that the issue of incentives is a red herring; the University has a reputation for bringing in a lot of research money, and it is impressive how steadily that funding has increased. The University HAS good faculty who are highly motivated and the business of incentives is nonsense.

It is still hard to understand certain things. In the 1970s the University bailed out the Medical School after capitation funds dried up; why is the Board of Regents and administration allowing this to happen again? And it is not accurate to lay the blame for what happened on the Rajender consent decree. There were a lot of dollars coming in and the rules were allowed to slip, with tenured positions split among several faculty. Why was that allowed? Someone must "just say no." If the University wants

someone here doing clinical work, that is fine, but they should not be tenured.

The University as a whole is being forced AGAIN to correct problems that arose in the AHC and the Medical School. Why can they not be separated, and tenure NOT held University wide? There should be tenure in the AHC and tenure under the other two provosts. The system is being contorted to solve problems generated in the health sciences, Professor Kuhl maintained, even though the problems do not exist elsewhere. The system should be taken down one level, with one for the AHC and one for the rest of the University, so the former does not have an impact on the latter.

The Medical School is not as different as it has been painted, said one Committee member. Reliance on clinical income is one thing, but in the reorganization of the biological sciences, the Medical School, CBS, and Agriculture are all together. The Medical School relied on tuition income, like the rest of the University, and there is an insurance pool aspect of the way the University is funded that should bind it together, although outliers should get attention.

The point Professor Kuhl was making, said one Committee member, is that if one is going to be in the pool, one has an obligation to be healthy.

The point, said another, is that it is not fair to call on the University to bail out the Medical School again. The question is, why has it been in this mess twice? The University has been in the same position for a long time, and it went into the situation with its eyes open. Indirect cost recovery (ICR) funds paid a lot of bills and the AHC has been a money machine for the University. Some would argue for separating the AHC in order to limit the University's exposure; some think the AHC would be better off if it could keep all those ICR funds. The Regents and administration have confronted these issues over and over; things rise and fall. The University shared in the money, and now must share in the decline.

The threat of separation is unionization, Professor Campbell said. The law provides for a bargaining unit in the arts and sciences core, one in the AHC, and one in the Law School.

Professor Gray thanked the visitors and guests for joining the meeting, and said that the Committee would act on the suggestions made.

2. Membership

Professor Gray noted that there are now two Committee vacancies, since both Professors Maruyama and Jones have resigned to accept administrative appointments. It was agreed that the two newly-elected individuals, Professors Sara Evans and Russell Hobbie, would be elected to begin serving their terms early. In addition, another individual would have to be elected for a one-year term to fill a vacancy.

Professor Gray then adjourned the meeting at 12:00.

-- Gary Engstrand