

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, February 21, 2002
1:15 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Joseph Massey (chair), Wilbert Ahern, Muriel Bebeau, Susan Brorson, Arthur Erdman, Daniel Feeney, Richard Goldstein, Marti Hope Gonzales, Candace Kruttschnitt, Leonard Kuhl, Judith Martin, Scott McConnell, Paula Rabinowitz, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Charles Speaks

Absent: Les Drewes, Marc Jenkins

Guests: Vice President Sandra Gardebring, Amy Anderson (University Relations); Associate Dean Richard Skaggs, Vice Provost Craig Swan; Executive Vice President Robert Bruininks (briefly); President Mark Yudof

Other: Elizabeth Wroblewski (Office of the Chief of Staff)

[In these minutes: (1) University public relations; (2) graduation rates; (3) removal of committee chairs/committee members; (4) discussion with the President]

1. Public Relations

Professor Massey convened the meeting at 1:20 and welcomed Vice President Gardebring and Ms. Anderson to discuss the University's public relations activities.

Dr. Gardebring distributed copies of a PowerPoint presentation and said she would focus on audiences, the message, tactics, evaluation, results, and current initiatives.

The University's audiences fall into three groups. First, the general public (people of Minnesota, legislature, governor, business community, prospective students)—people who are not connected to the University. Second, people who are connected to the University—enrolled students, parents, donors, alumni, faculty, and staff. Third, external agencies—federal and state agencies, bond agencies/investors, accreditation associations. In general, relationships with the third group are more stylized and formal and they are not managed in her office, Dr. Gardebring said.

Recent messages have been that this is a highly-ranked research university, that it has a high-quality medical school, the University holds people accountable for their actions, and the University has momentum. These messages change over time and can be opportunistic. For example, the University may not care for rankings of research universities, but the public is interested in them. The message about the Medical School has been that it has slipped in the rankings and its status needs to be restored. In terms of accountability, Dr. Gardebring recalled President Yudof's comment that "if it moves, we measure

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

it." The message about momentum derives from President Yudof's beliefs that all of the indicators are moving in the right direction.

There are a variety of ways in which the University communicates. One is "earned media," which is coverage by television and newspapers. University Relations analyzed coverage during the year 2000: there were 3200 stories that covered the University in Minnesota or national publications. (Advertising to achieve the same amount of coverage would have cost about \$6 million.)

Was it all good news, Professor Martin asked? It was not, Dr. Gardebring said, but the majority of it was. More than 60% of the items were feature articles (e.g., about faculty research); University Relations does push those articles and they are almost always "good news." The 3200 stories did not include sports coverage, Dr. Gardebring said in response to a question from Professor Massey; they only looked at news and editorials.

Of the articles, 78% were published in Minnesota. It is worth considering whether the University should have a more national agenda in terms of communication. The Academic Health Center does have a more national focus. Whether to do so depends on a decision about priorities. One has the sense that the University of Wisconsin turns up more often in national publications, Professor Martin said. Dr. Gardebring said she did not know but that that might be true. They have started working with the President to gain a more national focus by working with the Chronicle of Higher Education, for example, to build relationships with reporters interested in higher education. It is expensive to emphasize the national media.

They have also analyzed the broadcast media coverage in the Twin Cities. Generally the coverage is positive. The University, of course, does not push bad news; that generally comes at the University and acquires a life of its own.

The University does very little with paid media (billboards, advertisements, etc.). Many universities do more and the University could consider expanding its use of paid media. The University's focus would probably be on image, not admissions; such advertising is expensive but it could be considered. UMD has used paid media more, Professor Massey observed. Those efforts are directed more to admissions, Dr. Gardebring said; the Twin Cities campus has not done so because it does not need to increase enrollment, it is too costly, and there is the potential problem of a negative reaction (should the University be spending money that way?).

A few years ago there were radio spots about the University, Professor Martin recalled, and they were great. Dr. Gardebring said the University spent about \$150,000 on those spots and may do them again. It is a hit or miss proposition and the messages carried different themes, but they will consider doing them again.

The University also uses targeted mailings to selected individuals in its database; the State of the University address, for example, was mailed to about 800 leaders in the state, and Vice President Maziar's report on research was sent to research and development leaders.

The University also sponsors community visits; the deans and vice presidents travel around the state. Her office tries to keep track of these travels and to make sure a basic University message is included in whatever more specific message a University official may be delivering. They are also

sponsoring small-group dinners with the President and selected leaders in such areas as health care, news publishing, philanthropic leaders, and religious leaders. These are not fund-raising efforts, they are an attempt to build relationships.

Professor McConnell asked if there is a way, in the strategic communication plan, to leverage the content of faculty work, to include things people like to hear about? The faculty would benefit from the expertise of her office. Is there a way to bring that about? Dr. Gardebring said there is, although she pointed out that University Relations is a centralized communication office in a very decentralized university. If they know about something, they will push a story about it. There are collegiate public relations officers and some of those individuals will mine for stories. If faculty and academic leaders provide University Relations with information, they will try to place stories. There is a lot of good content at the University, she said.

Some faculty work may not fit in a strategic communication plan, Professor McConnell observed. They try to do stories around the President's initiatives, Dr. Gardebring said, but sometimes there is a great story that is not linked to an agenda that gives a picture of the University. The task for them is to get those stories. Is it the job of department heads and deans to call her, Professor McConnell asked? It is, Dr. Gardebring said, but they cannot promise that every tip will lead to a story, because that depends on evaluation by news people. They could, however, get more stories out if they knew more. Some faculty are not interested in news coverage, but the more people who send them emails with information, the better off they are, Dr. Gardebring said.

How do they evaluate communications efforts? By analyzing the quantity and quality of media coverage, for one. They determine success also by achieving support through donations and appropriations, they ask people how the University is doing through opinion surveys, and they listen to anecdotal feedback that conveys public perceptions. They did three surveys this fall, including a statewide telephone survey evenly divided between the metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas. They asked respondents to rank-order priorities and performance from a list of 11 items. The top three priorities according to respondents were that the University should (1) be a good manager of resources, (2) keep tuition affordable, and (3) demonstrate accountability by being forthcoming (the next two on the list were improving graduation rates and having a world-class medical school). The respondents ranked the University's top performance in three areas: (1) having a world-class medical school, (2) attracting and rewarding faculty, and (3) its national ranking. The public placed little importance on being more selective, having a more residential campus and fewer commuter students (which may reflect the success the University has had in this area already).

In terms of communication with the general public, more than 50% say they are at least somewhat well-informed about the University (what "well-informed" meant was up to the respondent to decide; they did not ask WHAT information they received, and some of it could be about athletics). People get information about the University from the newspaper, and secondarily from family and friends. They PREFER to get information from the newspaper, and also from the Internet. Asked if there are types of information about the University that is difficult to find, 90% said no.

In terms of communication with alumni, 63% said there are "adequate avenues to communicate views to the University. 88% said the University does 'somewhat well' or 'very well' in overall communication efforts. 77% said they receive the 'right amount' of information from the University. More than half said they have visited the University's web site."

In terms of the effectiveness of communication, about twice as many people think the University has been improving as think it has been losing ground. On a scale of 1-10, nearly 50% gave the University a 7 or an 8 on overall performance. 80% of Minnesotans believe public universities offer a good value, and over three-quarters believe public universities make a significant contribution to the state's economy. It may be, Dr. Gardebring said, the University may never be able to "move the dial" on perceptions of it by the general public, no matter how well-managed. She said she believes it important, however, to change perceptions with opinion leaders because they DO make a difference. (At one event, for example, a corporate CEO asked if the University had a chief financial officer—as if a \$1.7 billion organization might not have one.)

What they have learned is that when the message is clear, the University is successful in communicating it and receiving support for it. The University needs to address the discrepancy between what is really happening at the University and what people think is happening. It also needs to develop ways to illustrate its success in such broad areas as its value, that it is well-managed, and that it maintains a high academic quality.

Current strategies include web enhancements (and the portal project that she spoke about at the last meeting), internal communications support, targeted stakeholder communications, grassroots communication and advocacy, media relations, and positioning. With respect to the last, many universities have engaged in a much more systematic evaluation of their market situation and ways to enhance it (the emphasis is on public perspectives, not admissions).

Professor Erdman commented that it is his sense University Relations has been doing a better job of getting stories out. There is, however, a bias in coverage toward East Coast schools, where there is a lot more competition and much more money put into outreach. Here, "Minnesota nice" still prevails and there is a question whether it is appropriate to push stories. He said he was glad University Relations was being more aggressive. In departments there are lot of things going on that faculty need to push out. The University still has a ways go to, he concluded.

Dr. Gardebring agreed. She said she does not need more money, although compared to other Big Ten schools her office is somewhat thinly staffed (although the Academic Health Center also has a communications office). Where they have identified sound initiatives, the President has provided funding, but her office is subject to the same budget cuts that are all others. It is probably possible to use resources more strategically, but much of the effort comes from feet on the ground, connections to departments and faculty.

Sometimes stories are hard to find, Ms. Anderson said; it would help if this Committee would encourage faculty to understand the value of communication to the University and their departments, not only in research publications but also in relationships with the external community.

Part of public perceptions of the University are beyond her control, Professor Speaks told Dr. Gardebring, such as when individuals have a bad experience with University offices. These are things the University must take a careful look at. Dr. Gardebring agreed that the best public relations efforts will not work when things go wrong. If personal contacts are not good, the number of positive stories will not matter—and these negative perceptions can develop in a split-second.

Professor McConnell agreed that the University is doing a better job and administrators are understanding that public relations is part of their job and they must keep on message. Many of her sources are administrators, however; can they turn their talents to internal communication to get more stories? There are cultural inhibitions about talking about one's work; he encouraged Dr. Gardebring to think about a communication plan with the faculty. Part of the problem is keeping REPORTERS on message, Professor Kruttschnitt commented; because of her work in criminology, she receives a lot of calls, and it is sometimes frustrating to keep them focused.

In terms of negative experiences with University, Professor Feeney commented, there must be a way for her office to get messages back to people who can do something about what happens. Dr. Gardebring said her office does funnel anecdotes back to the appropriate administrators.

Professor Martin also commended the efforts of University Relations, but said one problem is that good information is directed to target audiences, so CLA people receive CLA information and Medical School people receive Medical School and other University information. There should be a way to cross-fertilize the messages, so CLA people receive Medical School information. At present the same messages go to the same people. Dr. Gardebring agreed they need to work through grass-roots committees to get out a broader message in the targeted publications.

They are also trying to help faculty be more comfortable working with the media; they provide a workshop for the colleges. She agreed that the faculty needed to be more engaged in communication, as Professor McConnell suggested. The colleges need to see it as their job to promote faculty and need to take the initiative to seek information, Professor Bebeau commented.

At this point Drs. Craig Swan and Richard Skaggs had joined the meeting. Dr. Swan commented on Professor Bebeau's contention. That is a two-way street, he said. Faculty, departments, and colleges have some responsibility as well. For example, he said he has always found University Relations and the Alumni Association responsive when he had stories to promote.

It is more than just fact-finding, Professor McConnell emphasized. The reaction of many faculty, when approached by the media, is "do I HAVE to talk to them?" It is not something faculty do. Someone needs to make the case that this is something they should do.

Professor Massey thanked Dr. Gardebring and Ms. Anderson for joining the meeting.

2. Graduation Rates

Professor Massey now welcomed Associate Dean Richard Skaggs (CLA) and Vice Provost Craig Swan to the meeting to discuss graduation rates.

Dr. Swan distributed copies of a statement adopted by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly in 1999 calling on the administration to take steps necessary to increase the four- and five-year graduation rate on the Twin Cities campus. He said that several actions had taken place after that statement. First, he and Associate Dean Rinehart from the Carlson School of Management co-chaired a committee of the Council of Undergraduate Deans that examined graduation and retention rates. That report, issued last fall, led to a letter from the President and Provost suggesting a rule requiring undergraduates to enroll for at least 13

credits each term, unless they received permission to register for fewer, as part of a broad strategy to facilitate timely graduation.

There is no magic bullet for increasing graduation rates, Dr. Swan said; there needs to be a constellation of policies and practices to encourage timely graduation. He said he believes graduation to be an important part of the undergraduate experience and that the University under-performs it peers in terms of graduation rates. He said he is not blaming anyone; the administration, faculty, and students must work together to increase student success. He distributed a list of steps to be taken to help students graduate on a timely basis; all of them are intended to implement the 1999 statement.

Professor Rabinowitz recalled that she had talked about this at the last meeting and wished to make her point again. If one compares the Twin Cities campus to its peers, one should consider the fact that many departments have two or three times as many faculty as does Minnesota while they have about the same number of students (e.g., in her department, 42 faculty versus 80-100 at peer institutions). It could be that one reason students do not graduate in a timely fashion is because they cannot take the courses they need: there are not enough faculty to offer the courses students need. But there seems to be no recognition of this problem. If departments had more faculty bodies, students could take more courses. She said she did not know if this is a problem in other colleges.

Dr. Swan said that is a difficult question to address. If the University is to be honest with students, it must be able to put together programs with the resources it has so that students can graduate in four years. If that does not happen, students will not come. All the indications are that students come for degrees, not just to take courses. The emphasis on freshmen seminars recognized the need for more faculty; it was a way to attract more money to the University.

Professor Speaks said he could not disagree with Professor Rabinowitz; there are instances in CLA and elsewhere around the University where units are under-staffed. There are a couple of other factors that must also be considered. It is not just the number of students in classes, it is also the number who want time from a faculty member. If students are at the University for six or seven years and if admissions stay the same, there will be more students around who need faculty time.

With the state budget situation, Professor Speaks said, there will be little change in the number of faculty; it may be necessary to back off new initiatives. Sooner or later the University must come to grips with whether it wants to have an expectation of timely graduation and will do all it can to make it possible. Dr. Zetterberg has asked whether the University has put in place the policies to help meet that expectation. His hunch is that the window is now. The President wants to improve graduation rates and believes a 13-credit rule is one way to do so, there is the report from the Council of Undergraduate Deans, there is the statement from the Committee on Finance and Planning about tuition that has also been endorsed by the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy. To derail the effort now comes when time is short; what are the constraints, he asked Dr. Swan?

The University has had for three or four years a 4-year graduation guarantee, Dr. Swan said: if a student cannot get the courses they need in a timely way, the University will pay their tuition for that course. So far, the University has not had to pay. There have been improvements in the four- and five-year graduation rates on the Twin Cities campus but they are still not where they should be. The six-year graduation rate has not changed. He said he was concerned that the improvements could stall. In terms of timing, planning for summer orientation is underway now; the more a decision is delayed, the more

difficult it becomes to get new material into orientation. The University catalogue will be ready by the end of March and it is intended to serve for two years; it would be best if as much as possible concerning graduation expectations and policies could be included in it.

Every time this issue comes up, everyone starts to think about reasons why students take so long, Professor Kuhl said. What do the STUDENTS say about why they take so long? Dr. Swan said they get different answers; it is hard to know. Has there been a survey, Professor Kuhl asked? Are there any items on the list Dr. Swan distributed that address student concerns? Students are very supportive of the items on the list, Dr. Swan said.

As she looks at the list, Professor Martin said, it strikes her that there is clear Assembly policy; the question is how to implement it. There was a lot of discussion about poor graduation rates at the time the University changed to semesters. The general thrust at the time was that the University, when on semesters, would be more aligned with other universities and student behavior would follow. The Committee has seen data from Dr. Zetterberg; student credit loads did not go down (they did go down, Dr. Swan observed, but not as much as they did at other institutions that have made the change). What one hears, over and over, is that freshmen and sophomores behave the way the University expects and the change comes in the junior and senior years. What happens between the sophomore and junior years to change behavior, she asked? How can the expectation of enrollment and graduation be reasonably communicated to students?

The 13-credit rule is seen as the simplest way to express the expectation, Dr. Swan said, but it must be adopted in a way that does not hamstring the University. It will start with new students so should apply to all students in the next four years. One place where the institution fails students is as they get close to the end of their undergraduate career. Dr. Swan proposed that all students have graduation plans and someone to work with them on the clear expectations. He fears that at present many graduation plans are in the students' heads and might be similar to unwritten papers in the minds of students and faculty. It would be best if there were something written down and against which progress can be monitored. Plans can change and some students will not know what they want to study, but a plan should call for a timely decision.

Anecdotes from students who did not graduate carry three themes, Dr. Swan said. First, they are annoyed the University let them drift away without graduating. Second, they are embarrassed they did not finish. Third, they are surprised their parents let them drift away. That sounds like they blame everyone else, Professor Kuhl commented; Dr. Swan said no, they also take responsibility themselves.

Professor McConnell recalled that Dr. Swan said the campus under-performs; what should the goal be, using multiple regression analysis of the appropriate factors? The five-year graduation rate should be at least 65%, Dr. Swan said. That is less than Penn State and Michigan, which are more selective; an appropriate comparison group for Minnesota in the Big Ten is Indiana, Iowa, Ohio State, Purdue, and Michigan State in terms of student characteristics.

Professor Speaks noted that the proposed 13-credit rule is less than what is specified in the Assembly policy, which calls for graduation in four years, which requires enrollment for 15 credits per semester. What is important is the average, Dr. Swan replied; a student might take 16-17 credits one term and 13-14 the next and be on track to graduation. Setting 13 credits as the rule is aggressive without tying the University in knots and it gives students some flexibility.

What can this Committee do to move the issue forward, Professor Speaks asked? Endorse the Finance and Planning Committee statement would be one step, Dr. Swan said.

Professor Kuhi said he found Professor Martin's statement interesting. If student behavior is fine the first two years, and something happens at the end of the second year (when students go into their major programs), has anyone asked them what is going on? The longer they are here, the more they work, and they can drift into full-time positions, Dr. Swan said. There are times when it would be appropriate to use a reasonable amount of student loans to aid timely graduation, he said; that would in many cases be to the student's advantage. Are there any statistical data on what happens to students, Professor Kuhi asked again? There have been talks with students and data from a variety of sources, Dr. Swan said, but there are no data from a graduation survey per se; he agreed that there should be a survey of current students. It should be of juniors and seniors, Professor Kuhi commented.

Dr. Swan also said he believed there should be a joint student-staff-faculty implementation oversight committee for the actions related to improving graduation rates.

Professor Kruttschnitt asked what the current five-year graduation rate is; 47%. If CLA has the most undergraduates, that will drive the aggregate number, she said. Are there differences across colleges? There are. Is there a CLA problem? No, Dr. Swan said; CLA is right on the mean. The numbers for other colleges vary; some are more selective, and in some cases the number of students is small enough that the graduation rate can fluctuate unpredictably.

In terms of the 13-credit minimum, Professor Kuhi asked, what evidence is there from other institutions that have made the change that there was any impact on behavior? The University of Texas engineering college adopted a minimum credit rule and significantly increased their graduation rates, Dr. Swan said. UCLA and Berkeley have similar rules, and while they get better students, their graduation rates are much better. Professor Kuhi said that adoption of that rule at Berkeley led to about a .2 average credit improvement after the change; the key was advising, so advisors did not tell students to take only 12 credits. The simplest way to get that message across is with a 13-credit rule, Dr. Swan suggested.

Has thought been given to the increased work for undergraduate deans offices that will need to hear requests for exemptions from the 13-credit rule, Professor Erdman asked? The dean and associate dean of the largest undergraduate college are prepared to bear the burden, Dr. Swan said.

Professor Speaks said he agreed with the need for more and better data, but this is a very complex issue. That student credit loads may have only increased on average by .2 credits is not sufficient information. The question is what was the effect over four years? And to ask for a comparison institution is asking an impossible question: what university adopted a 13-credit rule, with what impact, and did nothing else at the same time? When other factors come into play (other policy changes, etc.), it would be impossible to attribute any outcome to a 13-credit rule. Part of this decision might be data-driven; part of it, however, must be logic- and value-driven. The discount tuition program has not achieved the goals intended, through no fault of Dr. Zetterberg and others who developed it: it was not as well-publicized and well-known as it might have been (e.g., to Admissions and to Financial Aid staff).

It is time to get off dead-center and decide what to do, Professor Feeney said, noting that he does not deal with undergraduates so has no vested interest in the outcome. It seems to him that all of the

policy and practice options Dr. Swan has outlined have the potential to have an effect. Some of the student comments have also informed these committees how the system can be gamed; they could talk more if they have data but should not wait, he said. He moved that the Committee endorse the Finance and Planning statement on tuition and graduation rates.

Dr. Skaggs commented that the fall-off in credit loads is not in the sophomore-to-junior year, it is in the senior year, when there is a tremendous decrease in the average credit load. That phenomenon goes to the point that many students are working a lot more and it becomes more difficult for them to get that one last course they may need.

To adopt the change now also buys the University some time, Dr. Swan noted, because freshmen and sophomores already take over 14 credits per term--so the impact would not come into play for another year or two, as those students advance.

CLA expects it would have to deal with about 600 requests for exceptions, Dr. Skaggs reported. He also said that one crucial reason to act quickly on a policy is that if tuition banding is adopted in concert with a 13-credit rule (as the Committee on Finance and Planning has recommended), THAT could affect the behaviors of juniors and seniors. It is possible the colleges could have a problem as a result--if a large number of upper division students suddenly begin taking more credits than they have in the past.

The Faculty Assembly Steering Committee (that is, the Twin Cities members of the Faculty Consultative Committee) voted unanimously in favor of the statement that had been adopted by the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning:

The Senate Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP) has read and discussed the document, *Improving our Graduation Rates: The Report of the Graduation and Retention Subcommittee of the Council of Undergraduate Deans* (August 13, 2001). The Committee concludes that the University must establish and communicate an explicit expectation that, upon admission, most students will be full-time students and will be expected to graduate within four-to-five years of matriculation. In reaching that conclusion, the SCFP strongly endorses the comments and recommendations prepared by the Council of Undergraduate Deans and sent to the President and Provost on January 22, 2002. In addition, the SCFP offers the following additional recommendations for undergraduate students in all colleges of the Twin Cities campus.

- A policy that mandates a minimum average credit load of 13 credits per semester should be accompanied with a financial incentive in the form of a tuition structure that will support the University's objective.
- After review of three tuition-banding options (13 credits and above; 13-17 credits; and 12 credits and above) and a new tuition-discount option (75% discount for more than 12 credits) expresses its strong preference for the *13 credits and above band option*.
- A 13 credits and above band model, with no upper limit, is projected to cost the University \$3.7 million dollars in lost tuition revenue. Rather than accept that cost as an investment to improve undergraduate graduation rates, the Committee believes that the per-credit tuition charge for students who register for fewer than 13 credits should be adjusted upward to offset the projected cost of the 13-credit band model.¹

- The Committee further concludes that the 13 credits and above band model should become effective fall 2002 for all undergraduate students—entering freshmen, entering transfer students, and returning students.

1. The estimated per-credit increase in cost, in 2001-02 tuition rates, is \$5.36 (2.9%).

Adopted unanimously by the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning February 12, 2002.
Endorsed unanimously by the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy February 20, 2002.

3. Removal of Committee Chairs and Committee Members

Professor Massey distributed copies of a proposed change in Senate bylaws that would allow committee chairs and committee members to be removed from their position. The proposal is not prompted by any situation that now exists; the idea has been floating around for some time and has finally been prepared as a proposal. Committee members deliberated for a short while about where the locus of responsibility for making the decision should be; it was agreed that Professors Feeney and Martin would look over the proposal and then refer it to the Committee on Committees for review.

4. Discussion with President Yudof

Professor Massey next welcomed President Yudof to the meeting. The hour-long discussion touched upon a number of topics:

- the state budget situation, the University budget and how to deal with potential cuts, and the need for more extensive consultation on faculty salary increases (the President said he saw a major faculty role in establishing the guidelines on raises); the need to be sure that colleges follow budget directions
- internal taxes and support for common goods
- balances
- hiring freezes or salary freezes (the President said he did not foresee either one happening)
- the process of consultation on athletic issues
- the grievance policy
- research secrecy issues (there are broader issues on the horizon; there is need for a joint subcommittee of FCC and the Senate Research Committee to work with Vice President Maziar); it was agreed that there should be consideration of the procedural language of the Regents' policy and that Vice President Maziar should be invited to FCC to discuss the issues
- the stadium and the University's position on it
- the process for the review of Regents' policies

- the Extension Service
- the search for the University Services vice president

Professor Massey thanked the President for coming to the meeting and adjourned it at 3:10.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota