

Minutes*

Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee
Friday, January 28, 2011
9:30 – 11:30
300 Morrill Hall

Present: Barbara Elliott, Karen Miksch (co-chairs), Yusuf Abul-Hajj, Tracey Anderson, Arlene Carney, William Craig, Joseph Gaugler, Linda McLoon, Christine Marran, Paula O'Loughlin, Gary Peter, Paul Porter, Terry Simon

Absent: Barbara Loken, Carol Wells

Guests: Professor Carol Chomsky; Provost E. Thomas Sullivan

[In these minutes: (1) amendments to the tenure policy; (2) "Troubled Waters" questions]

1. Amendments to the Tenure Policy

Professor Elliott convened the meeting at 9:30 and welcomed Professor Chomsky back to continue the discussion of amendments to the tenure policy. She reported that the Faculty Consultative Committee had reviewed the amendments the Committee had approved last week and that Professor O'Loughlin had taken them to the Senate Judicial Committee, so there are comments from both groups. One major suggestion from FCC was that a summary sheet be prepared with a message to all faculty members making clear what the changes are and noting that they are for the purposes of consistency and clarity.

Vice Provost Carney began with section 6.22, which deals with Instructors on probationary appointments and reported that she had consulted with Vice President Carrier; the questions that arose at the last meeting were about notice provisions. Instructors on probationary appointments are given one- or two-year appointments; section 6.22 provides notice dates. These are people who are typically ABD, and Human Resources procedures provide that if a department hires a probationary Instructor on a one-year appointment, and notifies the person by March 1 that the appointment will not be renewed, the person's appointment ends at the end of that academic year and there is no additional terminal year. If the person had a two-year appointment to finish the degree, and did not do so, if the department notifies the person by December 1 of the second year, the person's appointment ends at the end of that academic year and there is no additional terminal year. These appointments are meant to be used in very specific circumstances, to hire people without a terminal degree. Vice President Carrier said that different notice dates probably were incorporated to give people more lead time in finding another position. It is not reasonable to expect notice by December 1 of the first year of an appointment—that is too early to determine whether the Instructor is making sufficient progress towards degree. The policy has notice dates elsewhere, Professor Chomsky observed, so these provisions parallel others elsewhere in it, to make clear that the notice requirements are different for one- and two-year probationary instructor appointments. She and Dr. Carney agreed they would revise the language to make clear the notice dates

* 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.

for the two different appointments (one year and two years). The current tenure policy provision is consistent with the Human Resources procedures already described, but the provision is not clear.

Professor Anderson inquired if an ABD probationary Instructor has a child, may that person invoke section 5.5, allowing for an extension of the probationary period. The question could come up, Dr. Carney agreed. Professor Anderson said her campus has had a probationary Instructor who had a baby, so it is not impossible. Dr. Carney observed that section 5.5 has been changed to allow up to three years extension. If one has been hired ABD for two years, and allowed to extend the appointment by the maximum of three years, the person could be here for five years without finishing the degree. She suggested that language could be added to section 5.5 providing that an Instructor on a probationary appointment may only extend the probationary period for one year, for any reason allowed in section 5.5. That provides flexibility and is proportional to the appointment. The Committee concurred.

Professor Elliott reported that FCC had asked why there is a three-year maximum being imposed that did not exist before. It could happen that a department chair is faced with the question of extending the probationary period interminably, Dr. Carney said. There will be a case someday. Most other universities have a limit, and while this is not a rampant problem, it could become an issue for the Senate Judicial Committee. Professor O'Loughlin agreed that generally there are limits and said she was not concerned about establishing a three-year limit.

They have said all along that these changes are for clarity and consistency, Professor Chomsky recalled, but this is something of a change, at least from the literal provisions of the current policy. There was a two-year limit on extension of the probationary period for caregiving; this proposal expands the limit to three years and applies it to all the listed reasons. She said it is appropriate to retain the proposed language and explain to the faculty how this changes the policy. If the faculty object to the change, the provision can be removed. Leaving the language as is would leave very odd provisions, Dr. Carney said, because there would be a limit on one reason to extend the probationary period (for caregiving) but not for others. That would be difficult for her to explain to departments and probationary faculty members. If someone has a child with a chronic illness, there is a limit, but there is no limit if the faculty member keeps having children. Professor Chomsky said she believed the limit is reasonable. Or the Committee could go with the intent of the framers, Dr. Carney said, and adopt a two-year limit, because it was probably a mistake in 2007 that the limit was not applied across the board.

The Committee endorsed other clerical changes in section 6.22.

The Committee also approved a one-word change in the language dealing with academic responsibility so that the quotation in the policy from the Regents' policy on Academic Freedom and Responsibility is correct.

Professor Chomsky posed a more general question about the format of the cover memo. It was agreed that the marginal comments would be removed and the changes explained section by section.

The Committee turned next to section 5.5. Professor Gaugler asked who determines whether a family member has a "major" illness, injury, or debilitating condition. All those questions are decided by the Provost, Dr. Carney said. They will usually ask for a letter, but because of HIPPA, they do not ask anyone to spell out all the medical details. If the case is a long, chronic illness that requires the faculty member to travel a lot to be a caregiver, or an acute case in this area, they take time. People do not make

frivolous requests, and some do not make them at all; it is more of a problem that people do not take advantage of the extension that is due them.

Professor Chomsky reported that FCC had asked a question about the birth of a child to same-sex domestic partners. That counts, Dr. Carney said, and she approves such requests routinely. They treat same-sex partners the same as married couples.

The Committee approved small editorial changes in sections 6.1 and 6.21. Section 6.21 deals with probationary appointments for Associate Professors and Professors; Dr. Carney explained that a department can appoint an Associate Professor or Professor for the usual six years or may give a three-year appointment. If they give a three-year appointment, there are limits on how the person may be terminated. The earliest the department may give effective notice is May 15 of the second year. The person is guaranteed two years, and if given notice by May 15 of the second year, is given a third, terminal year.

What if no notice is given on May 15 of the second year, Professor Chomsky asked? Then the department must vote in the fall of the third probationary year; if tenure is denied, then the person receives a fourth, terminal year, Dr. Carney said. Professor Chomsky said they would work out the language to make that clear. Dr. Carney reiterated that if the department does not choose to terminate a three-year probationary appointment at the end of the second year (by May 15), the person receives a full third year, and if there is then a negative tenure vote, the person receives a fourth year.

Professor Anderson again asked about extending the probationary period for this category of faculty. Dr. Carney suggested that since the Committee endorsed the possibility of one one-year extension for a probationary Instructor, the same limit should apply to probationary Associate Professors or Professors on a three-year probationary appointment. The Committee concurred.

In response to a question about the faculty of a department "recommending" tenure, Dr. Carney said it would be a significant change to the policy to introduce that term in that way. Only the Provost can recommend tenure, given the language of the policy. One can infer a recommendation, but the official recommendation comes from the Provost to the Board of Regents.

Professor Gaugler wondered about the perception of language in section 5.5 allowing extension of the probationary period. Dr. Carney said it creates a limit and it is also allowed because the University is trying to recruit excellent faculty. When an institution has a family-friendly policy, that helps in recruiting—and more so than in the past, new faculty ask about those policies.

Discussion turned to section 6.3, which now requires a single vote for promotion of an Assistant Professor and granting tenure. They are the same criteria, Professor Miksch said. Professor Chomsky said they did not have to be, but there is still a single vote. The standards may be different for promotion and for tenure—one is not necessarily higher than the other but they can be different. But there still is only to be one vote. The Committee agreed that the language about the vote in section 6.3 should read "a single vote is taken on whether to grant tenure and promote." Dr. Carney said that the new 7.12 statements have the same standard, unlike in the past.

The Committee agreed to editorial changes to section 6.4.

Professor Gaugler asked what effect there would be on Dr. Carney's review of 7.12 statements if these changes to the tenure policy are adopted. None, Dr. Carney said. In many of them, section 5.5 is an appendix, so the 7.12 statements may need a technical amendment to include the current language (if the amendments are adopted).

Professor O'Loughlin said that when the discussion takes place on February 3, it should be made clear when the amendments would go into effect. Dr. Carney said that none of the proposed amendments affect the criteria in sections 7.12 and 9.2. The amendments might affect the ability of some probationary faculty members to extend their probationary period, but not dramatically. The policy changes go into effect when adopted by the Board of Regents, and the schedule calls for them to go to the Board for action in May. Nothing that is done will put a faculty member at a disadvantage, Dr. Carney added; that is the reason they have a choice between old and new 7.12 statements when changes are made. Once the changes are made, she will send a message to all probationary faculty reiterating that their Memoranda of Understanding remain in effect, since these refer to the provisions of Sections 7.11 (Criteria for Tenure) and 9.2 (Criteria for Promotion to Professor).

With the amendments to the policy, there will need to be amendments to the Procedures, Professor Elliott observed. [The Procedures can be found here: <http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/faculty/tenure/pdf/Procedures101207.pdf>.] Dr. Carney said she would start drafting Procedures changes very soon and would work with Professor Chomsky on them. They will have to think about how to recast them, because up to now the focus has been on section 7, "Personnel Decisions Concerning Probationary Faculty." There will have to be language added on other sections of the policy, but the title of the Procedures will remain the same to avoid having to make changes in every 7.12 statement that refers to them.

Professor Elliott inquired what the approval path is for changes in the Procedures. Dr. Carney said that this Committee and the Provost approve them and they are presented for information to the Faculty Senate and the Board of Regents. The Faculty Consultative Committee would also see them and have the opportunity to comment. Professor O'Loughlin suggested that it would be useful to have someone from the Senate Judicial Committee involved in the discussions about the Procedures; Dr. Carney agreed.

Professor Chomsky suggested that section 12 Procedures be taken up as soon as possible because the faculty could be worried about programmatic changes as a result of budget cuts. Many of the Procedure changes related to section 12 can be taken from the Provost's memo regarding programmatic change. Dr. Carney agreed that changes related to section 12 should be made but pointed out that the changes in the other sections affect many more faculty than the number who might be affected by section 12. Dr. Carney said she could bring a draft of changes to the Procedures to the first meeting of the Committee in the fall.

Professor Elliott thanked Professor Chomsky and Vice Provost Carney for all their work.

2. "Troubled Waters" Questions

Professor Elliott now welcomed Provost Sullivan to the meeting to continue the discussion of questions about the film "Troubled Waters" that the Faculty Consultative Committee asked be addressed. She noted that the Committee had begun the discussion with the Provost and General Counsel Mark

Rotenberg in December, and at that time looked carefully at the first question. The Committee concluded that academic freedom extends to all students and to all employees who produce intellectual content by virtue of their employment. Some who are hired are in positions where they are not protected by academic freedom.

The questions for this Committee are these:

1. Under what circumstances does academic freedom extend to individuals beyond faculty, faculty-like staff, and other University employees who produce intellectual and artistic content? Conversely, what personnel or functions of the University are not covered by academic freedom? In general, what are the limits to academic freedom?
2. What is the understanding of academic freedom and responsibility as they apply to University administrators, only some of whom are tenured faculty members? What are the limitations of academic freedom that arise from their responsibilities as administrators?
3. What measures, if any, should be taken to ensure that administrators and others who are not faculty members understand the meaning and implications of the policy on academic freedom and responsibility?
4. When projects that involve the production of intellectual or artistic content are undertaken as works-for-hire or otherwise by non-University employees, or the products of such projects are expected to be copyrighted or otherwise owned by the University (which may imply approval or endorsement by the Board of Regents of the University), what does that mean for application of the policies of academic freedom and responsibility? What oversight by University faculty or administration, if any, is appropriate? What actions are appropriate if concerns arise about the connection of the project with the University? When the University holds the copyright to products, is there, or should there be, routinely a disclaimer stating that views do not represent those of the University, the Regents, the University administration or the faculty in general? If such a disclaimer is discretionary, who decides whether to include one, and on what basis?
5. What procedures are in place to govern decisions about University products that are in a gray area, where it is not certain whether rights and responsibilities of academic freedom apply?
6. The decision to delay showing the film was based in part on concern over controversy that would ensue from its showing. Some controversy is to be expected in disseminating intellectual work products associated with the University, however. The critical question is what actions are appropriate in the face of expected controversy. What have we learned from this particular controversy over how better to handle such concerns?

Provost Sullivan said he thought it would be helpful to frame the discussion with a brief outline and then turn to some hypothetical cases to look at who is and is not covered by academic freedom. He began by citing key language from the tenure policy: "Tenure is the keystone for academic freedom" and "both tenure and academic freedom are part of an implicit social compact" and "In return, faculty have the responsibility of furthering the institution's programs of research, teaching, and service."

He also read from Sections II and II of the Regents' policy on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (as the Faculty Senate has proposed to amend it): "Academic freedom is the freedom without institutional discipline or restraint to discuss all relevant matters in the classroom, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, and to speak or write on matters of public concern as well as on matters related to professional duties and the functioning of the University." There is a great deal contained in that paragraph, he said, and each clause is important, because they speak to the classroom, scholarship, and matters of public concern.

"Academic responsibility implies the faithful performance of professional duties and obligations, the recognition of the demands of the scholarly enterprise, and the candor to make it clear that when one is speaking on matters of public interest, one is not speaking for the institution." These provisions, like those on academic freedom, are also embedded in the tenure policy and the University's Policy of Conduct.

Provost Sullivan related that Professor Elliott has asked him about the relationship between academic freedom and the First Amendment. The short answer is that academic freedom is recognized in the law as a subpart of the First Amendment that is special to the academy. Provost Sullivan also observed that academic freedom is not an absolute right; the Supreme Court has recognized that the Bill of Rights is not absolute. Academic freedom is not a defense to an illegal act, slander or defamation, obscenity, or the clear and present danger of bodily harm (as a result of one's speech). The last one is the most ambiguous, and the most widely cited example is Justice Holmes' language in *Schenck v. United States* (1919), where he wrote that "the most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man falsely shouting fire in a theater and causing a panic." That example shows, Provost Sullivan said, that the First Amendment and academic freedom are not absolute. The Supreme Court is the arbiter, and it has created exceptions.

Provost Sullivan posed a hypothetical. A museum wants to do a project and the director tells the staff (e.g., P&A staff) that there will be an exhibit on X and asks them to emphasize this, focus on that, etc. The exhibit is prepared and the staff have done the opposite of what the director requested because they do not agree with the director's view. In that case, the staff were given a job to do but it was not done the way they were directed to do it, and they do not have academic freedom. They were given an assignment in the context of their employment; the employer assigned work to the employees.

Change the facts slightly, the Provost suggested. The exhibit is prepared to the director's satisfaction, and ready to open, when someone says that some part of it could be offensive to some religion. In that case, the academic freedom of the director is absolutely protected (and the director could be a faculty member or a P&A staff member). The second case has conduct that is materially different in nature and responsibility.

In the case of "Troubled Waters," he saw one pattern—the second—and not the first, the Provost said. A P&A staff member, by her own ingenuity, came up with a project, worked on it, edited it, and so on, and it was a product of her intellectual curiosity and acumen. The project was the result of her drive and curiosity and it was protected by academic freedom. The point, the Provost said, is that with a slightly-changed fact pattern, one can come up with entirely different results.

Students in a classroom have a range of academic freedom to engage in conversation, but if at some point student inquiry interferes with a positive educational environment, if it crosses the line, the student loses academic freedom because there is an institutional responsibility to manage classrooms in an educational fashion and does not interfere with the teaching and learning functions.

Professor Miksch pointed out that "Troubled Waters" was the staff member's idea and an educational product. That is a very important point, the Provost agreed. The legislative authorization called for an educational product, language that should have been a signal. Then he reviewed the employment contract and context, which further confirmed his view.

Professor Abul-Hajj said he did not believe anyone in the room would disagree with what the Provost had said. The question is that the Committee needs to address, in this situation, is whether a vice president went beyond her role and responsibility and stepped in and declared that the film was not appropriate material.

Provost Sullivan said he would refer to the record, where there was an apology. As he said earlier, he believed there was a practice (that may need to be codified) that if any question on any research, educational, or intellectual area arose, when there is the slightest implication of academic freedom, the question should be referred to the Provost's office (or the Office of the General Counsel, if appropriate). The record of events surrounding "Troubled Waters" says that there should have been consultation in the administration. That is where the discussion should start.

This brings the discussion to question #2, Professor Elliott said. Many administrators have tenure in departments but are 100% administrative; do they have academic freedom in their administrative work and what are the boundaries?

Provost Sullivan said that the federal courts in the last two or three years (including as recently as the last two months) are very clear on this question: As administrators (the cases mostly involve deans), people have limited academic freedom. They have the responsibility to engage in vigorous, robust discussion up to the point a decision is made; once the decision is made, administrators do not have a First Amendment right to criticize it, and they can be fired if they do. In its rulings, the Supreme Court has relied on a tradition that goes back hundreds of years. As a public employee in a position of authority, one relinquishes certain free-speech and academic-freedom rights. That is part of the employment bargain when one accepts senior leadership positions.

Dr. Craig pointed out that it is the activity, not the job title, that matters. He is an administrator and he also writes journal articles; he does not have academic freedom in his administrative activities but he does in writing journal articles. Provost Sullivan agreed. The Academic Freedom and Responsibility policy was changed last year to include matters of public concern as well as the functioning of the University, and the University received considerable positive press coverage because of the change, Provost Sullivan noted.

The most problematic part of the episode to him, Professor Gaugler said, was that the original grant application was reviewed by the administration to see if it was being followed, even though the grantors apparently were satisfied with the work conducted. It casts a pallor over scholarship if administrators can pull grant applications and review them without appropriate rationale (for example, evidence of misconduct). Provost Sullivan said he was not confident enough about the facts of the situation as cited in the question to speak authoritatively, but on the larger point, he said he receives calls perhaps once per week from people expressing concern or asking a question about what some faculty member is doing and whether it is covered by academic freedom. He said almost all of the cases are clear-cut in favor of academic freedom applying. Reviewing a grant beyond an appropriate peer review would cross the line, he said, and he would not check on what a faculty member is writing. There are times when bureaucratic procedures are used to stifle academic freedom, Professor Gaugler said, and he thought he saw that happen in the case of "Troubled Waters." The Committee needs to address that question.

Provost Sullivan said again that he could not comment on the facts because certain of them are beyond his knowledge, but Professor Gaugler's question raises a question about the intersection of theory and practice. Suppose that a unit has an internal peer-review process and items are fact-checked and a work meets the standards of the profession or the relevant community of scholars. "We as a community live by peer review, peer critique, and debate," the Provost said; the question is at what point does that process challenge one's free-inquiry rights? That may be at times a gray area. One can say that a museum should have standards and peer-review procedures, but at what point does that interfere with individual academic freedom? It can be a close call. Units must have standards and peer review; the question is the appropriate application.

Part of what he and Professor Gaugler are suggesting, Professor O'Loughlin said, is a definition of "peer." Peer review means a peer in that community. Her understanding of peer review is with a community with a shared set of knowledge and with faculty in her field, not in another field.

Professor Miksch said that if one thinks about grant proposals, one has academic freedom but also academic responsibility. The grant proposal goes through a lot of channels (e.g., review for indirect costs). The proposal for "Troubled Waters" had gone through those processes and the funding agency was satisfied with the result. If there is internal vetting of proposals, after normal peer review, it would be a flag for her if someone outside the process interferes with it. Why would someone else become involved? Only because it looks like the work could be controversial. Professor Gaugler agreed. Transparency in communication is critical.

Professor Porter said that in the case of "Troubled Waters," things did not work properly. How often do things work properly and the faculty or the public never see anything? He said he assumes that is quite often. Provost Sullivan noted again that it is rare that a week goes by without a call from someone. Much of this is not self-evident to many people; those who have not spent a lot of time thinking about it can find confusion or miss the complexity.

Professor Abul-Hajj said that for many in the academy, it is evident. Those outside the academy can be in a position to make a decision, which is troubling to the faculty. As the Committee prepares its white paper, it must address how the University can protect itself from this happening again and what the Provost's office is doing to educate staff about when they may not exceed their responsibilities. The role of the administration is key in helping individuals, and most people involved in scholarship understand academic freedom because it is the way they have been doing things for years that has been accepted nationwide.

And it is core to the University's existence, Provost Sullivan agreed. He concurred that academic freedom is more familiar and comfortable to faculty members and less so to non-faculty. Vice Provost Carney runs the New Faculty Orientation and other administrators run other new-employee sessions. He said he believes they need to do a better job in orientation of new employees, regardless of their status, about what a research university is, what a land-grant university is, and what people here do. Much may not be self-evident to new employees, and that kind of orientation may make employees embrace the job they are doing and be proud of the University. They have to be provided more information about the nature of a university and the core of its mission. It should be possible to have a conversation with every new employee so they can understand what the University does and feel a part of the institution.

Dr. Carney said there is a full-day new-employee orientation, and they encourage any who employ people to send their employees to the orientation. They do have senior administrators talk about the concept of a university. For many, this is their first employment at a university and it is important to add the concept of academic freedom to the orientation.

Professor Miksch said the Committee needs to make the recommendation in its report. The Committee also needs to think about current employees, given the updated Academic Freedom and Responsibility policy.

Provost Sullivan said that academic freedom was a topic of conversation at the most recent meeting of the Twin Cities deans and there was a very robust discussion. He said that Professor Elliott had summarized the situation well: "Troubled Waters" was unfortunate but it provides an educational opportunity for all.

Professor McLoon inquired if there are many administrators who are not tenured in departments. If there are, that is a problem, she said. There are a number of senior administrators and mid-level employees who do not have tenure, Provost Sullivan said.

Professor O'Loughlin said that people often think that threats to academic freedom come from outside the academy, but the academy includes administrators, and the threat can come from them as well. That threat is more marked because it comes from inside. She asked Provost Sullivan how many of the calls he takes are from the inside and how many from the outside. The Provost estimated there are about half from each. From faculty members, Professor Abul-Hajj asked? Some, Provost Sullivan said. And from department heads and deans, who call to ask if a particular activity is covered by academic freedom. Professor Miksch commented that faculty members may be more sensitive to academic freedom, but they may also think they have more freedom than they do or they do not understand the extent of the right. More often, she surmised, people do not realize they have rights, especially if they are not tenured (e.g., P&A staff and assistant professors).

In terms of the grant process, Provost Sullivan said, what if there is a suggestion that fraud is involved? That could provoke a claim of academic freedom. Professor Gaugler said he believes there is a clear delineation between compliance and disagreement about what a funder wanted. Those are different arenas.

Questions also come up about teaching, Dr. Carney said. They can be black and white, but where a unit must meet accreditation standards, the faculty as a group might say that this course must meet this standard, and a faculty member could say that he or she has the freedom to teach what he or she wishes. In many cases that is true, but not where the faculty of the unit have decided that a course must be taught in a certain way so that students learn what is required. Provost Sullivan drew the attention of the Committee to Interpretation 8 of the tenure policy, which deals with faculty assignments, and which provides that "the head of the academic unit will assign individual faculty members to teach specific courses in accordance with the academic workload statement and other policies adopted by that unit." The situation does arise; the faculty as a whole say that a course must cover this material; is that a question of academic freedom?

What if the dean or unit head says the faculty member must translate the course into an online course, Professor Gaugler asked? And want that faculty member to continue teaching it? If the faculty

member refuses, is that an academic-freedom question? Professor Abul-Hajj said he was a department head for 21 years and gave assignments to faculty members; it was up to the faculty member to decide how to teach it. A unit head cannot tell a faculty member that he or she must develop an online course—although, he added, he is aware that that is the trend in the Academic Health Center.

That is a tough question, Dr. Carney said. If the faculty of the unit have determined that a certain number of courses will be hybrid, a certain number will be online, and a certain number will be face-to-face, there will be more and more questions related to curricular decisions within units and the needs of the field. She recalled the case of one staff member who said he did not want to teach in a specific area because it was new and he did not want to learn it. But professions evolve and they have changed before, and it is not right to say that one will not teach something new. These are hard decisions, but the faculty as a whole have made a decision. Provost Sullivan referred to the Interpretation, which provides that a faculty member "may challenge an assignment by showing that it is unreasonable. An assignment is unreasonable if: (a) taken as a whole, it exceeds the workload expected in the workload statement of that unit, (b) the faculty member lacks the basic qualifications to teach the course, or (c) the assignment was made in violation of the faculty member's academic freedom or in violation of another specific university policy." With respect to this part of the discussion, the guideposts are (a) and (b), he said.

It was the decision of the faculty, Professor Elliott said. The unit decision takes precedence over the individual in the direction the unit is taking, Professor Abul-Hajj said. If the faculty member does not like that direction, he or she can quit.

These questions regarding the edges of academic freedom are among those the Committee needs to discuss, Professor Elliott said. She adjourned the meeting at 11:35.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota