

Subject: The Continuing Story to Date

From: Yates Hafner Dean, Monteith College

To: Concerned Parties

Date: October 29, 1975

It was in early May, 1975--or perhaps earlier--that President Gullen secretly proposed to the Board of Governors that Monteith College be terminated. Whatever had been its disposition in private, the Board in public declared it would not be so. That story--as much of it as is known to us--is told in our Self-Study Report, available for the asking. See therein "The Problem of Survival."

What has happened since then? First at the request of President Gullen, the University Council established a special ad hoc committee to review Monteith. For the Board, in its action on June 13, 1975, had stipulated that Monteith College should be reviewed during the 1975-76 year. The context of that action was one of grave concern over the finances of the University; not only Monteith but other programs and activities as well would have to be scrutinized. Hence, the motion adopted by the Council gives the ad hoc committee this charge:

. . . to study the role of Monteith College with respect to the mission of Wayne State University, and to report back as expeditiously as possible to the University Council on this issue. The study should concern itself with both the function and cost of Monteith College as it relates to the University as a whole.

Since the University Council is responsible for a systematic and continuing review of all educational programs that affect the University as a whole,

1. The question of Monteith College should not be examined in isolation but in the context of other University programs and the total University budget, and

2. The Committees should seek detailed and continuing information not only from the administration, but from the programs under study.

That is a very great charge indeed, calling for an assessment of the programs of Monteith College in relation to the mission of Wayne State University. The ad hoc committee would have to compare its evaluation of Monteith with that of other programs and also produce a responsible financial analysis of Monteith's changing costs in relation to other budgetary units of the University.

Given the magnitude of this task, the committee, chaired by Professor Sol Rossman, began its work at once. They asked us to furnish information that would give them a full picture of Monteith. Between late June and mid-August we sent them some sixteen documents, numbering over 1,000 pages and a bibliography that lists more than seventy additional items on Monteith. What they requested of other units of the University and was furnished them we do not know but we assume it is a matter of record.

Meanwhile, although we did not have an explicit mandate, it appeared to us that the main challenge facing Monteith (and many colleges in a hard-hit economy) was to maintain high quality while reducing costs sharply. To this end we volunteered to accept budget reductions totalling \$107,000 in the current fiscal year. So far, the University administration has cut \$91,000 out of Monteith's budget. While the 11% reduction is by far the largest cut in any academic program in WSU, we are baffled by the administration's declination of \$15,000 when other units are crying for help.

At the same time, we tried publicly to combat the impression that Monteith College was doomed. But despite a vigorous advertising campaign (financed not by the University but by friends and alumni) this fall we suffered the greatest "no-show" rate in our history. Although applications and admissions increased dramatically, the number of students who changed their minds and did not come to Wayne State or who registered in a different college within WSU after first selecting Monteith, was more than 50% of all students accepted into the College. One plausible hypothesis is that the publicity last spring took its toll. Who wants to come to or remain in a college about to go out of existence? The Gullen administration took no steps whatever to correct that impression, even after the Board had repudiated its effort to eliminate the College. (Contrast the vigor with which President Gullen and several members of the Board hastened personally to dispute the recent surmise by the Board chairman that WSU was likely to close.)

Nonetheless, thanks to the fact that Monteith courses are now open to any undergraduate in the University and to the fact that more students of engineering are now taking Monteith courses (since the College of Engineering requires all its freshmen to take a special core curriculum in general education from Monteith), we are now serving 11% more students in our interdisciplinary core curriculum than a year ago. At the end of final registration for fall quarter there were 1,017 students enrolled in Monteith courses. We are producing nearly 15% more credit hours this year than last at a cost that is 11% lower than last year's. Consequently, our cost per credit hour is expected to decline sharply by year's end.

We have been able to achieve this significant increase in productivity by not filling seven faculty vacancies, by slightly enlarging the size of our discussion sections, by holding non-personnel costs to a bare minimum, and through the voluntary efforts of some faculty members who are teaching overloads without additional pay.

Of course, it would be possible to modify the Monteith program further and retain certain features of our interdisciplinary curriculum at an even lower cost without anyone teaching an overload, but we have not been asked or instructed to do so. There are many ways to reduce the cost per credit hour to an extremely low rate and still manage to retain accreditation. How much a university decides to spend on a given program depends largely on the priority it attaches to it and the quality it wishes to achieve.

Often too, the level of spending is a function of historical and political circumstances; the level may go up or down unhampered by rational discussion of educational objectives.

At the close of the 1974-75 fiscal year, Monteith returned an unexpended surplus of about \$14,000 to the general fund of the University, completing our sixteenth year without a deficit. June 1975 also marked our thirteenth graduating class. Although still a very young college, the record of our 1,102 graduates is very impressive. An incomplete survey shows that 49 of them have become medical doctors, 72 have become lawyers (including two judges), more than 230 have become educators (including two academic deans), and that practically every other profession has Monteith alumni within its ranks. On the whole, our alumni were of average ability when they entered Monteith, as attested by objective examinations. We know that our results compare favorably with those of other undergraduate institutions nationwide.

This information, of course, we brought to the attention of the ad hoc committee. In September they invited us to meet with them to state whatever we wished and to answer any questions which they might have. The meeting was cordial and frank. At the beginning we asked for a clarification of the charge. No one on the committee could produce the charge in writing, but the chairman recollected that it was that which was voted upon by the University Council in June (see above). We then asked what the deadline for reporting was. The chairman said that no deadline had been established, but he speculated that a report would probably be possible by March, 1975, although, as he recognized, the task was very difficult and large.

Also, during the discussion of September 18 we made a point of asking the members of the ad hoc committee, all of whom were present, whether they themselves had any negative criticisms of any of Monteith's programs or whether they had heard any negative criticisms of Monteith. We asked the same questions when we met with the committee for the second time, which was on October 10, 1975. Both times, not a single criticism was mentioned. Reference was made to the disappointing results of a pilot program between Monteith and the Law School, which had been initiated by the Law School, but it was agreed that the experiment did not reflect badly on Monteith. In fact, members of the committee were very complimentary in their remarks about Monteith. One even suggested that a general education program in the natural sciences like the one offered in Monteith was far preferable to the arrangements currently obtaining for purposes of general education elsewhere in the University.

During our October 10th meeting with the committee (which is the last one we've had with them), several members thanked us for being so cooperative and for openly sharing so much information with them. We had given them our Self-Study Report and discussed freely with them several problems that we face within the College. Members of the committee acknowledged that these are not unusual problems; they present similar challenges to other colleges here and around the nation--such as how to help students more effectively to improve their writing ability, how to resolve the problem of general education in non-Western cultures, how to retain outstanding young faculty members and assist in their development, etc.

To our knowledge, no evidence was presented by members of the committee, by ourselves, or by other parties to justify the proposition that to eliminate Monteith would redound to the greater good of the University.

At the end of the October 10th meeting we suggested that the committee devote its next meeting with us to a discussion and close analysis of budgetary considerations. But so far we have not been invited to meet with them again.

On October 20th, the president of the WSU chapter of the AAUP, who sits ex officio as an observer on the Policy Committee of the University Council, told us that the Policy Committee that day had met with members of the ad hoc committee to receive an oral report. The ad hoc committee's recommendation, he said, was that Monteith College be "phased out." After twenty-four hours we called the University provost, who chairs the Policy Committee, to learn if anything serious had transpired.

Provost Haenicke confirmed by telephone that the ad hoc committee had reported orally and had recommended that Monteith be "phased out." Although there was no written report yet, the provost said that a motion was made and seconded by the Policy Committee to endorse the report and forward it to the University Council. "After brief debate," he said, the motion passed. The recommendation will come to the floor of the University Council at its next meeting, which is scheduled for November 5, 1975.

Dr. Haenicke further said that he had not had time to give it much thought. He had told President Gullen about it on the day it occurred, but as of October 21 they had not discussed it in any detail.

This unwritten report provoked a number of questions which I proceeded to ask. In responding to them, the provost emphasized that he could not speak for the committee; he could only summarize what took place at the meeting on the 20th. Judged in light of the written report, which we received on October 20 (see attached "Summary Report of ad hoc Monteith Committee"), the provost's answers appear to be very accurate. Since they reflect, like a gloss, both on the report and on the Policy Committee's discussion of the report, my questions and Dr. Haenicke's answers (with occasional thoughts of my own in parentheses) follow.

Was there anything said against the quality of any of Monteith's programs? No, nothing. "In essence," they found "a duplicative effort"; there is a program of general education "in modified form" in two other colleges. If Monteith is eliminated, students can still get general education from the College of Liberal Arts or from the College of Lifelong Learning at a much lower cost per student credit hour, he said. (These were almost the exact same words used by President Gullen last spring. I did not ask what was meant by "general education," the report does not say, and it carefully avoids stating that the Monteith curriculum is duplicated by that of any other unit; the ad hoc committee in conversation with us had noted the uniqueness of the Monteith curriculum at Wayne.)

When would the phase-out occur? The report is silent on this question. There was no discussion of timing.

If the purpose was to save money, what did the committee calculate would be the savings? There was no discussion of that, he said, but his own estimate was that the entire budget of Monteith would be saved for the University. (Perhaps Dr. Haenicke was unaware of the financial analysis we presented to the Board last spring.)

What would become of Monteith's currently enrolled students? The report is silent on this question. The provost thought they would enter other programs of the University. How? And which ones? And was there any evidence that they would stay at Wayne? There was no discussion of these points, he said, just a general feeling that the students would enter other programs at WSU. (Last spring the proposal was to allow currently enrolled students to complete their Monteith degrees.)

If the programs of Monteith are good, was any thought given to the possibility of saving what is worthwhile in Monteith's programs for the University? No. The only program mentioned in conversation was Chicano-Boricua Studies, which someone suggested should be preserved, he said, but the report gives no thought to preserving anything of value in Monteith.

What would become of Monteith's faculty and academic staff? On this point, the provost said that he himself made a statement, viz., he would do everything possible from a professional standpoint and from a contractual standpoint to relocate faculty as humanely and as efficiently as possible. But despite much good will, there is no exact plan to do this--no calculation of the feasibility of retaining tenured faculty or of reappointing term faculty.

Did the provost himself favor the abolition of Monteith? It was "difficult to answer." He felt it "sad to curtail something good." It should not be to the detriment of students; the faculty should be protected.

Would there be other cuts in addition to Monteith? Surely there will be, but the ad hoc committee did not suggest any. That will be up to President Gullen and the Board of Governors. The question is under study by the President's Task Force to Review and Make Recommendations on Budget Reduction Alternatives.

Will the ad hoc committee continue its work in an effort to fulfill its complete charge? No, the work of the ad hoc committee was finished.

Did the ad hoc committee make evaluative comparisons between Monteith and other programs of the University? It compared credit hour costs between Monteith, Liberal Arts, and Lifelong Learning, but of course it did not compare the cost of Monteith with that of any graduate program, for that would be "like comparing apples and oranges" he said.

Did the committee, however, implicitly or explicitly invoke a set of principles or priorities for the University in making its recommendation?

The provost said he would hate to interpret that. He promised to send us a copy of the report as soon as he receives one.

He added that Associate Provost Burrows Smith was calling all deans to instruct them not to extend any appointments that terminate in June, 1975, pending further developments in the budget.

The provost stated that if the committee's recommendation is approved by the Board of Governors, the provost and the dean must "put their heads together and plan an orderly transition." This time, he emphasized, it was the faculty who had initiated the recommendation. (Actually, that is true only if one forgets what happened last spring, for it was President Gullen who initiated the proposal to abolish Monteith, and it was in response to that proposal and at Mr. Gullen's specific request that the ad hoc committee was formed. Hence, the recommendation was initiated by the administration; it was merely stamped by the faculty committee and by the Policy Committee chaired by Provost Haenicke.)

In summary, the recommendation is to phase out, over an indefinite period of time, a college whose quality is not in question, in order to save an undetermined amount of money subject to factors not considered, so that other areas of the University, especially the graduate and professional programs, might be strengthened and developed. The phase-out is to be accomplished with good will toward the Monteith faculty and with the presumption that students will shift for themselves--no consideration having been given to the interests of the students, their legal rights to complete the degree programs in which they have matriculated, or the probability of attrition from Wayne and consequent loss of tuition revenue and state support. Nor has any calculation been made of the cost of educating those who might remain in WSU. Nothing of value in the target college is to be preserved. Whether the entire recommendation is practicable was not even discussed.

That is the state of our knowledge to date. In addition to the parenthetical comments that appear above, perhaps it would be useful to state for purposes of debate on the Council floor some of the questions which scholars in pursuit of an objective and judicious appraisal might be expected to raise. The questions will be stated in the form of "objections" as would be done in a mediaeval quaestio disputata:

1. If it is true that there is a "duplicative effort" between Monteith and some other college both colleges must be trying to do the same thing but not succeeding. But that is not so, for the results are quite different--witness the program descriptions, course descriptions, syllabi, assignments, examination questions, specific objectives and teaching methodologies. The core curriculum of Monteith, whether for engineering students, advanced transfer students, or general program students in Monteith, is quite different from the Group Requirements in the College of Liberal Arts and far distant from the General Studies content and format of Weekend College. Faculty in all three colleges familiar with one another's programs are surely aware that they are not all trying to do the same thing. The curricula are not identical because the efforts are quite different. All three have something

to do with general education only if one construes that term in its broadest, vaguest, and most meaningless sense as "non-specialized education"--which is the "definition" most frequently given by people who themselves are cut off from the tradition of general education. And even this general, inexact definition-by-exclusion does not fit the Group Requirements of the College of Liberal Arts, which, for the most part, are simply a collection of introductions to discrete disciplines. As introductions the courses may be good. But their mass does not constitute a coherent program of general education. General education should not be confused with introductory courses to the disciplines. (There is a vast bibliography on this point if anybody's interested.)

2. Although the committee is said not to have found fault with Monteith, it has by implication rendered a negative evaluation. In effect, it is saying of Monteith that it's desirable, it's good, but it's not important. For if it were important, the committee presumably would have addressed the question of how to preserve what is worth saving in Monteith. But evidently, the committee gave that little or no thought.

3. If Monteith is not important enough to preserve in any fashion (save perhaps Chicano-Boricua Studies), presumably it has been judged in comparison with programs that are deemed worthy of preservation. What are those other programs that will be saved at the expense of Monteith? After mentioning some of the effects of budget reductions, the committee emphasizes that there is a major commitment to the graduate and professional programs and that "this commitment is now seriously threatened by inadequate funding." Presumably, then, Monteith should be eliminated so that the graduate and professional programs may be adequately funded. The committee does not state who made this educational policy decision. It does not state how the demise of Monteith would strengthen the graduate and professional programs. Nor does it present a single argument why the University should give higher priority to its commitment to graduate and professional programs than to its commitment to maintain and strengthen general education for undergraduates.

4. If WSU can dispense with Monteith College, what provision will the University make for meeting the needs for which Monteith was founded in 1959 and judged to be worth continuing in 1964? (See the report on Monteith submitted to President Hilberry in 1964 by Vice President Chamberlain of Columbia and Professor Riesman of Harvard--and made available to the ad hoc committee.) Those needs are even more acute today than they were ten or fifteen years ago. By ignoring them, the committee seems to be suggesting that WSU need not be concerned with such problems as the integration of knowledge; or the awakening of Wayne students into a life of intellectual (as distinct from academic) inquiry; or the individual student's growth into a sure sense of his own capacities; or the conscious cultivation of intellectual flexibility and resourcefulness.

5. Again, if WSU can dispense with Monteith College, a deprecation of the potential of Monteith for increasing its national leadership role and further enriching Wayne State is implied. (See the section "Future Plans" in our Self-Study Report.) By ignoring or implicitly denigrating this potential, the committee seems to be saying that in the realm of general

education WSU should abolish its present claim to national distinction and revert to a lacklustre followership. But that does not seem consistent with the first goal proposed for WSU by the Self-Study Task Force, namely, to maintain and strengthen programs of general education.

6. By making a recommendation that would thus entail a catastrophic metamorphosis of the University's priorities, the committee appears to have gone beyond its ad hoc mission and to have become a policy-generating body for the entire University. The ad hoc mission was to respond to a budgetary crisis and find ways of saving money, not to propose a radical shift in educational policy. It was to have done this by examining Monteith not in isolation but in the context of other programs and in relation to the mission of WSU. The present mission of WSU includes Monteith and the objectives for which Monteith was instituted and has been maintained for sixteen years. The ad hoc committee's recommendation would deform this mission and deface the University.¹

7. By not addressing the question of how much money can be saved through a modification of Monteith's activities (which modification would certainly affect other units of the University in ways that should be pointed out explicitly and made clear), the committee has ignored one major feature of its charge. A responsible financial analysis would surely have taken into account such questions as the following: How many faculty members can be relocated within WSU without eliminating the savings which the dismantling of the College is aimed to achieve? After all, some 9% of our budget is encumbered by personnel obligations. How many Monteith faculty can be removed from the University payroll by June 30, 1975? (Answer: None--without abrogating contracts.) How many Monteith faculty contracts terminate in June, 1977? (Answer: Two.) June 1973 is therefore the earliest date by which the faculty could be significantly reduced if present contracts are honored as the committee recommends. What evidence is there that the students presently enrolled in Monteith would stay in the University if Monteith were taken out from under them? Has any study at all been made of this? Is there a known history that enables us to predict what would happen? If students insist on their right to complete the degree requirements of the college in

¹It must be admitted that some doubt has been cast upon this interpretation of University policy, though, by a statement by President Gullen in his "Open Letter to Faculty and Staff on Cooperation with Community Colleges" (printed in Wayne Report, October 23, 1975). Mr. Gullen writes: "Wayne's Board of Governors has adopted a strong policy of cooperation with area community colleges, avowing the University's desire to offer only third- and fourth-year and higher courses in the geographic areas served by these colleges, and assuring recognition of the prime community college role in offering course work at the first- and second-year levels." If this is true, then the new policy of WSU is to discontinue lower division offerings. Not the least of the many questions raised by this announcement is What role did the faculty play in forming the new policy redefining the nature of the University?

which they have matriculated, how much will it cost the University to comply? Or, if the University decides not to comply, how much will that cost? For those students who do remain in WSU and enter other programs, what will be the cost of generating the credit hours that they would have earned in Monteith? From those students who leave WSU because Monteith is discontinued, how much tuition revenue and how many state dollars will be lost? Taking all the above factors into consideration, what would be the range of net savings that can reasonably be expected in 1975-77? In 1976-77? Thereafter? Until these questions, minimally, are answered credence should not be placed in the contention that to phase out Monteith would be to save a notable amount of money--or even any money at all--for WSU.

8. President Gullen published a letter on the editorial page of the Detroit News, October 20, 1975, in which he spoke of "some curtailment in program offerings" as "temporary hardships." "But these setbacks," he wrote, "are temporary, and Wayne State is already planning for new and expanded educational programs to meet the demands of the people of our state, which is committed to providing the best possible higher education for its people." Then, in his annual address to the faculty, on October 29, he referred to "light at the end of the tunnel" year after next. That was good news. But it also raises some questions which the University Council should examine: If the hardships are temporary, should the permanent removal of an entire college be recommended? Or, if the removal of a college is countenanced, where will the money for "new and expanded educational programs" come from? What are they? What is their justification over against the destruction of a college? It may behoove the Council not to act on the present recommendation before hearing President Gullen's answers to these questions.

9. If the sole reason for phasing out Monteith is that an equivalent education may be gotten for less money elsewhere in the University, does it follow that if Monteith can produce credit hours at, say, \$15 per credit hour, one of its "competitors" costing more will be eliminated? If the decisive factor is cost per credit hour, would the Council tolerate an experiment in giving general education at a cost equal to or less than that of Liberal Arts or Lifelong Learning? The results to be evaluated and compared with other programs? In other words, how far is the University willing to go in experimenting with general education? Perhaps a more sensible alternative to abolishing Monteith to realize a doubtful savings would be to order the College to achieve a stipulated credit-hour cost by 1977-78, to watch the experiment carefully and evaluate the educational results. That would make sense, though, only if the University were willing to follow-through on the implications of the Monteith experiment.

10. The speed with which the ad hoc committee has done its work (and its full task has not been discharged) suggests that it has been pressured by the administration to act quickly. Why should President Gullen be so eager to terminate an academic program if our financial hardship is temporary and "Wayne State is already planning for new and expanded educational programs"? It would not seem appropriate for the faculty of the University to be a party to reckless haste.

11. If it can be established that the students will enter other programs of the University when Monteith is abolished, why does the recommendation speak of phasing out the College? Why not an abrupt termination? Perhaps it could be effected this winter quarter. Simply register all Monteith students in another college of their choice and suspend the Monteith curriculum permanently--no courses after this fall. Reassign faculty to other units that are in need of help--whether teaching, research, secretarial, janitorial, fund-raising, public relations for the University, etc. Or, "buy up" the contracts of faculty who do not want to work elsewhere in WSU. But the committee did not recommend abrupt termination; they recommended phase-out. When asked about the timing, we were told there was no discussion of that. Again, it smacks of haste and outside pressure--of motives feigned or disguised. A vote by the University Council to "phase out Monteith" would therefore not seem to be a reasonable or honorable act.

12. While the Council may have the right to discharge any of its ad hoc committees with thanks, it should not so dismiss this one without recognizing that its complete charge has not been fulfilled.

If debate were conducted and truth pursued as in the quaestiones disputatae of mediaeval universities, the makers of the thesis should be given an opportunity to reply to the objections. We would welcome a very full and detailed reply to all of them.

We note that President Gullen still has not established the presidential commission on general education that he announced on May 30, 1975. In our judgment it is imperative that the commission be established; at the very least it would be a reaffirmation of confidence that the faculty can act as scholars even when matters of finance and survival are at stake.

If there is one thing we ask, one mission to which we entreat our colleagues, it is the call to scholarship, the call to the pursuit of the ideals of objectivity and judicious inquiry. Granted, there are times we must act before all the data are in, and there are times when we haven't the time to examine the extant data: Even then, prudence--or what the ancients called providentia 'seeing ahead', translating what the Greeks called phronesis 'practical wisdom'--calls for courage and imagination, not fear and servitude. For it takes more than narrow learning to be a scholar, and it takes scholarship as a minimum to make a university.

Attachment

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Summary Report of ad hoc Monteith Committee

FROM: Sol Rossman, Chairman, ad hoc Monteith Committee EXT.

TO: Milton D. Glick, Secretary, University Council

DATE: 27 October 1975

I. Formation of the ad hoc Monteith Committee.

In response to the University Council reaction to the informal action taken by the Board of Governors to eliminate Monteith College, President Gullen requested that the University Council study the Monteith situation and make a recommendation. On June 20, 1975 the Policy Committee charged the Curriculum and Instruction Committee, chaired by Sol Rossman, and the Budget Committee, chaired by Norman LeBel, with this task. A joint meeting was held and a sub-committee was formed consisting of the following:

Sandra Brown, Admissions
C. Norman Guice, Liberal Arts
Bernice Kaplan, Liberal Arts
Norman LeBel, Liberal Arts
Leon Lucas, Social Work
James McMicking, Engineering
Ruth Morrissey, Nursing
Sol Rossman, Liberal Arts, Chairman
Helen Suchara, Education

The Policy Committee subsequently voted to change the status of the sub-committee to an ad hoc committee.

II. Charge to the Committee. (see attached)

III. Procedures.

- A. Dean Hafner of Monteith College was informed of the formation of the Committee and was asked to send all information he believed to be pertinent.
- B. Nine meetings were held throughout the summer and into the fall for purposes of obtaining additional information and for evaluating information obtained.
- C. Two meetings were held with Dean Hafner and his representatives.
- D. Representatives from Institutional Research were consulted.
- E. Provost H. Bohm was consulted.
- F. A meeting was held with Provost D. Haenicke and Associate Provost L. Roellig.

IV. Conclusions.

- A. Monteith is one of three colleges in the University engaged in general education. The other two are Liberal Arts and Lifelong Learning. There are differences between the three. Monteith and Liberal Arts differ primarily in the structure of their approaches to general education. Monteith and Lifelong Learning address different student populations and make different demands upon them. The cost per credit hour in Monteith (51.6) is significantly higher than the cost per credit hour in Liberal Arts (28.7) or in Lifelong Learning (32.9). It is important to indicate that the Liberal Arts figure includes both undergraduate and graduate programs.
- B. The quality of the basic Monteith program is not in question. The problem reduces to a university-wide financial one.
- C. The current and foreseeable financial situation of the University is dire. The substantial cuts which have been made during the past few years, as well as the drastic cuts made necessary by the present budget, have had a damaging effect. Full-time teaching positions have been lost with an accompanying increase in part-time faculty; class-size has increased; classes with small enrollment have been cancelled; programs of high demand have had to limit enrollment; the Library cannot keep pace with the needs of the programs of the University. These are some of the major effects noted by the Committee. The greatest impact of these cuts has been on the graduate and professional programs. These programs represent one of the major commitments of the University, which has long sought to strengthen and develop them; however, this commitment is now seriously threatened by inadequate funding.

V. Recommendations.

Given the current and continuing financial plight of the University and the duplicative and costly nature of Monteith, the Committee regrettably recommends that Monteith be phased out. The Committee further recommends that the tenured faculty of Monteith be retained in appropriate appointments throughout the University. In addition, the Committee recommends that the contracts of non-tenured Monteith faculty be honored and that due consideration be given to the renewal of such contracts.

RC/me

cc: Provost D. Haenicke