Minutes*

Senate Committee on Finance and Planning
Tuesday, April 19, 2011
2:00 – 4:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Russell Luepker (chair), Jon Binks, Devin Driscoll, Will Durfee, Steen Erikson, Lincoln Kallsen, Lyndel King, Judith Martin, Fred Morrison, Paul Olin, Richard Pfutzenreuter, Gwen Rudney, Terry Roe, Michael Rollefson, Karen Seashore, S. Charles Schulz, Jeremy Todd, Lori-Anne Williams, Aks Zaheer

Absent: Kara Kersteter, Kathleen O'Brien, Shruti Patil, Mandy Stahre, Thomas Stinson, Michael Volna

Guests: Kris Wright (Director, Office of Student Finance), Vice Provost and Dean Henning Schroeder; Professor Susan Wick (Chair, Classroom Advisory Subcommittee)

[In these minutes: (1) financial aid for undergraduates; (2) Graduate Education Finance Task Force; (3) budget update; (4) statement on classroom funding; (5) committee retreat discussions]

1. Financial Aid for Undergraduates

Professor Luepker convened the meeting at 2:00 and welcomed Ms. Wright and Dean Schroeder to discuss financial aid. Ms. Wright began with a presentation on financial aid for undergraduates and distributed copies of a set of slides.

What does the Office of Student Finance (OSF) do?

-- Collected $916,283,043 in Student Finance revenue (all campus/all careers for FY10)
-- Administered $706,241,076 in financial assistance (all campus/all careers) in 30 major programs
-- Collected on an outstanding balance on $70 million in loans
-- Provided receivable, collections and financial aid system support to all coordinate campuses
-- Work with One Stop to provide financial literacy information to students.

Professor Zaheer asked about the difference between the $916 million and the $706 million. Ms. Wright explained that OSF also handles the billing for books and residential life, so the $916 million is for tuition and fees as well as other charges such as room and board, books, breakage and health care. $706 is the amount of aid paid. Families and students pay the rest (the amount between $916 and $706 million).

Why is aid important?

-- Undergraduate Tuition and required fees was $379,852,488
  – Does not include room and board, books, transportation or personal
-- Total Aid was $347,180,272
  – Includes work and work-study

* 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.

25% of students do not receive aid, Ms. Wright reported, so 75% do.

Ms. Wright posed several questions: What is the current strategy for undergraduate financial aid? How do our students pay for their education? What changes are occurring in the way students pay for their education? What are the impacts of recent changes in federal and state financial aid programs?

In terms of what it costs to attend, Ms. Wright explained, that varies from institution to institution and year to year, the amount identified for each institution relies on a federal formula with required elements that must be supported with actual costs, and is referred to as the Cost of Attendance. The "University follows federal guidelines to determine a 'Cost of Attendance' (COA) for various categories of students" that depends on various factors: the student's place of residence, whether undergraduate, professional, or graduate, whether living on campus or commuter, and whether resident or non-resident.

The COA for the University, Twin Cities campus, Minnesota resident undergraduate living on campus is this:

Tuition & Fees:	$12,288
Books & Supplies:	1,000
Room & Board:	7,576
Transportation:	194
Personal/Misc:	2,000
Total Cost of Attendance:	$23,058

This does not include $900 per semester for health insurance, the cost of a car, a single room, or a computer, Ms. Wright pointed out. Students can ask that their COA be adjusted, within reason, if their costs are higher; they could be provided additional loans, if there is money available. For non-residents (non-reciprocity), the COA would be $4000 higher. Ms. Wright said she did not know the percentage of students who are non-resident, non-reciprocity, but surmised that it is quite small.

How is "financial need" determined? Ms. Wright explained that financial need is the difference between a student's COA and the Expected Family Contribution (EFC); COA minus EFC = financial need. "The Expected Family Contribution (EFC) is how much money your family is expected to contribute to your college education for one year. Typically, the lower your EFC, the more financial aid you will receive. Factors such as family size, number of family members in college, family savings, and current earnings (information you provide on the FAFSA) are used to calculate this figure. U of MN uses a formula established by the federal government. Takes into account family income, assets, size of current household, and the number of family members currently attending college." For some students, the EFC is automatically zero, such as for families that file form 1040EZ.

Of the 29,921 degree-seeking undergraduates on the Twin Cities campus in fall 2009, 25% received no financial aid and did not file a FAFSA. 75% received some amount of grant or scholarship; the average was $5,621 and includes all sources (federal, state, other scholarships, and University merit and need gifts). 69% of these students used loan programs; the average loan was $8,407 (excluding Parent Loans, which must be co-signed by a credit-worthy parent/other and for which the parent is liable). There is significant overlap between students who receive grants/scholarships and those who use loan programs.

Ms. Wright outlined the variety of sources of financial aid for students, including grants and scholarships, loans, work-study, parent loans, tuition waivers (primarily graduate students), athletic scholarships, University employment and tuition benefits, and tax credits and deductions. The last one, Ms. Wright observed, does not help pay the bills when they are due, but it does help for the subsequent year. Mr. Rollefson asked at what income level, roughly, one does not qualify for aid. Ms. Wright said it is about $80,000; eligibility for federal assistance (Pell, SEOG, etc.) ends at about $60-65,000 and for state aid at about $80,000. The University awarded about $6 million in federal and state work-study funds this year.

For the Twin Cities campus in 2009-10, Ms. Wright reported that OSF provided $51.8 million in Pell funds, $65.7 million in state aid funds, and $73.7 million in University funds (undergraduates only). The last included tuition waivers, Asset Managed accounts, U of MN Foundation accounts, Federal Stimulus, and O&M funds. Need-based aid included $23 million from O&M funds and $6 million from federal stimulus funds. Admission (merit) aid was $8 million in O&M funds. In terms of what they describe as "self-help aid," they provided $211.1 million in student loans, $43.7 million in student earnings (undergraduates; includes work-study and non-work-study income), and $34.1 million in parent loans.

Professor Roe inquired about default rates on loans. Ms. Wright said it is about 1.5%, which is quite low. The state sees about the same default rate. She noted that education loans are not dischargeable in bankruptcy and on Title IV loans, the federal government will come after students until the loans are paid, including taking Social Security payments. The University will not release transcripts until campus-based loans are paid current or in full. The University will not release transcripts if a student is in arrears on his or her student receivable balance or on his or her campus-based loan payments. Any accounts in arrears owed to the University will trigger a hold on the student's records.

Ms. Wright provided two examples of aid packages for students, one from a family with an adjusted gross income of $25 - $30,000 and one with an adjusted gross income of $82,000. In the former case, with a COA of $23,058, the student would be provided total aid of $23,058 that includes $5,500 in student loans and $1,826 in parent loans. The expected family contribution (EFC) is $2,250, which is included in the loans/work. In general, for low-income families, the EFC is about 10% of income and an increasing percentage as family income increases. Families in the second example are not eligible for state grants or Pell grants.

Mr. Driscoll pointed that it is less than 10% for non-dependent students. Ms. Wright agreed and said that the calculations for independent students are very different.

Professor Martin inquired if OSF assumes that families at the $20 - $25,000 income level actually have $2,250; Ms. Wright said federal rules assume they do. Professor Seashore observed that the "expected family contribution" is more like $7,500 when one looks at the loans that the student and parents must take out. Why call it the expected family contribution when it is so far from reality, she asked? That isn't the only fantasy of the federal government, Professor Martin commented. Professor Seashore asked if the EFS is increasing; it is, Ms. Wright said. Ten years ago it was about half of what it is now. Professor Seashore asked if there has been any discussion about making the EFC closer to reality, or is the conclusion that "fantasy is good"? There is not, Ms. Wright said, and there will likely be declining funding for Pell grants; the federal government is also considering reducing work-study and SEOG funds,.. If both programs were eliminated the Twin Cities Campus would lose about $8 million in federal assistance.

Mr. Rollefson asked if the COA includes what one might call "pizza and beer" money. It does, Ms. Wright said; $2,000 per year.

Professor Roe asked what data on the income distribution of students look like. Ms. Wright said that about 50% of the students come from households with incomes of $110,000 or greater

Do they actually use the EFC number in OSF, Professor Durfee asked? They do, Ms. Wright said; they use it to determine the amount of aid to give; it determines how much need-based aid they can provide. Ms. Wright provided a bar graph indicating the share of the COA for dependent resident undergraduates by parental income level and type of financial aid. In general, the lower the income level, the greater the contribution from state and federal grants and the lower the EFC. The majority of the aid is need-based, Ms. Wright commented, so a student from a family that has more than about $80,000 in income is mostly out of luck.

Ms. Wright provided comparative data for 1968-69 and 2010-2011 on "Working your way through the U of M" Then and now:

	1968-1969	2010-2011
Tuition and fees	$385	$12,288
Federal minimum wage	$1.25	$7.25
Amount available after Social Security and Medicare	$1.20	$6.76
Number of hours **per week** (52 weeks) needed to cover tuition costs	6.2 hours	34.8 hours

One can talk a lot about the increase in tuition and fees, Ms. Wright commented; in conservative circles the argument is made that as the federal government raises the amount of Pell grants, tuition goes up. The issue is much more complex than that and involves (1) the rise of for-profit institutions and their students relying on Pell grants, (2) the decline in state support, and (3) a number of other factors.

Ms. Wright also provided data on loans for the Twin Cities campus:

	FY 2000	**FY 2010**
Undergraduate Loan Volume	$66,949,835	$211,127,084
Percent of undergraduate students borrowing	49%	57.4%
Average undergraduate amount borrowed	$5,501	$8,407

Student Loan Indebtedness for 2009-10 Baccalaureate Graduates

	% of Grads	Average
Twin Cities	64%	$25,463

A student needs to make about $35,000 per year to reasonably be able to pay back the loan over ten years. For every $3 increase in tuition, students/parents must borrow $2 more.

Ms. Wright provided information on the cost to students of not graduating in four years. Average loan burden for students who graduate in four years (2008-09) was $24.062; for students who graduated in five years, it was $27,284, and about the same amount for those who took six years.

There are changes planned to the University's Promise Scholarship program. Ms. Wright itemized the reasons and the changes, which are:

- Effective academic year 2011-12
- Will apply to new and continuing undergraduate students
- Number of students will remain approximately the same as 2010-11 (over 13,000)
- Projected annual cost to the University in 2011-12 will remain approximately the same as 2010-11 (about $30 million)
- One program
- Eligibility based on EFC, not Pell Grant
- Scholarship amount guaranteed for 4 years for freshmen, 2 years for transfer
- Lowest income students receive the largest Promise Scholarships
- Well-defined cohorts of recipients
- Better support and advising of recipients

The benefits will be:

- The University will be able to predict and plan for the cost of the program and annual increases, as approved by the Board
- Students will be able to predict and plan for their Promise Scholarship aid for a four-year period
- Having a four-year, defined cohort enables the University to better serve recipients

Professor Luepker inquired if state grants appear to be targeted for cuts in this legislative session. They are, Ms. Wright said. If the Pell grants are reduced, the state grant is based on a tuition ceiling, less Pell to reach a state grant amount. If the Pell goes down, the gap between them is bigger, so students lose out if there are not enough state funds. In the past, the state grants have absorbed the difference.

Apropos of the data from 1968-69 and 2010-11, there are some parents who cannot or will not help students, Ms. Wright said, so they have to talk to parents about realistic expectations. Mr. Driscoll asked if there any data linking 35 hours of work per week to time to degree; it is not reasonable to work 35 hours per week, so students work fewer hours and take longer to graduate. There have been articles in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Inside Higher Ed* about this, Ms. Wright said, and agreed that it is an issue, especially for middle-income students who are not Pell-eligible.

Professor Luepker asked about the difference between the $916 million collected and the $706 million in financial aid; was the difference what came from parents and students? It was, Ms. Wright said—that was the out-of-pocket expenses that someone paid. Professor Luepker asked if the 529 plans were playing any role. They would not know, Ms. Wright said, because they would be part of the out-of-pocket money students and parents pay. They do know that before the housing crash, Sallie Mae found that 25% of families were using home-equity loans to help pay for college.

Professor Roe asked how the pattern at Minnesota compared with other Big Ten school. Ms. Wright said they are comparable, although a larger percentage of Minnesota students borrow and they borrow more. Michigan and Northwestern, for example, offer aid up to the level of need with gifts, so they are more generous. Ms. Wright also explained that the University makes loans; it has a $70-million revolving fund, and as loans are repaid, they can loan more. Most of the loans are at 7%, some lower, and they are talking with Asset Management and the Foundation about them because 7% is not competitive. The loan fund is growing slowly as loans are repaid.

Professor Luepker thanked Ms. Wright for her presentation.

2. Graduate Education Finance Task Force

Professor Luepker turned next to Dean Schroeder for a report on the graduate-education finance task force.

Dean Schroeder reported that they hope to have a preliminary report by the end of the semester and are wrapping up their work on different models. The task force was originally formed to address a concrete problem: Graduate students on federal grants are too expensive to cover, and the task force was asked to find a short-term and a long-term solution. This is not a problem unique to Minnesota. Then the task force received a broader charge, and is looking at models for charging and collecting tuition and ways to align the tuition model with educational goals for graduate students.

Some aspects of packaging tuition and counting credits do not align with what they believe a graduate-student experience should be like. Right now students are more expensive in their first years, then they take a prelim after two-three years, and then take thesis credits (which keep the student expensive). Only after that, when they are enrolling for one credit, are they cheaper on grants and are able to do grant research. This delays graduation because PIs have a hard time funding students before they finish their thesis credits—and then when they become cheaper to fund, the students may linger on grant funding. Moreover, the way the University charges tuition, students take whatever courses are available and in the tuition band, up to 14 credits, so they can get through coursework quickly.

They do not believe that is what the graduate-student experience should be like. Students should start to get the flavor of research on their own rather than staying in assignment mode (i.e., in courses) for the first two or three years and then finding out late what it means to be a researcher in the field. The result is late attrition, when it would be better if attrition came earlier. The University should have a model that allows students to take courses when they need them, early or late in their program.

A tuition band up to 14 credits makes sense for undergraduates because it provides an incentive take courses and finish their degree, Dean Schroder said, but the situation is very different for Ph.D. students. The Ph.D. is not a measure of credits, it is the experience as a whole and represents the ability to generate new knowledge.

So the committee is trying to even out the cost of tuition, Dean Schroeder related, and there are two possible ways to do it. They can even out the costs arithmetically, which would make it easier to put on a grant a student earlier in his or her graduate career and there would be no incentive for PIs to wait because a student would be cheaper later—the incentive would be equal throughout a student's program. This model would also allow students to take thesis credits before the prelim, so that if someone comes in research-ready (e.g., from a Master's program), they are not barred from doing research. The task force is also running models with no or smaller tuition bands where course credit is cheaper and thesis or FTE credit is more expensive.

The issue they must tackle is what a change would mean for the tuition revenues of each of the colleges, Dean Schroder said. They will not make a recommendation before the look at the consequences for all units. The models they are discussing deal with the NIH/NSF cap and allow the institution to define educational goals, after which the tuition structure would follow, not the other way around.

Mr. Driscoll said that Dean Schroeder was right about the banding, but that students are concerned about the elimination of the banding because it affects self-paying students and would affect professional Master's students. There are models with partial or smaller tuition bands which take this into consideration, Dean Schroeder said.

Professor Roe said he has been complaining for years about the way graduate students are charged; a fixed charge up to 14 credits is a tax on research budgets. This would be a great step forward. In terms of thesis credits, has anyone studied faculty time so it is known if the credit numbers are appropriate? If a student realizes that he or she is paying a lot of money for credits that reflect advising and one-on-one interactions, Dean Schroeder said, the student will have more leverage for the faculty to provide additional service in a model that makes thesis/FTE credits more expensive; some may not be spending enough time with their graduate students. Professor Roe said it has been his sense that the University is over-charging students; graduate students facilitate his work, but on the other hand he has to read a thesis three times, advise, and so on. The key problem about charging graduate students is that when they are on an NIH grant, they are not there to be educated, they are there to do the work of the grant and have little opportunity to do their own work. That is an interesting contradiction. The federal government is looking at incorporating an educational component into NIH research grants as a metric for approval and renewal.

What are the practices at equivalent universities, Professor Seashore asked? Dean Schroeder said he talked with the graduate dean's offices at ten peer institutions and asked how they allocate resources to pay graduate students. Every university has its own way of doing this and there are a lot of models, from a flat fee (independent of credits and courses) to a rigid coupling of courses taken and tuition paid. Professor Seashore asked about the relationship between the model used and faculty workload. Dean Schroder said that in many departments or colleges professorial workload comes into play with classes of more than 10 students, but there is a lot of work with smaller group of students in tutorials, colloquia, or independent studies that is particularly valuable to graduate students and would need to be captured as well.

Professor Morrison asked what the average time to a Ph.D. is. Dean Schroder said it varies across disciplines. The University is about average among its peers: up to 9 years in the humanities, 4-5 years in the sciences, and the social sciences in between. With respect to what makes sense in English or History, for example, the Mellon Graduate Education Initiative has shown that taking more than 7 years does not increase the chances of a person obtaining a reasonable job even if the additional time means more published work prior to graduation; fewer than 7 years is fine if one is visible in the field. The composite average is about 7 years, Mr. Driscoll reported, and the University has an institutional average of 50% completion.

Who will decide on the models, Professor Martin asked? Dean Schroeder said that President-designate Kaler will probably have a lot to say about the decision.

Professor Schulz said he was very concerned about the NIH grant payline going down to 10% or below. All universities are worried about this.

Professor Luepker said the Committee would look forward to the final report and thanked Dean Schroeder for his comments.

3. Budget Update

Professor Luepker called on Vice President Pfutzenreuter for an update on the budget.

"Nothing is happening," Mr. Pfutzenreuter reported. The legislative process has slowed down considerably. The University is proceeding on its budget framework because it cannot wait, but it will be nimble when it knows the final numbers from the state. But it is still a month to go before the legislature must adjourn.

Professor Luepker thanked Mr. Pfutzenreuter for his report.

4. Statement on Classroom Funding

Professor Luepker turned to Professor Wick, who was rejoining the Committee to discuss the statement by the Classroom Advisory Committee on funding for classrooms. He noted that the Committee had asked questions at its March 1 meeting and asked her to return later.

One question she was asked, Professor Wick recalled, was what Vice Provost McMaster had to say about the statement. She and Mr. Todd went to see Dr. McMaster, who was very supportive of the statement. He was caught in the middle, she said: His budget was cut back and he had to decide between retaining people and paying for services. Dr. McMaster acknowledged that if the cuts continue, classroom quality will decline and the Office of Classroom Management will have to use its budget for hardware.

Mr. Rollefson again expressed concern about the process. There are hundreds of people who could come to the Committee and say that their funding has been reduced. How does the Committee determine to whom it will give access? Mr. Todd pointed out that the Committee has given a charge to the Classroom Advisory Subcommittee to look at classroom funding; the statement is coming from a subcommittee of this Committee.

Professor Seashore said that the Committee seems to arrive easily at concerns about priorities, which may reflect the membership on the Committee; they are connected with the core teaching mission. Reviewing the vice-presidential offices will help the Committee set some priorities in the future. That said, classrooms and the physical plan have been a consistent long-term concern of this Committee.

One significant aspect of attention to classrooms, Professor Martin said, is that in all the time she has been on the Committee, the person employed as responsible for classroom support has been a member of the Committee. The issue has been thought important, and given the changes in the last decade such that the University now receives more money from tuition than from the state, classrooms are very important—and they have been part of the Committee's business for a very long time.

Professor Morrison said he largely supported Mr. Rollefson's point. Are classrooms more important than salary reductions or graduate-student tuition? If the Committee adopts the statement, it is saying that that they are more important. He said he was not willing to say that. There are other problems the University faces as well. Thirty years ago this Committee was asked to rank in priority order 237 claims on the University's budget, and it did so. He said he did not want to get into the business of picking one priority. He suggested the Committee endorse the last paragraph of the statement:

> The Classroom Advisory Subcommittee (CAS) recommends a minimum level of recurring funding at 50% of lifecycle requirement to maintain the basic-level of maintenance and renewal of classroom infrastructure. CAS furthermore recommends restoring funding to 80% of need by the 2014-15 biennium, in order to provide a quality standard for classroom facilities, technology and support that is appropriate for a major, nationally ranked university.

He suggested, and the Committee concurred by unanimous email vote after the meeting, the following statement:

> The Senate Committee on Finance and Planning endorses the last paragraph of the statement from the Classroom Advisory Committee and believes that funding for classroom facilities and technologies should be a high priority among the many priorities to be considered. The Committee expects to participate in discussions about allocation of resources among those priorities.

Professor Morrison said he believed there will be a bigger crisis than many expect, and to put a heavy commitment on classroom funding could lead people to be disappointed. He said he thought the standards proposed in the statement are inadequate, but if the institution faces disastrous reductions in standards elsewhere, this one may suffer as well.

Professor Seashore said she agreed with Professor Morrison; the Committee must be supportive of the statement because teaching is core to University activities. Classrooms here are still dumpy compared to most high schools. When the Committee looked at the units that report to Provost Sullivan, they noted that a number deal with undergraduate education. She said the Committee needs to talk to Vice Provost Sullivan about the "people versus services" dilemma.

Professor Luepker agreed with Professors Martin and Morrison and observed that the cuts to classroom maintenance and technology that have been reported are draconian. Professor Olin also agreed and pointed out that deferred maintenance costs more when delayed; if the budget will not get better later, it is better that the University pay as it goes rather than face even more expensive problems later. Professor Martin agreed with supporting the statement as well; it offers moral support for the proposition that classrooms are important, she said, that they must be adequate in order for instructors to do their work, and that the University should not backslide too much.

5. Committee Retreat Discussions

Professor Luepker reflected that the Committee had interesting discussions with four of the University's vice presidents at its retreat on April 15. He expressed high regard for the discussions; all four of the vice presidents came prepared and answered questions as candidly as one could expect. The process began about a year ago, he recalled, when questions were raised at a Senate meeting; people said the administration was growing by leaps and bounds and consuming a lot of money—a perception widespread in academia generally. The Committee now has a great deal of information. The question on the table is how to use the data and move forward. He said he learned much about many new operations and organizations; the Committee needs to think about how to present the information so it is useful to others and so the Committee can comment and make recommendations.

Mr. Rollefson said he was impressed by the fact that there were 74 senior administrators when President Bruininks took office and 74 when he leaves office; the Committee should explore that further.

Professor Morrison said that when he came to the University, there was an academic affairs vice president (with two associate vice presidents and an assistant vice president and two secretaries); now there are many more people in that office. He is not saying they are not necessary but it is a different view of where administrative work is done.

Professor Seashore said she wished the Committee to consider at greater length the Provost's office, which is so close to the core and so large and complicated. One hears that student affairs is crowding out the core (new residence halls, recreational sport facilities, etc.); she said she does not know if that is true, but she suspects it is not. If there is to be talk about priorities in times of deep budget cuts, the Committee needs to know more about units that are not self-supporting.

Professor Luepker said his notes from the discussions with the vice presidents suggested two global points: One, each argues that he or she had units dropped on them by a previous administration or for historical reasons, and that activity continues, and two, there seem to be no sundown provisions or systematic evaluation. Except for one of the vice presidents, none of them said anything about the "new normal." The question is how to bring these issues into relief and be helpful to the new president.

Ms. King said that at the final meeting of the Subcommittee on Twin Cities Facilities and Support Services, they had a discussion about Northrop Auditorium, the acoustics, the mission, and the halls.

Professor Martin observed that the University has an administrative structure to serve a $3-billion-per-year organization. If the budget is $2.5 billion, what will be needed? She said people do not know if the administration is outsized for a $3-billion organization. It could be, but it also may not be. Professor Zaheer said that one is in the dark about the question if there are no metrics or benchmarks. Professor Schulz said that one also has to compare a multi-mission organization with a corporation that makes products; the University is more complex. It is also important to consider fixed costs and variable income model when looking at institutional size, he added. There can be fixed costs that do not go up when there is more money flowing into the institution.

There is a straightforward way to develop a regression model of the number of administrative staff on independent variables, such as the number of students, Professor Zaheer said. If one could obtain the data from peer institutions, one could have a better sense of whether the University is over-staffed or under-staffed. That is nearly impossible to do, Professor Seashore responded; in her college, for example, they have many P&A staff—who are typically classified as administrative but 90% of whom are doing teaching and research. If there are no standard variables, the Committee could get a sense of how the numbers change, Professor Zaheer suggested, which would be better than the nothing it has now. Mr. Rollefson pointed out that with the University's budget model, college administrations have grown because there has been considerable decentralization. Professor Seashore commented that one example is the size of college development offices, which has tripled. Compliance requirements have also increased without regard to cost, Professor Zaheer said.

Professor Luepker said the Committee will start looking at the data and making sense of it. Unlike a business, the University has a historical public mandate and many agreements built up over time. He adjourned the meeting at 4:10.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota