Minutes[*]

Senate Committee on Finance and Planning
Tuesday, January 31, 2012
2:00 – 4:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Russell Luepker (chair), Martin Caride, Sarah Chambers, Catherine Fitch, Lincoln Kallsen, Kara Kersteter, Cody Mikl, Kathleen O'Brien, Richard Pfutzenreuter, Terry Roe, Michael Rollefson, Ann Sather, Karen Seashore, Arturo Schultz, S. Charles Schulz, Aks Zaheer

Absent: Brittany Bergemann, Will Durfee, Susan Hupp, Ruth Lane, Fred Morrison, Gwen Rudney, Thomas Stinson, Michael Volna

Guests: Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education Henning Schroeder; Associate Vice President Frances Lawrenz (Office of the Vice President for Research); Michael Denny (Capital Planning and Project Management), Vice Provost Robert McMaster

Other: Suzanne Smith (Assistant Vice President, Capital Planning and Project Management), Monique MacKensie (Director of Capital Planning)

[In these minutes: (1) Graduate School model for funds distribution; (2) postdoc vacation payout policy; (3) draft six-year capital plan; (4) update on Northrop Auditorium]

1. Graduate School Model for Funds Distribution

Professor Luepker convened the meeting at 2:00, welcomed Vice Provost Schroeder, and explained that the Committee is interested in learning about the model for distributing funds.

Dean Schroeder said that the model is new and evolving each year. He began by noting language from a November 23, 2011 memo that went to the deans and appropriate vice chancellors:

> On April 28, 2011, a memo was sent to you outlining the key changes in graduate student funding mechanisms effective in fiscal year 2013. In the memo, we mentioned the $4.5 million "Quality Metrics Pool" that will be allocated "based on a transparent set of quality metrics." Between January and October of this year, the Quality Metrics Allocation Plan was discussed and refined through numerous consultations with various groups including you, your associate dean, faculty, and graduate students. For fiscal year 2013, the list of metrics includes: 1) time to degree, 2) completion rates, 3) the Bostrom efficiency index and, 4) placement information collected from the annual program profiles. In late August, we asked for a more detailed placement record of your graduates, as well as for narratives that would help place all of the collated data in context.

As with any reform, to a certain extent they proceed by trial and error, Dr. Schroeder commented. They have found through feedback that when the Graduate School was reorganized, some things were decentralized that should not have been, such as support for intercollegiate programs. He then drew

---

[*] 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.

attention to language in the memo about the quality metrics allocation plan for 2012-13:

- Allocations from the pool will go to the collegiate deans with the exception of a small group of intercollegiate, interdisciplinary programs that will receive direct allocations from the Graduate School.
- Money allocated from this pool must be used for direct support of graduate students.
- The Quality Metrics Pool was divided into three sub pools: i) allocations for stand-alone master's programs (M.A., M.S., and M.F.A. degrees only); ii) allocations for Ph.D. programs; iii) transition grants.
- The transition grant is used to help minimize any allocation reduction of more than 15% compared to the FY10 and FY11 Block Grants allocation. As the Quality Metrics Allocation Plan is being refined over the coming years, it is envisioned that the transition grant funds will be reduced and more money will be allocated via the quality metrics pool.
- Time to degree, completion rates, the Bostrom efficiency index, placement data, and the narratives and placement details provided by the programs/colleges were all taken into consideration.
- For many programs, the narrative information provided by the programs/colleges played a crucial role in determining the program's placement in the funding category. The narratives helped place the data in a meaningful context as well as highlighting other important facets of the graduate program.
- It is important to note that ***<u>data trends over time and not absolute values</u>*** were primarily used for evaluation.
- For Ph.D. programs that also offer an M.A. or M.S. degree, data from the Ph.D. component were weighed more heavily than data from the master's component.
- Master's-only programs were categorized as either "Y" (appears to be on the right track with no major concerns) or "N" (not enough data to make a determination at this time or with noted concern[s]).
- Each master's-only program in the "Y" category results in $15,385 of allocation credit for its home college, independent of the size of the program; each master's-only program in the "N" category results in zero allocation credit for its home college.
- The Ph.D. programs were placed in one of three categories:
    1. program appears to be going in the right direction with no major concerns;
    2. some concerns are noted;
    3. program's status is unclear—e.g., too few data to make a judgment at this time (10 or fewer degrees awarded in the last 10 years), new program with little or no data; or, the program has major concerns.
- Each Ph.D. program in category 1 results in twice as much allocation credit ($40,366) as category 2 ($20,182) for its home college, independent of the size of the program, while each program in category 3 results in zero allocation credit for its home college.

At the general level, the Graduate School used to fund first-year fellowships, Dean Schroder said, and there was a separate pool of funds for block grants—and the funds from both went directly to graduate programs. The $3.5 million in first-year fellowships are no longer in the Graduate School cost pool; the money has been left in the colleges. They are allowed to keep funds based on a five-year average of the fellowship funds they had, so that colleges receive the same amount that they did before.

Professor Roe asked what it meant to say that the $3.5 million is no longer part of the cost pool. The dollars stay in the colleges and will not be assessed for the cost pool, Dr. Schroeder said. They used to be collected and then returned as fellowships. As a result of the change, the Graduate School cost pool decreased by 18%. They will monitor the colleges to see that the money is used for direct graduate student support; the money was returned to the colleges in order that they would have more flexibility in providing student support; programs know what the best students look like and how to create packages to attract them. All the feedback they have received indicates a very positive response to increased flexibility at the local level to assemble packages to recruit the best students. The one disadvantage is that in a small college, there might be only a few fellowships, so they cannot (for example) offer 30% more fellowships than they expect to be accepted because they cannot risk being committed to more than they have funding for.

Mr. Mikl said he appreciated the flexibility for units to put together offers when they need to (not constricted by a Graduate School process) and come up with their own amounts based on the strength of the applicant pool during that particular search cycle. But it would be bad for graduate students if, somewhere down the line, when colleges are presented with financial difficulties, they somehow kept some of this money and stopped supporting the first-year fellowships as much as they had.

Dean Schroeder said he had been in discussion earlier today about a plan to help small colleges take a risk and offer more fellowships than they have funding for; there may be a central mechanism to allow colleges to take more risk. The Graduate Education Council has discussed the idea of creating a central account or back-up mechanism to help small units.

Mr. Rollefson recalled that when the Graduate School held the fellowship funding centrally, they were never retrenchable. Deans could do what they wish with the funds in tight economic times. Dean Schroeder said the funds are not to be retrenchable and the ways they can be used for graduate student support are defined. Professor Luepker said that if he were a dean, facing budget problems, and received more money because of a decline in cost-pool charges, he would think the funds would be subject to being cut because there is no longer a distinct pool of dollars for fellowships any more. The budget instructions can read as the president and provost decide, Mr. Kallsen commented, and they could identify an amount of money for graduate-student aid and direct the colleges not to spend less than the amount identified. There is general protection for the funds as well as in the budget instructions.

Moreover, Dean Schroeder added, the deans will be accountable for the number of fellowships their college offers. He agreed that the funds need to be watched carefully. He also noted that the funding for doctoral-dissertation fellowships has been increased by $2 million per year for three years; if one compares Minnesota to its peers, one would find many institutions investing in graduate education. In order to stay competitive, increases in the investment in the front end of graduate students' careers will also be necessary.

Professor Luepker returned to the topic of the quality metrics plan. Dean Schroeder said that $4.5 million used to be block grants that were allocated this year on the basis of quality metrics (as outlined in the bulleted points reproduced earlier from the 11/23/11 memo). The lump sums were provided to the deans based on how programs were reviewed by the metrics review team. [The members of the metrics review team were Associate Deans Alex Rothman (CLA), Wayne Gladfelter (CSE), and Ken Bartlett (CEHD), Vice Dean Tucker LeBien (Medical School), Regents Professor John Sullivan (chair, enrollment management subcommittee on graduate education), and Dr. Peter Radcliffe (Executive Director, Office of

Planning and Analysis).] The metrics used were discipline-independent that measure efficiency and quality.

Professor Zaheer asked how they evaluate where students go. The Graduate School has data through the annual program profile until 2009 on where students were placed, Dean Schroeder said. They did not just celebrate academic placement; they also counted business, government, and the non-profit sector as long as the positions had some relationship to the Ph.D. program the student pursued. More information on placement was provided through the narratives that the programs submitted. Professor Zaheer said that the research quality of the universities where Ph.D. students were placed would be an important criterion for evaluating the success of a Ph.D. program. Dean Schroeder said that they gathered data on time to degree, placement, etc., and gave them to the colleges for review and so that they could add narratives (there was no template for the narratives; CLA provided over100 pages, CSE provided about 10 pages, and both were excellent). He reaffirmed his view that the process should be data-informed, not data-obsessed.

Everyone should be aware of this bullet from the memo, Dr. Schroeder emphasized: It is important to note that ***data trends over time and not absolute values*** were primarily used for evaluation. Time-to-degree varies by discipline and they did not look at absolute values, so no one suggests "punishing" the humanities because its students take longer than those in the sciences. They looked at data over time, so a change in time to degree from five to seven years was worse than a change from ten to eight years. Each program is its own control. If there were ten or fewer graduates in a program over the period, then there is need for discussion.

The quality-metric pool was $4.5 million, Dean Schroeder related; because they recognize that the metrics applied this year are not the sole determinant of quality, only $2.6 million of the pool was distributed on the basis of the quality metrics; the remaining $1.9 million was used as transition grants to make sure that no college received a reduction of more than 15% from its previous allocation. This provides predictability for the colleges. In the case of the previous block grants, more money went into programs with more students. The metric they are now using does not take into account student numbers.

As the last bullet in the list indicates, Ph.D. programs rated in category 1 produce an allocation of about $40,000, those in category 2 about $20,000, and those in category 3 $0. Size was not a metric because they believe that quality is independent of size (down to a certain level), Dr. Schroeder said. Because there was no scale metric, and FY09 and FY10 allocations were based on size, they needed to use the $1.9 million as a buffer against drastic changes in allocations.

Professor Chambers asked (1) how they identified the $40,000, $20,000, and $0 amounts, and (2) will they try to develop an algorithm that accounts for program size. Dean Schroeder noted that only Ph.D., M.A., M.S., and M.F.A. programs were reviewed by the standards of the quality metrics, but block grants went to additional programs in the past (e.g., professional master's programs), so they had to take into account colleges that would receive a large drop in allocation because of the programs covered, and they also determined that M.A./M.S. programs could not generate more credits in the algorithm h Ph.D. programs. They ran different scenarios to see how the numbers played out and this seemed the most reasonable way to proceed. They tried to look at scale—there is an enormous range in program size, from over 300 students to less than 20—so they used the 15% rule to recognize size.

Ms. Fitch asked what happens with a college such as the Humphrey Institute, which has one master's program. This cycle was all transition, Dean Schroeder said; going forward, they will talk with

Provost Hanson about how to develop the measures further, in collaboration with the programs. The new provost will have a significant say in this. The transition grants should shrink over time and some of the funds should be used to include professional master's programs if metrics for them can be developed.

Professor Seashore said she applauded the effort to develop metrics; there always has to be a first stab at the process. With respect to actual outcomes, transition funds are always the first to go away, so the biological and physical sciences will be the beneficiaries and the social sciences and liberal arts will be the losers. Sometimes one can use the right metrics and get the wrong answer. Have they received any responses to the use of the quality metrics that suggest they should think more about the process?

Dean Schroeder said he did not believe the social sciences and humanities would be losers in the long run in funding for graduate student fellowships. There was a sense among some that leaving the money in the colleges—the money that they would have paid into the cost pool—would have created sets of winners and losers (for example, the sciences have subsidized fellowships in the humanities, something that happens at every university because the humanities have little access to external funds, and that subsidy is acceptable as long as the institution has excellent humanities programs). That is why they used the five-year average of fellowships received.

Professor Seashore said she honored the efforts to create a better process but the outcome will be looked at by some as evidence of further privileging the sciences because of their ability to obtain external funding.

Professor Roe said he also applauded the idea of identifying metrics, which exposes the decision process to greater transparency, something that is very desirable. But on the question of using some indirect cost resources to subsidize activities in, e.g., CLA, is a two way street because there is actually a cross-subsidization. This occurs because the actual indirect costs of projects in the liberal arts, for example, are far below the "official" indirect cost rate the University is required to charge projects, while the actual indirect cost rate in units needing laboratory equipment and other more expensive facilities is far above the "official" ICR rate. The fact that the "official" indirect cost rate is above the actual indirect cost rate in liberal arts means that a liberal arts project generating indirect costs at the "official" rate is subsidizing units needing expensive facilities. Dean Schroeder agreed that there is subsidization to the sciences because of overhead costs.

Professor Chambers commented that she is from CLA and was surprised to see the drop in funding allocation, but noted that only four colleges saw an increase because of quality measures—while twelve saw a decrease. It appears that scale is an issue; small programs went up a great deal while large colleges doing work in the sciences went down.

Dean Schroeder agreed that colleges that had traditionally received little graduate fellowship funding from the Graduate School went up because they had not been in the system before. The large increases are relative, not absolute. It is important to note that the research and scholarly work that graduate students are pursuing is about originality and, innovation, and thus the ability to take risks. All of these attributes cannot be expressed in numbers. This why the qualitative aspect of program evaluation (based on the narratives that were requested) is equally important.

Professor Luepker thanked Dean Schroeder for his report.

2. Postdoc Vacation Payout Policy

Professor Luepker now welcomed Associate Vice President Lawrenz to the meeting and noted that the Committee had received a request to take up an issue from Professor Cramer, chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee:

> Under University policy (see http://policy.umn.edu/Policies/hr/Hiring/POSTDOCAPPOINT.html/ and, subordinately, http://policy.umn.edu/Policies/hr/Leaves/ACADEMICVACATION.html/) postdocs are allowed 22 days of vacation per year. While that is humane, the part of the policy that seems problematic is that if the vacation is not used (or not REPORTED to have been used), then they receive a lump sum payout upon termination of any unused time up to a maximum of 22 days. That lump sum comes from Central, and is recovered as part of the fringe rate on postdocs.
>
> So, the problem is that if you go to a large department with a lot of postdocs (say, Chemistry) and with UM Reports look to see how many accrued vacation days they have, then one sees that a huge number have the maximum. This massive payout of cash is costly! One might argue that this is more a reporting problem than it is a policy problem.
>
> But, many other comparable schools to Minnesota also permit postdocs to have vacation time, but their policy is, use it or lose it (e.g., Michigan, Iowa, Illinois -- Ohio State does not permit vacation, although no doubt in practice humane advisors approve some time away; Wisconsin leaves vacation up to PIs, but there is no accrual and pay-out).
>
> Naturally, what matters is our total compensation when it comes to attracting postdocs, but my guess is that our postdoctoral salaries are no different than those at the other big 10 schools mentioned above -- what's different is the 10% of salary boost that we provide with the vacation payout... That fringe comes out of departmental and PI hides.
>
> Please consider this an encouragement from me to take a look at this issue.

Dr. Lawrenz began by commenting that there is a postdoc association and that she is not in charge of postdocs; they are self-managed and the organization is free to do what it wishes. The Office of the Vice President for Research provides the association a small amount of money to run its own affairs ($10,000 to run programs for postdocs).

Professor Luepker said that his college has a number of NIH postdoc training programs. Before Professor Cramer brought up this issue, they had never faced it: If a postdoc takes no vacation and come to the end of the appointment, and says they need a month's payout, training grants will not pay for it. What options are there? Can a unit force postdocs to take vacation?

They can strongly suggest it, Dr. Lawrenz said. There are three categories of people who do postdoc-type work: Postdoc associates, postdoc fellows, and research associates. Of the three categories, only two are true postdocs and only one has 22 days of vacation (the postdoc associates). Postdoc fellows do not receive vacation. Research Associates are P&A and receive the benefits associated with that status. For the postdocs who receive vacation, the fringe-benefit pool pays for their vacation.

Committee members had a discussion about how accrued vacation benefits are paid and agreed that they needed additional information.

Dr. Lawrenz said that the policy is that postdocs receive 22 days of vacation per year; it is up them and their supervisor whether they use it. It is personal; some departments track it and some PIs do not LET a postdoc take vacation. There is not consistent reporting. There could be various ways to deal with the question but, in her view, the postdocs deserve the vacation time. If the policy is "use it or lose it," the University needs to tell PIs directly that they must give the vacation time (because postdocs are not really in a position to tell a PI that they are entitled to a vacation). This may be an educational issue, not one that requires a separate University policy, she said, so that everyone knows who is to receive vacation time. Not everyone does and it is not obvious who does and does not, although this is reasonably clear on the University's policy website.

The real problem is that the vacation is not budgeted for, Professor Chambers said; if it were built into budgets, departments could deal with it. Professor Luepker agreed and observed that if a postdoc is hired on a grant for a year or two, and accumulates vacation, the grant won't pay for the vacation. (There was disagreement about whether it could be paid if it is regular University benefit.)

Mr. Kallsen suggested the Committee gather some facts; Dr. Lawrenz agreed. She also noted that there could be differences between NIH training grants and R01 grants. Professor Luepker also agreed and said the Committee could, with more information, discuss this with Human Resources. He thanked Dr. Lawrenz for joining the meeting.

3. Draft Six-Year Capital Plan

Vice Presidents O'Brien and Pfutzenreuter presented the draft six-year capital plan (principles and process).

Vice President O'Brien began by introducing two new colleagues who have replaced long-time University staff involved in capital planning, Suzanne Smith, Assistant Vice President for Capital Planning and Project Management, and Monique MacKensie, Director of Capital Planning. She then noted that the Board of Regents directs the administration to develop a six-year capital budget that is to be updated annually. It consists of the capital improvement budget (year 1, 2012) and the capital plan (years 2-6, 2013-18). Several elements shape the plan: Academic and support-unit planning (compacts), facility condition assessment, campus master plan, and debt capacity and financial analysis.

While many may see the capital plan as a "black box," what defines the six-year capital plan is relatively clear, Vice President O'Brien said. Established priorities emerge from the compact process (from the deans and faculty, what they need to get their jobs done); strategic priorities advance from decision-making by the deans, chancellors, and vice presidents (a comprehensive University view leads to perhaps two dozen highly-ranked projects; projects demonstrating programmatic urgency and development readiness will rise to the top. This is largely consensus decision-making but this is the President's recommendation to the Board of Regents.

The academic criteria are derived from the annual budget and compact process run by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and the Senior Vice President for System Academic Administration. Vice President O'Brien observed that the criteria have been used by the University for 30 years or more: centrality to mission; quality, productivity, and impact; uniqueness and comparative advantage; enhancement of academic synergies; demand and availability of resources; efficiency and effectiveness; and development and leveraging of resources.

The capital-planning principles are these: Ensure student success; ensure faculty research productivity and scholarly impact; fulfill the statewide mission; protect public assets and investment; and responsibly manage the University's finances.

The key findings for this six-year capital plan were as follows, Vice President O'Brien said: There is a pressing need for updated laboratory space (the last two capital requests included funding for lab space but they only addressed a small portion of the need); all campuses and colleges identified a need for interactive classrooms for engaged learning (some questioned the classrooms built in the Science Teaching and Student Services facility, but now most campuses and colleges want access to them); increasing collaboration among colleges to plan together and share facilities; and growing interest in space utilization initiatives to consolidate space and save money (including the demolition or decommissioning of facilities).

The recommended six-year capital plan, the total envisioned investment, totals $1.32 billion. Of that, 75% would come from the state, 18% from University funds, and 7% from self-funded projects. The last could include residence halls, parking facilities, etc. The plan is predicated on major requests to the state in even-numbered years (the normal capital appropriations years) and smaller requests in odd-numbered years (which are usually devoted to operating budgets but which can also include small capital appropriations). Vice President O'Brien indicated the size of the projected capital requests through 2018 and discussed with the Committee how much the University typically receives from the state. One trend they have seen is that the size of projects is getting bigger, so there are not a large number of projects in the requests in 2014, 2016, and 2018 (the smaller requests in odd-numbered years are primarily for HEAPR funding, for renovation and renewal). The areas of focus will be on research excellence, student success, asset renewal, and space utilization.

Vice President O'Brien said the details will be available in the full report to the Regents, to be released within the next few days. She identified a few of the facilities that would be included in each of the areas of focus. Research excellence: Tate Laboratory (Physics), St. Paul research labs, Psychology and Child Development. Student Success: Briggs Student Center (Morris); wellness/recreational sports facility (Crookston); active learning classrooms (systemwide); libraries/education centers. Asset Renewal: Pillsbury Hall; AHC released space repurposing; HEAPR funds. Space Utilization: renovate Eddy Hall, demolish Williamson; decommission Fraser. The last focus also includes introducing alternative workplace strategies in the development of new buildings (e.g., how offices and common spaces are used).

Vice President O'Brien reviewed projects under consideration and looked at the evolution of capital planning (set out in the 2008 capital plan), moving from project-based and linked to department goals to (with this plan) academic neighborhoods and alignment, based on interdisciplinarity and collaboratively-controlled spaces with institutional strategic goals in mind.

Vice President O'Brien briefly reviewed the next steps. Action on the six-year capital plan is expected by the Regents in March, 2012.

Professor Luepker thanked Vice Presidents O'Brien and Pfutzenreuter for the information.

4. Update on Northrop Auditorium

Professor Luepker next welcomed Mr. Denny to provide a report on the Northrop Auditorium project. Mr. Denny, the project leader, distributed copies of slides and walked the Committee through them. Vice President O'Brien reported that the project has been a partnership between the academic and services sides of the University, a project that began with the involvement of then-Dean Steven Rosenstone. When Dr. Rosenstone left the University, President Bruininks recruited Professor Judith Martin to lead the project on the academic side; with her untimely death, Vice Provost McMaster is now co-leading the project. Ms. O'Brien said that "Northrop is being reconfigured to create a vital academic center of distinction and discovery that enlightens, challenges, and engages students, faculty, and the broader community."

[Note: The slides presented were visual depictions of Northrop plans, interiors, visualizations of the completed facility, and so on, and will not be, cannot be, summarized in these minutes.] A few of the major points that Mr. Denny made in the course of his presentation were these.

-- They discovered that a large number of changes had been made in the course of construction in 1924, so the drawings were not always accurate.

-- In the old auditorium, about 80% of the seats were outside the best acoustical range for events; now about 83% will be within the range.

-- The building either needed to be boarded up or renovated; it is the second-most iconic building in the state (after the State Capitol); the University spent about $15 million in 2006 to protect the building envelope.

-- The building is being taken apart piece by piece; Northrop was selected as one of the six finalists for the 2011 World Demolition Awards ceremony in Amsterdam. They are essentially building a building within a building.

-- When the existing auditorium was taken out, it was necessary to brace (and constantly monitor) the walls to be sure they did not collapse.

-- The new Northrop will have three programs that will make it a busy place during the day (University Honors Program, 6000 s.f.; Institute for Advanced Study, 5,300 s.f.; and Innovation by Design, 1,000 s.f.). It will also have Concerts and Lectures, collaborative/study space (13,250 s.f.), café and dining, a shared lecture/recital hall, 3 seminar rooms, 2 classrooms, and 3 other shared/multi-purpose spaces. In terms of the auditorium itself, the seating capacity will be 2,725 (4,765 before), the acoustics will be world-class (dreadful before), the sightlines will be excellent (bad before), amenities will be industry standard (none before), and technology will be cutting-edge (obsolete before). They did an international search for acoustics and design consultants; one of the leading architects in the world for these kinds of facilities happens to be local (HGA) while the acoustics firm is an international firm (ARUP). They have tested and modeled just about everything possible in the new auditorium, including sound and seating. The acoustics will be very close to those of the Concertgebouw in Amsterdam.

-- Study space on the East Bank will increase by about 55% when the project is completed.

-- The historic urns and loggia will be in the hallway outside the new auditorium.

-- In the course of deconstruction, WPA murals were discovered. They could not be saved but they are being reproduced, exactly, with funds provided by the late Professor Martin. The murals will provide an opportunity to recognize Professor Martin's contribution to the project and the institution.

They are building a new building in an old building; is the old building robust enough for the new building, Professor Roe asked? It is, Mr. Denny said. They did many steel samples, for example; the interior is completely robust and is being brought up to code (including the footings). It is a very stout building that will last another 100 years or more.

That will depend on the shell, Professor Shultz pointed out; was it repaired to proper standards? Mr. Denny said that tuckpointing is a technical process, and in this case the University sent the company to school to learn how to do it specifically for Northrop, and the University tested and matched the grouting needed.

Professor Luepker recalled that two years ago the University was still engaged in fund-raising to support the project. Is that still a problem? When the University approved the building, it planned on $10 million from fund-raising and $20 million from HEAPR, Vice President O'Brien said. She assured the Committee that in February, 2011, when the Regents approved the Northrop renovation, the funding plan was in place.

Professor Luepker thanked Mr. Denny and Vice President O'Brien and adjourned the meeting at 4:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota