

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, April 25, 1996 (Part I)
12:30 - 3:00
Dale Shephard Room, Campus Club**

- Present: Carl Adams (chair), John Adams, Carole Bland, Victor Bloomfield, Dan Feeney, Virginia Gray, James Gremmels, Russell Hobbie, Roberta Humphreys, Fred Morrison, Harvey Peterson
- Regrets: Lester Drewes, Laura Coffin Koch, Michael Steffes
- Guests: Regents Chair Thomas Reagan, Regents Julie Bleyhl, Jean Keffeler, and Patricia Spence
- Others: Professor Edwin Fogelman (Senate Judicial Committee); Martha Kvanbeck (University Senate); Maureen Smith (University Relations); 25 or 30 faculty members

[In these minutes: with the regents in attendance: tenure; the presidential search]

Prior to the beginning of the meeting, Professor Adams announced that there were two items to be discussed with the Regents attending this meeting: tenure and the presidential search. With respect to the latter, rumor has it that there will be a committee of nine, of whom two will be faculty; others will be students, political appointees, and so on. Professor Bloomfield reported that the prior presidential search advisory committee (which he chaired) had thirteen faculty (ten from the Twin Cities and one from each of the coordinate campuses) and five students and two staff--a very different concept than that apparently now being considered.

1. Discussion with the Regents

Professor Adams convened the meeting at 12:30 and welcomed Regents Reagan and Keffeler, and explained that one item of interest was tenure, including an assurance to the faculty about the way the Regents expect to respond in the process of amendment to the tenure code. Would there be unilateral changes following limited consultation, or can the faculty expect extensive consultation on issues where there may be differences? Another item is the presidential search, and specifically the process to be used. The Senate Consultative Committee will next week provide advice to the Board on characteristics to be sought and requirements of the position, but there is uncertainty about the process. The rumors circulating are disquieting, because they do not suggest there will be faculty involvement to the extent there has been in the past or what could be expected in the future.

Regent Reagan said he believed the best way to proceed would be for he and Regent Keffeler to respond to questions. The first one might be the procedural one, Professor Adams said; Section 19 of the tenure code says that amendments from any source will receive consultation. The faculty expect that the

*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.

mechanics for the process would be a recommendation from the Faculty Senate for appropriate modifications to the tenure code; the Regents could accept the proposals, or they could express concerns about the proposal or that something else needed to be addressed. In the latter case, the concern is whether the issue would be returned to the Faculty Senate for additional consultation.

Regent Reagan recalled that he and Professor Adams had discussed this issue on the telephone recently. It is HIS intention, he said, that should the Faculty Senate "come a little short of where the Regents think we have to be, for all the constituencies who think we have to do some revision of the code," that the Board would return the proposals to the Faculty Senate, with impressions of where the Regents believe the code should be, and provide an opportunity to revisit the issues. He has spoken with Regents Keffeler and Spence about this, and they share his view.

He also asked the General Counsel to review the language of the code on this subject, and read his letter on the subject: "We not only recommit the Board to the practice, but re-emphasize our intention that no final action shall be taken by the Board of Regents on any amendments to the tenure code until such amendments have been submitted to the Faculty Senate for its advice and recommendation." That is his view, he concluded.

Regent Keffeler said that was also her view, however, she said she suspected that part of the faculty concern is about the circumstances under which the consultation would take place and its timeliness. One can imagine putting issues plainly on the table, she said, but individual members have expressed an interest in considering unit-based rather than University-wide tenure. If the faculty come forward with University-wide tenure, as an example, and if the Board believed it should go to unit-based tenure, the statement of Regent Reagan and "the way the constitution is put together would, I think, be a little bit redundant if one of the things you have been doing throughout your entire process is debating specifically that. How do we deal with that kind of thing at the end?" She also inquired if the review process would be three or six months or more?

One Committee member noted that Professor (J.) Adams raised the question of unit-based tenure in the January discussion paper. The faculty as a whole has not debated it. One thing that many faculty would like an assurance on is that even if the Board were to adopt unit-based tenure versus institutional tenure, there is a wide range of detail in doing so, so that comment upon it would be useful. ANYTHING, even little tinkering, the faculty would urge ought to come back to the Faculty Senate for reconsideration. When there has been reconsideration of a specific proposal put forward by a majority of the Board, then the Board is free to act. Unit-based tenure might be different in all sorts of detail that the faculty would like an opportunity to respond to, in an attempt to influence the Board.

In terms of the length of the process, one thing that has been of great concern to the faculty is that the Board is likely to receive the first round of the proposals in the summer--when it will be difficult to convene the Faculty Senate or to get a reasonable representation of faculty views. After the summer, the next Faculty Senate meeting will be in October or November. By that time the Board may have formulated ideas; the faculty would like an assurance that if the Board has ideas that are different from what has been sent forward, the faculty will have an opportunity at that October Faculty Senate meeting to respond.

This is the process that was used a decade ago. As a result of concerns by the Board of Regents, a

committee of faculty met with the Board, the Board expressed concerns, language was drafted, taken to the Faculty Senate, and the language was adopted. That is far preferable to having language imposed. Is that an acceptable answer? That the fall meeting would be a time to consider changes? If not, there will be a great deal of anxiety.

One Committee member expressed support for having proposals ready for this summer. Professor Feeney said he could assure the Regents that there would be language ready, although what the proposals would be he could not predict at this point.

Professor Adams said it was not clear what explicitly was being sought from two individual Regents, but noted that the sentiments express a significant concern. What would be helpful is if that concern could be allayed; is what was suggested about the fall Senate meeting reasonable?

Regent Keffeler said that if one takes away the mechanics and speaks to the spirit of the proposal, her view is that she would not wish to have before her, as a member of the Board, action to change the tenure code without knowing what the considered view of the faculty is. How that point is reached, and the chronology, she said she did not know.

The significant point is that the "considered view" of the faculty is represented by an official position of the Faculty Senate, with respect to specific items. That is a concern: that people not take from a generalized "this isn't well drafted yet" that there has been a rejection of the idea as a whole. The language of Section 19 refers to any proposal for amendment; "I understand that to mean any SPECIFIC proposal for amendment, not any generic idea that there ought to be an amendment in this direction," Professor Morrison said.

One Committee member commented on Regent Reagan's phrase about amendments "coming short of where we have to be." What is the Regents' position on "where we have to be"? Regent Reagan responded that they do not have a position on that at present. When they see the document presented to it by the Faculty Senate is when the Board will have to decide if it is "where we have to be" or if it lacks something in one or another area. They have set up the process so the faculty would deal with the issues, up to a point; then the Board must decide where it wants to be. That will be measured by the various telephone calls the Regents have had with legislators and taxpayers and faculty members and students, but they will not know until they see the document. Regent Keffeler concurred.

What was being sought in the question, asked one Committee member? Clarification of what is desired, it was said. There are a number of faculty who feel they have seen proposals from a number of different sources, some in the proper channels and some not. This has led to considerable confusion about what the end product should be, about "where we have to be."

Regent Reagan said that right now they are dealing only in general terms. What he hears from the rest of the Board is that they need some flexibility that the present code may not be providing. That flexibility, in the minds of a lot of Regents, comes down to a lot of economic forces, things that the Board might have to do some time and that it better prepare for so it can effect those things. But that is very general, he cautioned, and the Board cannot provide more specific direction at this point.

There are a number of questions coming to the Committee on Faculty Affairs and the Tenure

Subcommittee from within the faculty and from the outside, Professor Feeney reported, about what the real driving forces behind the need for revision of the tenure code are. They have heard all kinds of explanations: that it was the funding problems in the health sciences, it was public pressure, and so on. What is coming out of the discussion is a question of what the real expectations are. Is this a moving target? There have been discussions about the percentage of faculty who are tenured, and data were sought from peer institutions. Nobody knew what the goal was; is it to be at 50% tenured faculty fifteen years down the road? The problem that comes up is a resistance to change if people do not understand the need for change. If there was a plea to be made, it is to know what sort of things are driving this process. Is it because of a funding problem because of projected state revenues, and things will be so bad that the Board may have to declare financial exigency across the University if such changes are not made? That is what people need to know.

Regent Reagan said it was all of these things. Among things that by themselves are NOT driving the process, he said, are the problems of the Academic Health Center. They are a factor, but not the driving force. It is not the legislature's interest, but it is a factor. It is not just the taxpayers' concern, as they express an interest in the survival of the University. It is ALL of those things. It is the downturn in state funding for instructional costs; that level should be 33%, but current figures suggest it is 22 or 25 or 26%. Those are all factors, and are factors universities across the country are considering.

It is not true that Minnesota is the only one facing these problems; a few have been through the process, and others are contemplating it. A number are watching Minnesota to see what it does. At a recent meeting of the Association of Governing Boards, Regent Reagan related, many people, including presidents, faculty, and regents, told him that Minnesota is stepping into a morass that it will be difficult to settle, and asked why. His answer, he said, is that it appears to the Board of Regents that something has to be done. The University needs flexibility. There are many who are saying the Board must create a better atmosphere in the culture and environment of downsizing that is going on in this country. There are those who are asking why the tenure of a faculty member should be sacrosanct. There are a lot of different factors that come into play. The interesting thing that comes out of these discussions with other people is that they say they wish they were doing what Minnesota is doing, in that it is facing the problems. No one has any idea what the outcomes will be, but they all believe they will also have to face these problem in the not-too-distant future. His view is that "if we can do this, and do it right, and keep us all together," the new president will have the greatest possible gift that person could be given--if this is all settled, and everyone agrees there is a reasonable compromise. Others view that as a very good way to compete for top candidates for the presidency--if they know that this issue has been addressed, and in a manner that did not tear the University apart. He has been told, he said, that if the University wants to go after top-notch talent, it should have a campus that is not bloodied by an issue, like this one, and is not a campus that has just fired its president or forced him or her into retirement under pressure. Driving all of these things that are being done is the most important thing they can do as regents, to get the best talent they can to take over on July 1, 1997.

The Committee understands what he has said about the importance of getting a new president, said one Committee member, and the difficulties there will be if the campus is not solidly behind what has happened. The faculty feel the University is far from that situation right now, and that for a variety of understandable reasons, are not yet on the same wavelength with the Regents. The process by which the faculty and Regents attempt to work together on this will be crucial.

One is struck, it was said, by the expression of concerns from the outside world about why tenure is a difficult issue and why the University must become more flexible. One does not know what responses are being given, but one of the responsibilities of regents is to articulate to the legislature, to the public, to the taxpayers, the importance of tenure and what it will mean in the 21st century, just as it has meant a lot in the 19th and 20th centuries. It may have a slightly different meaning, but that meaning will be absolutely fundamental to a shared and productive discussion. That kind of discussion is needed. It is awkward, however, because there is a chain of command in the University: the faculty, the administration, the Regents. In general, the Regents deal with the administration and expect the administration to deal with the faculty. This meeting is a short-circuiting of that process, and that is to be commended. But the first thing that needs discussion is "what are the values as well as the problems of tenure."

Regent Reagan said it was absolutely right that regents, in an ideal situation, should have been speaking more to the importance of and the need for tenure, of whatever kind it may end up being. They have not had the opportunity or the time to do that. At one of their meetings, when Professor (J.) Adams was speaking, it was said people wondered what the Regents have in mind. Will they go after tenure and get rid of it? After a lengthy discussion, he recalled, he asked Professor Adams what they had to do as regents to let the faculty know the Regents were not out to destroy tenure. They understand the need for academic freedom and other reasons; they believe, however, given the tenure code that the University of Minnesota has, that they need a little different code to allow them to do things they may have to do down the line. It is correct, however, to say that there should be more discussions.

Regent Keffeler said she was not sure where "to grab hold of this conversation." She said she gave the matter a lot of thought in the letter she sent to Professor (C.) Adams prior to this meeting. As she said in the letter, until the situation is assessed, and the faculty and Regents can come to agreement on where they think the University should go, what should be important, and whether the tenure code in any way mitigates their ability to achieve those objectives, it is not clear how they will know if the solutions proposed are the right ones. There is a lot of spadework to be done. If the faculty sees the University's situation in one way, and the Board sees it in another way--if the faculty thinks there is not a financial problem, and the Board is convinced there IS a financial problem, it will be hard to avoid disaster until the two groups come to agreement. So the financial situation should be examined. That is one piece. If the faculty think the operating assumptions of the Board are incorrect, the faculty may be right. "Tell us why you think they are incorrect and let us develop a new common base," she said. She said she did not know if university-wide tenure is a problem, except intuitively, until she knows whether there are units, because of better quality education or too little money, might be phased out. Nor does she know until she understands the natural profile of what is happening to the faculty now, as faculty are hired and retired. This is basic information that is required for intelligent decisions; one cannot propose solutions without having done that work.

One Committee member said the financial situation was of specific interest. One of the things that has been on the faculty's mind, and where it has not been getting answers either from the administration or the Regents, is the extent of the financial crisis that is supposedly driving the tenure code decisions. The faculty need the numbers.

Regent Keffeler noted that she had said in her letter that the faculty and Regents should literally sit down together, with the financial framework the administration put together. That suggestion, she noted

on looking around, was provoking rolled eyes.

One of the numbers the faculty wonder about, based on numbers they have been able to obtain, is that faculty salaries are 12% of the total University budget. That is a relatively small total fraction, so faculty wonder why they, and tenure, are the target of attempts to downsize or re-engineer. It seems to the faculty that there are other areas that are probably bigger fractions of the budget, and attention should be focused on them, instead of undermining the basic justification for a university, academic freedom, and probably jeopardizing the University's reputation nationally and internationally.

There are good and reasonable answers to that question, Regent Keffeler responded, that do not have to be matters of opinion.

Professor Adams said that Professor Morrison should respond to the suggestion about discussing the financial framework, as chair of the Finance and Planning Committee. Professor Morrison reported that he also had a computer program to run financial futures; there is no question that while the numbers may be different by 30% or 40%, there are some financial challenges ahead. There are also some major opportunities, in other ways that have not been addressed.

At this point, Regents Bleyhl and Spence joined the meeting.

From the point of view of the Committee on Finance and Planning, it has looked at the financial projections, and realizes the University has major financial problems. Many of those major problems are caused by capital construction; the University builds buildings and then has to support them. It has to support them by cutting instructional money. There are hard decisions along that line that also have to be made. One of the things that concerns faculty is that the piece of this that appears on the table right now is the tenure piece, and not some of these other issues.

That is a good message for the Board to get, Regent Keffeler commented.

Similarly, Professor Morrison said, there is an issue with regard to retirements. At least until two years ago, there was great worry about how the University would repopulate the faculty, because of the large number of projected retirements. If there is a large number of projected retirements, "do we really have a problem?" he asked.

Another point that he has made elsewhere, Professor Morrison said--and he wanted it to be clear that he is the author of much of the current tenure code--is that the existing tenure code has not been fully and effectively utilized, in its own terms. It could be more effectively utilized, in its own terms, without any change and without undermining people's protections. That must also be thought about.

But what comes to the faculty is a sense that the way to deal with this is layoffs. That has been extremely demoralizing, creating a climate of concern, and giving the University a reputation around the country that is making hiring and retention difficult. It can be hoped that by next fall the University is not in the position of the bloodiness of the faculty, "but right now we are." This Committee, with a 119-9 vote at the Faculty Senate last week, had a communication of what faculty sentiment is--and that sentiment is over this issue.

What must be focused on is what can be done to move the discussion along, in a positive way, rather than look at what was there in the past, Professor Morrison told the Regents. Some of this is an issue of "what is the role of faculty in the University?" Those who have been around awhile think of the faculty, in a sense, like the regents; the faculty are also named in the charter. The faculty are in a sense also the officers of the University. There is a difference between thinking of the faculty as the officers of the University who have a responsibility for instruction and research, and thinking of the faculty as the day labor of the University who are subject to hire or dismissal at will. One of the real concerns is nurturing, for EVERYBODY'S benefit, the notion that the faculty are more than the day labor; that they are an important part of building and molding and creating a bigger and better university. That must be enhanced and encouraged. There are things in the revisions to the tenure code being considered that will do that; there are other things that could also be done. To some extent, however, that has been under attack from a number of quarters for a number of years; the faculty need some reassurance on this.

One Committee member suggested that there may be agreement that before there are drastic changes in the tenure code, there needs to be clarity about the directions in which things will go and problems for which solutions are sought. In addition, there is a need to know the scope of solutions that have been offered for each of those problems, ranging from implementation of the current tenure code all the way to stopping construction of buildings. Attention should be on the solutions seen as desirable; if the tenure code ends up being one after that process, the faculty will be "on board." But right now it is prudent for the faculty not to do anything drastic, when it is not clear what the purpose is.

Another Committee member suggested that over the summer there might be more informal meetings between faculty and subsets of the Regents. One can look at this from a cost-benefit perspective. The Regents are looking at the benefits of flexibility of downsizing and so on; to the faculty, there are also major costs attached to different solutions. There is a need for deeper discussion of other areas of the University, and about the values and benefits of tenure.

"I have spent my life at the University, as have the other people in the room, trying to attract people to the University, trying to get the best talent, and figure out what sort of environment would attract the best young people, the best mid-career people, the most talented senior people." The Regents are talking to people outside the University whose major concern is how to shrink it; one hears people ask why faculty should have these jobs if they have to downsize at AT&T. Those are quite different situations, and there has to be thought given to the possible damage being done to the University's attractiveness by prolonging this discussion and by considering some of the options. In the balance, it may be necessary to consider doing things no one would have thought necessary ten years ago, but it is necessary to look at both sides of the equation before any changes are made.

One element of this tenure discussion that is unclear is the issue of timing, said one Committee member. One might wish for a magic solution tomorrow, but seeking solutions too quickly could be dangerous. There is also the question of the legislative performance measure.

One Committee member said there are some things that there appears to be general agreement on, that could be done quickly; whether those would satisfy legislative concerns is unclear. There are other things that need more extensive discussion--identifying the problem before identifying the solution. The Regents have imposed the timetable; the faculty needs to hear how they feel about doing a few worthwhile things that are not controversial, and then spending more expended time debating the harder

issues.

This is the same issue that came up when Regent Reagan visited the Committee last December, recalled one Committee member; the same point was raised, and the answer he should give is the same one he gave then: "do the best you can by June, and we'll see in June where we are."

The Regents should keep concentrating on the goals of the public land-grant research university for the state of Minnesota in the year 2010 or 2020, and then challenge the faculty and administration how to get there, and hold them accountable for getting there. That is a different way of approaching things than to work on specific rules or resource questions, or specific complaints from legislators or the public. It is Regents responsibility to front for the University with the legislature and with the public.

If a question is raised that seems uninformed, rather than back up, it is necessary to challenge it and enter into a dialogue with the public the University is expected to serve. That is not what the Board is doing, but that is what must be done, rather than working at a level of operations. If the faculty or the administration are involved in operations that do not serve the long-term health and vitality of the University, that is the time to challenge what is being done. But the challenge should be to the result; it is the faculty's job to figure out how to get there, whether in education, research, or outreach.

One has the feeling, after service on this Committee, that too often not enough attention is paid to where the University is trying to go and too much attention is paid to day-to-day procedures of how to get there. Too much attention to the day-to-day makes it easy to lose sight of where one is going. That has to do with issues of needing this college or that department, which is not the right question. The right question is whether this particular activity is getting the University where it wants to be, in a competitive environment fifteen years down the road.

The right things are being said, but the activities of the last six months do not match the rhetoric. The University has a human resources policy arrangement, and attention should be to how human resources policies contribute to the long-term health of the University over the next 25 years. Within that, there is the faculty part of human resource policy, and within that there is a set of specific rules that have a history and rationale. The process should not START with that detail, and then elicit the kind of reactions that have been seen, which are very destructive.

It is not the time to assess blame, it is the time to figure out where next to go. The answer Regent Reagan gave in December was the right one: Do what can be done, keeping in mind the context in which they are raised. It may take another year to get this project finished; based on the history of what happened ten years ago, if the needed results can be accomplished in that length of time, that would be a success. But these issues cannot be settled in six or eight weeks.

The most important thing to be done is to take constructive action to engage, together, the big issues, Regent Keffeler said. The Regents will be more effective in stepping forward in defense of tenure if they understand much better what the real threats are to academic freedom, and what the relationship between them is. The Regents will be much more effective in representing the faculty, and its importance, if they have looked at the overall picture. In terms of timing, she said, there is a need to immediately start talking about such core issues, such as academic freedom and there is a need to start getting the information that is needed. If the faculty continue to move in the directions it is now moving

in terms of specific code revisions, and if there are revisions the faculty feel are reasonable, that would be fine. But it would be a shame if all the energy were concentrated on relatively insignificant changes to the tenure code, and in the meantime there were no engagement on the major questions of institutional direction, academic freedom, and the overall renewal of the University's human resources.

One Committee member said that sounded directly on the point. In the past the Regents and faculty have been buffered from each other, and that barrier is being broken down at a time of considerable stress. This process should continue. If there could be discussions over the summer, with representatives from the various committees that are concerned, to share information and talk about philosophy and discuss financial information to try to reach a common understanding of it, the fall could see a time when the faculty were ready to act.

On the issue of timing, Regent Reagan noted that one Committee member had suggested finishing this process within a year. He said he would like it to be finished sooner--before the new president is appointed, which they want to see in eight or nine months. If this is prolonged, it will play into the hands of outsiders concerned about tenure. The reaction will be "there they go again. They're turning it over to the faculty. They'll work it and work it and work it until the Board gets tired, and nothing of any consequences will happen." He cautioned the Committee not to shoot the messenger; he said he is just relaying what is out there. There are those who believe that at the University, if something is to be turned over to the faculty, it will take years to get anything done. The Board wants this to be done as soon as it can; that is one signal he can honestly convey. He can also say, if the situation **REQUIRES** that there be a backing off and some things done first to make it work, that will extend the time, the Board understands. The faculty should understand one other fact: the timeframe was **NOT** designed by the Board of Regents, he concluded.

One Committee member said that the topic does not need discussion but the Regents should get a message. As one listens to the debate and talks to people, it is clear that one of the severe problems, something that has broken down the trust and communication of the faculty, has been the CSC consultants. The Regents hired them, the Regents know what the consultants are doing for them. One of the best things the Board could do to help clear the air would be to terminate the relationship.

This comment elicited a round of applause from the visitors to the meeting.

Professor Adams said it was his understanding that Provost Cerra is going to meet with the faculty of the Academic Health Center to discuss the issue of the relationship with the consultant and the re-engineering activity. There will be opportunity to understand where the AHC leadership stands on this issue.

Professor Adams then asked that there be discussion of the process of conduct of the presidential search, noting that anxiety about it has been increasing.

The search is under way, Regent Reagan reported; they have a consulting firm, Korn-Ferry, under contract. He and Mr. Bosacker have spent many hours reading the literature and talking with everyone they can who has a sense of how to conduct a search. He spent most of a day with one of his predecessors, David Lebedoff, who was chair of the Board the last time a presidential search was conducted, as well as with Mr. Bosacker's predecessor. What they were told repeatedly was that they

first needed to decide what is needed in the next president--what are the qualifications and expertise that is needed to take this University and move it forward.

That advice prompted the Board to set up some thirty public forums with a wide array of constituencies, who will tell the Board what they believe is needed. Several of them have been held, and they are working well. They are receiving good advice and people are pleased. Another driving factor in doing this, he related, is that they see an opportunity to not only to get the best president, but also to obtain support in the state for the institution. If they can talk to as many people as possible, to ask their impressions of what they believe the University needs, they believe there will be a large public relations plus for the new president; the people of the state will feel they have been part of the process. They are not playing games with people, he added; they are not going to have meetings and ignore what they say.

The next step, after the forums are completed in late May, will be to appoint an advisory committee to the Board. That committee will advertise for candidates and do the screening. This is probably the item of most interest, he observed, and nothing is decided, but they have been advised to keep the group as small as possible, perhaps nine to eleven. Many such committees have 20 or 30 members, which makes it difficult for them to do their work. With the theme of getting a broad constituency involved in the process, there will be an opportunity to get people interested in the University and willing to help it.

They have considered the various constituencies, and want participation as broad as possible while keeping the group as small as possible. Certainly the faculty will be involved, he said; they have not determined what weight they will have, but they will have more weight than any other constituent group. But it will not be all faculty, he added. They will have the business community involved, and labor; not just organized labor, but labor in the broadest sense. The legislature will be involved; there will not be elected officials on the committee, but they will have a say because they hold the fate of the University in their hands. The Governor will have a role. Students will also be involved, as will be the alumni. How these groups will be weighted is not decided.

Regent Reagan said they would like the advisory committee to identify about three candidates, and then the Board will make a choice. They would like to have someone selected by December of 1996 or January of 1997. That date is important because it is when the legislature will reconvene, and they have been told it is important to have the president-elect understand the budget that is being sought.

One Committee member distributed two pages from the Michigan alumni magazine; Michigan is also seeking a president now. There are interesting parallels between what Minnesota and Michigan are doing, and the differences. Michigan also used a forum process to elicit comments and have a search advisory committee consistent with what Regent Reagan said about desirable size. Their search committee is chaired by the Dean of the Law School, has one alumni representative, six faculty members, two staff members, and two students.

The Board will talk about what the best composition of the search advisory committee should be, but the Board should be cautioned that a group made up of advocates for specific points of view will be a problem. It is important to have people understand the issues that have to be on the table, but when there are staunch advocates for a particular position, that is a recipe for deadlock. The University must understand what the legislature and the business community and the public think, but the people around

this table need not be reminded, it was said, that some of these agendas are very short-term. The faculty are here for their life. Legislators come and go, regents come and go, business community people come and go; the faculty are here for the long haul, and that must be remembered as the committee is put together.

Practically speaking, said one Committee member, since faculty are the ones working in this "industry," and the others are not, it is the faculty who will know how to find the candidates, who will know who to call to check them out formally and informally, who know what kinds of things should be sought. Whatever the size of the committee, at least half of its members should be faculty, because they will be the ones who are the workhorses. The other people might be involved in the interviews or screening, but they will not be very effective, on average, in scouting out candidates and vetting their recommendations.

One Committee member said that the idea of the forums was wise, but suggested that there are two additional steps that should be taken. One additional forum should be with successful university presidents, and there should be a review of the literature on what makes a successful president.

Professor Adams then called on Professor Fogelman for a comment on tenure. Professor Fogelman said there are two different processes at work; one is the one that was discussed, about greater flexibility and accountability and so on. The faculty is very responsive to that. The other process is re-engineering in the AHC; that is inimical. The report calls for getting rid of departments, deans, tenure, and academic freedom.

Professor Fogelman urged the members of the Board to read the report of their own consultant, Mr. Denny, about the general guidelines. It is the OPPOSITE of re-engineering; it is diametrically opposed to the whole re-engineering effort. The report from Mr. Denny is an enlightened and important document, and cuts the ground out from the entire re-engineering notion. For the sake of the University, the Board must pay attention to what Mr. Denny's report says in relation to re-engineering.

One of the visitors to the meeting followed up on Professor Fogelman's comments and provided two articles that she asked the Board members to read.

Professor Adams said he sensed an open spirit of communication on the part of the Regents and expressed the appreciation of the Committee for that approach.

-- Gary Engstrand