

Minutes*

**Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee
Friday, September 26, 2008
9:30 – 11:30
300 Morrill Hall**

Present: Tom Clayton (chair), Yusuf Abul-Hajj, Tracey Anderson, Arlene Carney, Carol Klee, Barbara Loken, Linda McLoon, Karen Miksch, Paul Porter, Carol Wells

Absent: Joseph Gaugler, Terry Simon

Guests: none

[In these minutes: (1) copyright policy; (2) University of Illinois statement on political activities; (3) applicability of the Academic Freedom and Responsibility policy to administrators; (4) Rochester campus personnel plan; (5) "The Last Professors"]

1. Copyright Policy

Professor Clayton convened the meeting at 9:30 and turned first to Professor Wells for a report on the copyright policy.

Professor Wells noted that she is a member of the Senate, of the FCC-appointed copyright subcommittee, and of this Committee. The copyright policy will be up for a vote on October 2; according to the minutes of the Faculty Consultative Committee, the Provost created a copyright committee to draft the policy but disputes will be dealt with later. The FCC-appointed subcommittee met only once with the Provost's copyright committee to identify issues. Dr. Carney reported that the Provost's committee had included four faculty members: Gary Balas (past FCC chair), John Archer, Marc Jenkins, and Ruth Okediji; Professor Okediji and University Librarian Wendy Lougee co-chaired the committee. It was also assisted by Jon Binks from the Provost's office and Greg Brown from the Office of the General Counsel, and she also served as a member.

Professor Wells said she thought the FCC-appointed subcommittee was to assist in writing the administrative policy, but only met it once. She said she was surprised to now see the policy up for a vote at the Senate. FCC recommends voting to adopt the policy but to settle later how disputes will be resolved. The administrative policy does not refer to online materials or software—but the policy also does not say they are not included.

The letter the copyright committee sent to the Provost said that software had been excluded because it was too complex an area to deal with. She noted that the policy has been available for comment for a month and that it was sent to all constituent groups, including members of the Senate. The Provost appointed the copyright committee with the knowledge of all the other Senate committees. Every faculty member received notice about the policy and the draft was brought to the Senate Research Committee, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, and the Faculty Consultative Committee. They

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

also received feedback from CAPA and others. This was not a secret process, she pointed out. Professor Wells said she was not claiming that it was, but the subcommittee she was on to work on drafting has not seen the document. Dr. Carney also noted that the copyright committee asked if it should consult with this Committee; Professor Clayton agreed that copyright more appropriately would go to the Research and Faculty Affairs committees. He also agreed that copyright is not a direct concern of this Committee but is of small interest to the extent it affects academic freedom. Dr. Carney said that the representatives of the copyright committee were not present and she pointed out that Ms. Lougee is the one who has made the presentations.

Professor Wells repeated her points that the FCC-appointed subcommittee had not met to give advice, that the policy was missing a dispute-resolution process that FCC asked for, and that the policy was misleading because it does not say it excludes software and online materials. Professor McLoon said she did not see how the policy could exclude software and online materials. Vice Provost Carney pointed that software was discussed at length by the copyright committee and identified many difficulties; Professor Balas supported excluding it from the policy because the issues are so complex; the Senate Research Committee agreed. Software will be dealt with separately.

Dr. Carney pointed out with some exasperation that this was not on the agenda for the meeting today and she had made no preparation to talk about copyright nor had she brought any materials related to it. Professor Clayton said that the issue came up late so wasn't on the agenda, but it was appropriate for the Committee to talk about it. But it has received no report from the copyright committee so has not heard what the Senate Research Committee, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, and the Faculty Consultative Committee heard, Dr. Carney responded. This discussion puts her in a difficult situation. She added, in response to another query, that online materials are covered by the policy.

Professor Clayton said it appears that the FCC-appointed subcommittee was forgotten.

Professor Clayton asked what the Committee wished to do. Professor Wells said that if the only policy language is what is on the web, she will move to table the policy until dispute resolution is included and it is clear that it does not include software and online materials. Professor McLoon agreed with comments that the policy is vague and unclear.

Professor Miksch asked if the dispute-resolution process would come before this Committee. It would not, Dr. Carney said. The Libraries provide first-level assistance and information. How the dispute-resolution process will work is the subject of current discussion with FCC and the Office of the General Counsel and Ms. Lougee.

Professor Clayton agreed to convey to the Faculty Consultative Committee what this Committee considered friendly amendments to the motion concerning dispute resolution, software, and online course materials. The Committee approved unanimously.

2. University of Illinois Policy on Political Activities

Professor Clayton distributed copies of a statement the Committee might consider in response to the University of Illinois policy on political activity. The policy memo from the Illinois website was provided to the Committee.

* * *

Prohibited Political Activity: Upcoming elections and how this impacts you as an employee

Tuesday, November 4, 2008, is the 2008 Presidential Election. There will be many activities on campus and nationwide related to the election over the coming months. So, it is important that as an employee of the University of Illinois, you are aware of the elements of the *State Officials and Employees Ethics Act* that may impact your participation. First and foremost, the law is not intended to hinder or in any way violate your individual freedoms. In fact, the activities defined as "prohibited" per the law are only prohibited while employees are on University time or using University resources or property. If the appropriate benefit time is charged and the activities do not take place on University property, it is permissible for you, while representing yourself individually (not as a University employee), to become involved in such events.

The concept of prohibited political activity is challenging to fully define, so it is always a good idea to consult with the University Ethics Office if you are unsure (866-758-2146).

Some of the main categories of commonly occurring prohibited political activity are explained below. Remember, these are things employees can not do while working, when on University property, while using University resources (e.g., phone, fax, paper, email, etc.), or when acting as a representative of the University; but they are things that can take place if the appropriate benefit time is used and University property and resources are not involved:

- Preparing for or participating in any rally or event related to a specific political candidate, party, or referendum - this includes preparation and circulation of campaign materials, petitions, or literature
- Soliciting contributions or votes on behalf of a particular political party or candidate
- Assisting at the polls on behalf of any political party, candidate, or organization
- Surveying or conducting an opinion poll related to anticipating an election outcome, or participating in a recount challenge related to an election outcome
- Running for political office

The law isn't always as clear as we'd like, so here are a few specific examples to better define what is and what is not considered prohibited political activity (can't be performed on University time without appropriate benefit usage; and never on University property or using University resources):

Prohibited Political Activity	Acceptable Political Activity
-------------------------------	-------------------------------

Wearing a pin or t-shirt in support of the Democratic Party or Republican Party, or a Democratic/Republican candidate	Wearing a pin encouraging others to "vote" that is not specific to any particular party or candidate 
A supervisor requiring an employee to engage in political activity outside of work	An employee independently choosing to engage in political activities outside of work
Distributing, producing, or posting flyers or other campaign literature on campus during lunch or break time	Distributing, producing, or posting flyers or other campaign literature at an off-campus location during lunch or break time
Registering employees to vote in a booth that is clearly designated to one political party or candidate	Registering employees to vote while on their lunch or other designated breaks in a party-neutral booth

Specific examples of things that are expressly prohibited include:

- Placing a collection jar on your desk or even in a break room to solicit funds for a specific political candidate or party
- Attending a rally on University property specific to a political candidate or party - regardless of whether or not you are on University time

The University Ethics Office can not and does not intend to police each of the campuses for political buttons, t-shirts, bumper stickers, etc. Instead, we ask that employees educate themselves and become aware of their responsibilities to the law as it relates to employment with the University of Illinois. Knowing the various aspects of the prohibited political activities section of the *Ethics Act* will simply assist you in acting in a manner that is consistent with the law.

* * *

Professor Clayton described the policy as "absurd and unbelievable." Should the Committee make a statement, and if so, to whom? Professor Abul-Hajj said the Committee need not react to an absurd stand by the University of Illinois administration. It is preposterous to talk about it and administrators should not dictate political activities. Professor McLoon said she was torn about saying anything because silence could imply agreement.

Professor Wells pointed out that students on the Illinois campuses can engage in the activities, but not the faculty and staff!

Professor Clayton said he objected strenuously to restraint such as this but that he was doubtful whether the example invited the Committee to take a position. If the Committee is going to issue statements, they should be something worth saying, not just disapproval or commendation. Professor Wells agreed and said the Committee should not borrow trouble. If the University of Minnesota were to take a similar action, then it would be appropriate to respond. Vice Provost Carney said she suspected the likelihood of this university adopting any policy like that at Illinois was so remote it was difficult to imagine. Perhaps not now, Professor Abul-Hajj said, but that depends on who the administrators are.

Professor Loken suggested waiting to see how the Illinois administration responds, or if another major university adopts a similar policy. At that point this Committee might respond.

Professor Miksch said she thought the Illinois policy is SO outrageous that she could not believe it would have a chilling effect on free speech at other universities. If it does, then the University of Minnesota should make it clear it does not have such rules.

3. Applicability of the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Policy to Administrators

Professor Clayton next asked Committee members to review proposed language to be added to the "Comment" section of the proposed motion for the Faculty Senate asking that it recommend an amendment to the Board of Regents policy on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. The proposal came as a result of a discussion with the General Counsel, who reportedly was concerned that the Board of Regents would see the change as affecting the right of the President to select and retain senior administrative staff who supported the announced goals and policies of the Regents and the administration.

[The Committee has been working on a proposal to amend the Academic Freedom and Responsibility policy as follows (new language in caps, language to be deleted [in brackets]): "Academic freedom is the freedom to discuss all relevant matters in the classroom; to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression; and to speak or write [as a public citizen] without institutional discipline or restraint ON MATTERS OF PUBLIC CONCERN AS WELL AS ON MATTERS RELATED TO THEIR PROFESSIONAL DUTIES AND TO THE FUNCTIONING OF THE UNIVERSITY. Academic responsibility implies the faithful performance of academic duties and obligations, the recognition of the demands of the scholarly enterprise, and the candor to make it clear that the individual is not speaking for the institution in matters of public interest." The "Comment" that follows the proposal explains to the Faculty Senate (and presumably to the Regents, if the Faculty Senate and the appropriate consultative processes thereafter concur in the recommendation.)

The draft additional language for the "Comment" read as follows:

The Committee recognizes that freedom to speak about the affairs of the University without institutional discipline or restraint does not necessarily extend to those who hold senior administrative positions. The Committee understands that the president and the senior officers can expect that those in administrative positions (for example, at the level of dean or above) and staff who work with or for them will support announced University goals and policies. For example, a vice president who testifies at the legislature or other public venue against a policy of the Board of Regents or an announced goal of the University may be subject to discipline or termination (from their administrative position, but not from their tenured faculty position, if they

hold one). The Committee accepts the proposition that administrators have the right and responsibility to choose colleagues who will join in advancing the goals the administrators have articulated, and to discipline or dismiss those who do not. The focus of the amendment the Committee has proposed is on faculty members and other University staff who do not hold senior administrative positions but who are willing to participate in the governance system and who may express views critical of institutional proposals. It is not the business of the Committee to try to establish the understandings or conditions of employment attendant on the hiring of administrative officers; presumably the President and his or her colleagues will establish the parameters under which administrators may or may not speak about institutional matters.

Professor Clayton explained that the language indicates the Committee does not presume to tell the administration how to run the administration. Senior administrators could be professors who feel a moral obligation to speak, and they always have the option to speak at their own peril.

Following some confusion about whether the proposed language would be included in the policy or only in the "Comment," which provides legislative history, the Committee looked positively on the addition. Professor Klee asked if the proposal applies to people who serve on Senate committees; it does not because one cannot be an administrator and serve as a voting member of a Senate committee (but administrators can and do serve as ex-officio members). Dr. Carney said that those who hold administrative positions may express their views in private but not in public; if she had strong objections to a policy being sought by the Provost, she would resign and return to her faculty position—and she could speak out as a professor. There is an unwritten understanding that if one is part of the administration, one does not speak out against it, and it is ethical to say one cannot be part of an administration because one feels strongly about something.

This is a team concern, Professor Clayton observed: it is demoralizing if a member of your team shoots at the other basket. He proposed an amended version of the proposal, shortening it. [Following the meeting, the General Counsel offered a few minor additions to Professor Clayton's suggestion.] The final result approved unanimously by the Committee by email read as follows:

The focus of the amendment the Committee has proposed is on faculty members and other University staff who participate in the governance system and who may express views critical of institutional proposals. The Committee recognizes, however, that freedom to speak about the affairs of the University "without institutional discipline or restraint" does not necessarily extend to those who hold senior administrative positions. The Committee understands that the Board of Regents and the President have the right to expect that senior officers and others in key administrative positions (at the level of dean or above, for example) and their immediate staff will support the University's mission and the policies, procedures, goals, and programs established and announced by the Board of Regents and the President, and will not publicly undermine them. This includes, for example, statements before the legislature, to the media, and the like.

4. University of Minnesota Rochester Personnel Plan

Professor Clayton next recalled that the Committee had expressed reservations about the Rochester campus personnel plan in terms of who had tenure and who was doing the instructing. Is the plan the Committee's business, he asked? [It is; the Committee is asked, under the University policy

Academic Appointments with Teaching Functions, to provide advice to the administration on collegiate personnel plans.]

Professor McLoon commented that Committee members know, from the previous discussions, that this is an issue she feels strongly about. She said she has several concerns and itemized them for the Committee. Tenured and tenure-track faculty have a different commitment to the University and different goal compared to those who depend on student evaluations in order to be retained. She has seen a slow increase in the number of non-regular faculty doing teaching as tenured and tenure-track faculty move away from it. It is insulting to say that she (a tenured faculty member) is not devoted to teaching like someone hired to teach would be. She said she believed the reason for the decision to hire non-regular faculty (student-based faculty) at Rochester is financial until she is shown that the salaries of the design (tenured) and student-based (non-regular) faculty are equal. She said she is aware that there have been a lot of non-regular faculty hired across the campus but believes there is a point at which one must draw the line and say it is not a good thing for the University and insulting to tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Professor Abul-Hajj said the proposal for Rochester is more like a technical college than a research university. The faculty there will not be doing research (except in education). It is a health-sciences unit that educates students as pre-health-professionals. If one wants to educate pre-health-professionals, there are already a lot of avenues in other disciplines; what role does this program plan and what will its graduates do? He said he agreed with Professor McLoon. But the Committee cannot do anything about the program, he concluded. Professor McLoon concurred; if there is to be a campus, the program is not within the purview of the Committee, but it can talk about the personnel, the fact that two-thirds of the personnel are not tenured or tenure-track faculty, a situation she repeated is driven by money.

Professor Miksch said that after the presentation at the last meeting she had a better sense of what Chancellor Lehmkuhle and Vice Chancellor Neuhauser are calling "student-based" faculty. It is an unfortunate name for them, because from her understanding, what they are doing is akin to best practices in higher education, with learning labs and the like: the students have contact with tenured/tenure-track faculty and then can go to learning/assistant labs. The student-based faculty are more like writing- or math-center directors. Teaching and lectures are by tenured/tenure-track faculty, who work with colleagues that run the learning labs. That is the plan, Dr. Carney agreed. They chose to use the term "faculty" in a way that it is not used on this campus. There will be support people working in writing and math labs, not teaching courses. Originally she thought that some people would develop the curriculum and others teach it, Professor Miksch said, but it is clear that the tenured/tenure-track faculty will be doing the teaching.

Professor Klee said it is important to clarify that point. She related the "curriculum creep" that has occurred with third-year Spanish. The third-year curriculum used to be developed and taught by tenure-line faculty, but no longer is. Now the curriculum for all of the first three years of Spanish is developed by P&A supervisors, not by tenure-line faculty, and is taught exclusively by P&A staff and graduate instructors. She said she worries about curriculum creep at Rochester, given the personnel plan they have proposed, with individuals starting as support staff and ending up delivering instruction. Professor McLoon said she understood the student-based faculty would not just teach labs but also deliver instruction. Dr. Carney said she did not believe that would be the case. As Vice Chancellor Neuhauser pointed out, because they have no graduate students at Rochester (in the Twin Cities a calculus class might be taught by a faculty member with recitation sections led by graduate students), the student-based faculty at Rochester would fill a role similar to graduate students who lead recitation sections on this

campus. Such sections are used a lot in the sciences, and even with more interactive classrooms and the Smart Commons and library assistance for writing and math.

Professor Porter queried if two-thirds of the faculty are non-tenured, but not really faculty. They use the term "student-based faculty," Dr. Carney said. The Committee could recommend that they not call them faculty, Professor Porter suggested. Dr. Carney said that Professor McLoon's points are important to communicate; by giving the title "faculty" to those doing support work appears to create two tiers of faculty—the University should not compromise by doing that and the definition should be clarified. They are the ones who used the term faculty, Professor Wells said—"student-centered faculty," "postdocs," and "affiliated faculty." Her concern, she said, is that the primary research methodology of these faculty is teaching outcomes. She said she wants biology faculty to thrill students about biology, but these faculty would only have a secondary research interest in biology. There are not enough hours in the day to do disciplinary research and teaching research; these are not University faculty thrilled about the research they do who want to share it. Professor Miksch said that that is what she does in research in teaching law—but she agreed there are not enough hours in the day. She signed on for the appointment anyway and keeps up in two fields, and likes it very much. The Committee is asking for clarity, she said, because the minutes of the last discussion focused on tutoring but also on delivering the curriculum. There needs to be more clarity in the job descriptions, which may be difficult when there is no program yet.

It is important to let people know up front, Professor Abul-Hajj agreed. His concern is the tenured/tenure-track faculty: the University will bring in these faculty to do research but will they have a chance to advance themselves as faculty? Rochester has a 7.12 statement that is different from Twin Cities campus departments, Dr. Carney said. So that most promotion and tenure will be based on teaching, Professor Abul-Hajj asked? If so, it should be said that they are only being hired to teach. They will not be in an environment where they can do research. Dr. Carney repeated that the Twin Cities campus has 7.12 statements that are very different from those at Morris and Crookston. In the latter two cases, teaching carries great weight and they use different scholarly indices and criteria; they have different expectations. There are varying degrees of research in the portfolios; some are more like the Twin Cities, some less. At Morris, the research the faculty do is with undergraduates. Members of this Committee cannot envision their 7.12 statements working for Rochester. The system accepts different kinds of 7.12 statements, as noted in the tenure code.

Professor McLoon said Rochester is smaller but that she has taught at a small college, where she did every lab. Why are the faculty not teaching the other parts of the course? That is what faculty do at small institutions. The model being proposed does not make sense in light of the relative numbers. In addition, she said, she worries about the long-term career outlook for the postdocs. Is it right to set them up in a place where they will be under-employed and could have trouble finding positions? She said she feels strongly that faculty should be mentors to postdocs; who will be mentoring them about their careers? A liberal-arts college expects some scholarship. The University should not set people up so they are potentially unemployed or unemployable; that is abuse. This has that feeling, she said, and it makes her uncomfortable.

When will classes start, Professor Abul-Hajj asked? (Fall 2009.) They said they have not hired any faculty at Rochester yet, he commented—they have positions posted but have not hired. Chancellor Lehmkuhle said that it could be difficult to find people—that there are people willing to take the positions but that they are hard to find. Small liberal arts colleges manage to hire them, Dr. Carney said.

Professor Wells said the Committee should ask for more clarity on how many and what kinds of faculty will be hired at Rochester, what their duties will be, and should align the positions with the proposed curriculum. Rochester will seek accreditation as a bachelor's-degree institution and award 120 credits, so the Committee should see how they propose to correlate faculty and credits. That would be different from what the Committee has asked of other units, Dr. Carney observed. The recommendations are not binding, Professor Clayton pointed out, but will be thoughtful. He suggested Committee members provide language they want to see in any statement. Professor Porter suggested defining faculty, discussing curriculum planning vis-à-vis the date of admitting students, and identification of who is formulating the curriculum. Professor Abul-Hajj said the faculty should dictate the curriculum but that is not clear that is what will happen. Dr. Carney said it is not clear that all of the questions raised are within the purview of this Committee.

5. "The Last Professors"

Professor Clayton spoke next for several minutes about the content of a new book entitled "The Last Professors"; Committee members had been provided with an interview of the author, Frank Donoghue. [Frank Donoghue was interviewed in *Inside Higher Education*, 11 June 2008, about his views and book, *The Last Professors: The Corporate University and the Fate of the Humanities* (New York: Fordham UP, 2008)]. Professor Clayton noted that CLA is hiring a new dean and that the three candidates have given public presentations on what would do as dean. He said he was interested especially in what they would do with the humanities. They are not well understood by many and are eroding in the University, a situation no one is doing much about. They will disappear except for pragmatics parts that can be appropriated by other units. CLA teaches the most students in the University but is probably the least well-supported, and the humanities least supported in CLA. Some of them were killed in the culture wars. It could be that few care for the humanities except for humanists themselves.

Professor Clayton's comments follow.

There are reasons for concern not only about what is seen by Frank Donoghue and others as the accelerating erosion and eventual loss of tenure and academic freedom in universities, but also about the fields virtually certain to suffer most and go first. These are the core humanities, the subject-matter disciplines professing—studying, teaching, writing about—works of art, literature, and thought in such departments as language and literature, linguistics, art history, music history, and parts of philosophy and history, with other departments having overlapping attention to the subject matter.

Some of these have been core disciplines since classical antiquity. But since the 1960s, especially, the term has been appropriated to such an extent that almost any academic or other institutional activity concerned with human beings is thought of as the "humanities." The word arguably has more resonance than substance, in ordinary use.

The social sciences and cultural studies have partly absorbed the humanities as the "humanistic social sciences," one of those effects of discipline drift or neighborly annexation. This is sometimes a function of indiscriminate interdisciplinarity—and I doubt whether there is any other kind; but one has to have a critical faculty independent of institutional evaluation to be able even to entertain such a thought these days. I hasten to add that I don't impugn interdisciplinarity itself for a minute. It is indispensable and rightly the very *modus operandi* in many fields, probably most of the sciences and social sciences,

and the professional schools. This is one reason why thinking outside the interdisciplinary box is almost inconceivable and in practice is never done, or almost never. The core humanities have a way of making one think about issues like “interdisciplinarity” and offering alternative and often overarching perspectives as well focused perspectives that ask hard questions about means, ends, and content up close.

So the core humanities have lost some of their identity as well as their support in research universities, eroding within as well as between and across disciplines. A second reason why the humanities have been eroding is that in many places the line between the core humanities and the arts has blurred. And since the arts are the more conspicuous and sexy, commercially speaking, they attract most of the attention, admiration, and support of the kind that might go in part—if lightning struck and mutated donors—to the humanities, which tend to be unseen, neglected, undersupported, and condemned in effect if not in fact and often both. One might think that practitioners of the arts, the *makers* of works, would strongly support the humanities, since in making works for posterity they are making them in a way for humanists. But this is often not the case, perhaps because support is hard enough to muster for professors of the arts, and the arts and humanities are in competition for limited resources. Worse luck for the future of their own production, since without professors of the humanities to help preserve them many will sink into oblivion as soon as they cease to be fashionable. This is the fate of superseded science—except as sustained by historians and philosophers of science—but it arguably shouldn’t be the fate of the arts. But who is arguing that, if not humanists?

The second implies a third reason why the humanities are facing institutional and therefore social extinction. Because of their very nature as disciplines professing—studying, not producing—works of art, literature, and thought, they can rarely claim the same kind of “innovation and edginess” (in the phrase of one of the CLA-dean candidates), much less the great breakthroughs, of research disciplines like the sciences or productive fields like the arts. The primary activities of the humanities are learning, scholarship, criticism, and teaching—and the creation, transmission, and dissemination of *knowledge* of works of art, literature, and thought. Theirs is an art of analysis, celebration, and preservation. Without the humanities and the judgments they enable and express, the prevailing institutional discourse of universities is likely to incline ever nearer to what philosopher Harry Frankfurt has theorized in his little book, *On Bullshit* [Harry G. Frankfurt, *On Bullshit* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2005)], which begins, “One of the most salient features of our culture is that there is so much bullshit. Each of us knows this. Each of us contributes his share. But we tend to take the situation for granted” (1). Bullshit is pervasive at the best of times, even (or especially) in learned circles, and there must be disciplines to contest such tendencies. They are the humanities. Snuff them, and suffer evermore for it, though who would know? Once gone, they could scarcely be recognized for what they were but, even if they could, couldn’t be resurrected without an effort so costly it wouldn’t even be considered.

We haven’t the time or place to argue these issues here and now, when there is much to do that is directly our business, so I’ll mercifully not go into what and how good the humanities are, a position virtually impossible to argue with persons who have not experienced them, because the humanities are ultimately a matter of direct intellectual experience with the help of those who profess them. Those who have experienced them know them for real—and know themselves, others, and the world that is and the world that might be, the better as a result.

* * *

His emphasis is pragmatic, Professor Clayton concluded: there is not enough money and tenure will disappear. But people have no idea what they need from the humanities, it is pragmatism without content. He asked if Committee members had any views, because these issues concern tenure and academic freedom.

Professor Loken related that she has a liberal arts background even though she is a faculty member in the Carlson School in Marketing and Logistics Management. For the humanities to be successful, they need to define what positive things come out of humanities departments, concrete or intangible, that will benefit individuals in the future. That would help to save them in the long run.

Professor Clayton related that one of CLA dean candidates said that donors are easy to find for the arts and religious studies but not the humanities.

Professor McLoon said this topic was like the one about defining faculty; the humanities define what the heart of a major research university should be and define what a graduate should know. But universities shy away from that task, defining what students need to be good citizens of the world. It is acceptable to define what institutions expect of students, but it is not clear that the institutions have been very thoughtful about it—so students can take what they want. European taxi drivers seem more educated than U.S. college students because they come out of a very different educational system. She said she does not know what average undergraduate students look like when they leave.

The Council on Liberal Education is concerned with that issue, Professor Clayton said, but not as much as it needs to be. He said the University could try a new model, raising faculty concentration on doing what the core of the humanities are trying to do, which would be unique in the United States. The University of Chicago under Robert Hutchins had the same courses for everyone—in the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities—something that provided very good discipline (the whole program has not survived but there remains a strongly intellectual esprit de corps among undergraduates, which makes it different from most other institutions).

Professor Klee wondered about the situation of faculty, and non-regular faculty, and whether it is worse here than elsewhere and worse in the humanities than in other fields. It is extensive in some fields, Professor Clayton said, but he did not know if the situation is better or worse at Minnesota. There is erosion throughout, Professor Abul-Hajj said, even in the basic sciences, with greater use of non-regular faculty. Why do you hire non-regular faculty, he asked Professor Klee. It is a budgetary issue, Professor Klee said. According to the department's supplemental personnel plan, non-regular faculty would teach only years one and two, but in fact they teach much of the upper-division curriculum: 40% of that curriculum is delivered by non-regular (i.e. contract, adjunct, PA) faculty, 40% by graduate students, and 20% by tenured/tenure-track faculty. Minnesota is the worst case she has seen, she said, although the problem is nationwide because Spanish enrollment has increased so much in the last twenty years. This is a budget issue, and the college has not been able to fund sufficient tenured and tenure-track faculty lines to address the problem.

Professor McLoon said she too believes the issue is related to money and the fact that universities are trying to use a business model—even though they are not businesses. She needs to pay for everything in her lab, but this is not a business and K-12 schools are not a business. They will not work without adequate funding, however. If all the grant funding went away, would there be enough money to pay all the tenured and tenure-track faculty? There would not. The University is underfunded and teaches

54,000 students on a shoestring, which is a sad comment. There are a lot of universities that use a business model, Professor Porter observed: the ones that deliver education on line.

If this is a state university, the state is not fulfilling its responsibility to the University, Professor McLoon said. She commented that she has a colleague, an associate professor at Emory University, who makes twice what she does. There comes a point, she said, when one begins to wonder. Professor Miksch said she has seen data on funding for public universities; at Virginia the public funds make up about 8% of the budget, so is it public? As the level of public support lessens, society sees these institutions less as a public good than a private good. That model cannot be sustained, Professor McLoon said, because NIH budgets will not keep doubling so that institutions can support faculty on research grants. Dr. Carney pointed out that Minnesota, compared to most of its peers, is well supported by the State of Minnesota. It is also difficult to raise private funds to replace state funds; it would take billions of dollars in an endowment to replace the state support the University receives. It is interesting to speculate why public support for the University of Minnesota has not declined as much as it has for the other public institutions in the CIC; in her view, the situation is as it is because the University's leaders work with the legislature and because some Minnesotans still believe education is a public good. But it is an issue that requires constant attention.

Professor Wells said that as a scientist, she is reminded constantly of the importance of the humanities. She sees a lot of students from foreign institutions that have only learned technical things; they cannot read manuals and cannot think for themselves. The humanities teach students to articulate their views, to sharpen their observations, to think critically, and to expand their knowledge. She said she knows that without a strong humanities base for scientists, the whole culture of science and the way they train students would be gone.

Professor Clayton said he would welcome ideas from Committee members on what the Committee should do. Professor Loken urged that the discussion continue. At which point Professor Clayton adjourned the meeting, at 11:25.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota