Minutes[*]

Senate Committee on Finance and Planning
Tuesday, August 19, 2003
2:15 - 4:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Charles Campbell (chair), Calvin Alexander, Brittny McCarthy Barnes, Stanley Bonnema, David M. Brown, David Chapman, Dan Feeney, Michael Frankosky, Gary Jahn, Thomas Klein, Joseph Konstan, Michael Korth, Kathleen O'Brien, Richard Pfutzenreuter, Charles Speaks, Sue Van Voorhis, Warren Warwick, Susan Carlson Weinberg, Michael Volna

Absent: Thomas Stinson, Terry Roe

Guests: Al Sullivan (Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost); Wendy Pradt Lougee (University Librarian), Janis Jaguszewski, Charles Spetland (University Libraries); Associate Vice President Steve Cawley (Office of Information Technology)

[In these minutes: (2) capital projects/capital request; (3) library acquisition funding; (4) new financial system (PeopleSoft vs. Oracle)]

1. Welcome and Introductions

Professor Campbell convened the meeting at 2:05 and called for a round of introductions.

2. Report from the Capital Projects Subcommittee

Professor Campbell turned to Professor Brown for a report from the Capital Projects Subcommittee. Professor Brown began by noting that capital projects have usually been thought of as new buildings but now also includes HEAPR funding (Higher Education Asset Preservation and Renewal). HEAPR funds are intended to preserve existing facilities by repair or replacement of things like electrical systems, windows and roofs, air quality systems, etc. If funds for capital construction are not designated by the state as HEAPR funds, the University must contribute one-third of the costs; the University, in turn, now requires that units provide one-half of the one-third, or one-sixth of the project cost. The administration has decided to emphasize HEAPR funding over new buildings in the University's capital request.

The University's proposed capital request for 2004 totals $159.9 million, of which the University would be required to contribute $23 million. HEAPR funds, the majority of the request, are a "bottom line" amount and not identified facility by facility, presumably because the expenditure of these funds is a less political process than is new construction. The University also worries that identifying HEAPR funds on a building-by-building basis invites politicization of the process.

[*] 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 represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

The schedule for the request, Professor Campbell noted, is that it was presented to the Board of Regents in July as a preliminary request and will be brought back in September and October as a final request.

Professor Brown said that he had asked that Committee members receive information before this meeting; it was not sent, so he could not review the items of the request.

Professor Konstan asked if the University is in the process of setting priorities for the HEAPR funding, even if it has not identified them in its request. Professor Brown said he did not believe so. This is a very small capital request, he pointed out, and priorities do not need to be set further. Vice President O'Brien had reported that there will be a meeting about the request with the (state) Finance Commissioner in the near future; it may be, Professor Brown said, that that meeting will determine if the University must identify priorities in its request.

The directions from the Finance Commissioner for the bonding bill indicated that the administration is less interested in creating more space and is more interesting in retaining the space that already exists, Vice President O'Brien explained. That led the University to be more responsive to the administration. With 24 million square feet of space, she said, if the University receives this and future HEAPR requests, the funds can be used to make space more usable.

Many of the items identified for HEAPR funding, Professor Brown said, have been identified earlier; the list of projects is not off the cuff. Vice President O'Brien added that they come from academic priorities and facility conditions.

Professor Brown then drew the attention of Committee members to a resolution adopted by the Subcommittee in June. The resolution provided: "Capital improvements which include centrally-scheduled classrooms should NOT be the financial responsibility of the academic unit which houses the facility and should be exempt from the 1/6 cost-sharing principle which applies to other capital improvements that are not designated for HEAPR" [emphasis in original].

Committee members debated the resolution at some length. One concern was that if the resolution became policy, it would encourage units to include centrally-scheduled classrooms in facilities in order to avoid paying part of the 1/6 cost and could lead to a flood of requests to be on the capital projects list because classrooms are "free." Another concern was that the resolution did not specify that only the costs of the classroom were to be exempt from the 1/6 cost, not the entire facility. Another concern was that it is not always clear what a "centrally-scheduled" classroom is; Ms. VanVoorhis pointed out that there are partnerships between colleges and central scheduling so that a college receives first priority in a centrally-scheduled classroom. It would be odd, she said, if a college has first priority in a classroom but has no financial responsibility for its construction.

Vice President O'Brien commented that before the Brenner report in 1994, there were a lot of ad hoc decisions about facility maintenance. The report provides guidance on supported and non-supported space and might help this discussion; in any event, she said, the University should avoid returning to a system of ad hoc decision-making.

Ms. McCarthy Barnes asked what the financial implications of the resolution were. Professor Brown said that would depend on the size of the building and the number of classrooms in it. The financial implications could range from the tens of thousands of dollars to the millions.

What problem is the resolution intended to remedy, Mr. Klein asked? That there is no mechanism to separate the costs of centrally-scheduled classrooms from the 1/6 matching requirement imposed on academic units, Professor Brown explained. Such classrooms meet academic needs beyond the unit making the request for the facility. If Mechanical Engineering does a major renovation that includes a centrally-scheduled classroom, the department should not be responsible for the cost of the classroom, Professor Speaks amplified.

Professor Campbell observed that there are priorities for classrooms in buildings and that classroom technology upgrades are not charged to departments; classrooms are treated as a common good. There is the general issue that classrooms are for students and students come from everywhere.

The Committee voted on one proposed amendment to the resolution, which failed. It then approved the resolution, with another amendment, 5-4. The final resolution read as follows: "Capital improvements applicable to centrally-scheduled classrooms should NOT be the financial responsibility of the academic unit which houses the facility and should be exempt from the 1/6 cost-sharing principle which applies to other capital improvements that are not designated for HEAPR." Professor Brown said that Mr. Pfutzenreuter and other central officers had been present at the Subcommittee discussion of the resolution and did not oppose it. Professor Campbell said that it was his sense of the discussion that there was broader support for the principle than the vote indicated but he did not have specific wording to propose.

It was agreed that Professor Campbell would bring the resolution to the Faculty Consultative Committee for disposition.

3. Library Acquisition Funding

Professor Campbell next welcomed Professor Lougee and her colleagues, Ms. Janice Jaguszewski and Mr. Charles Spetland, from the University Libraries.

Professor Lougee distributed copies of a set of slides dealing with library collections and reviewed them with the Committee. Some of the salient points were these:

-- While the majority (83%) of the Libraries funding in 2002-03 was from state funds, there has been a recent shift in support. About one-half of the state funds have been swapped for University fees, resulting in 33.7% from state funds and 48.7 % from fees in 2003-04. In addition the Vice President for Research has allocated $500,000 from the $38 million in royalty income toward library collections for several years.

-- In terms of measures of institutional support, Minnesota is below the mean of the CIC schools when the percentage of the institutional budget going to the libraries is considered or when actual expenditures are compared. Between 1998-2002, library spending at Michigan increased by 25% over this period; Penn State and Illinois by 24%, Wisconsin by 15%, and Minnesota by 14%.

-- The libraries' collections comprise both traditional (over 6 million books, 38,000 current journals, maps, manuscripts, etc.) and digital (270 databases, 16,000 e-journals, and growing e-book resources) The University ranks 17th in the nation among research libraries in its traditional holdings, but holdings generally are becoming increasingly digital.

-- Of those elements that make up the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI), beginning in the late 1990s it is library material costs that have seen the greatest increases. They have averaged 8-9% annual inflation in the last few years; this year journal inflation rose to 12% (which was both unexpected and unwelcome). The cumulative effect of these pressures is reduced purchases of both monographs and journals.

At Minnesota, inflation and modest budget increases have resulted in an ongoing reallocation process and significant journal cancellations. University receipts of journals have been diminished by 8,000 titles since 1995--and the majority of these lost titles are due to cancellations.

-- Electronic publishing presents entirely new models for the library. These resources may be dynamic or interactive. A significant change is felt in the manner of acquisition. Electronic content is licensed through contractual agreement specifying how it can be used. Electronic licenses for journals tend to run 15-20% above and beyond print costs; for reference works they are two to six times greater than print costs. Licenses can restrict users, uses, and ownership.

-- Two examples of commonly-held titles were presented: SCIENCE (print version) costs the library $425 and costs an individual $125; the campus license for SCIENCE (electronic version) costs $10,105 (which includes two of the coordinate campuses). NATURE (print version) costs the libraries $920 and costs an individual $159; the campus license for NATURE (electronic version) costs $6,800 (which includes the three coordinate campuses).

Is it legal for a department to buy one of these subscriptions at the price an individual pays, Professor Campbell asked? Ms. Lougee noted that some smaller libraries have utilized donated copies of individual subscriptions, but the costs of managing these gifts are high. Asked if she had any sense of the number of individual versus institutional subscriptions to SCIENCE or other titles, Ms. Lougee said the libraries do not have ready access to these data. Studies have demonstrated, however, that typically departments purchase approximately 25% of the information content acquired for a campus. As the libraries license electronic content for the campus (at greater cost) departments will benefit in that they can cancel departmental subscriptions.

Professor Konstan asked, apropos the electronic license cost, if it would be affected if the University cut in half, or doubled, the number of users. What if the license were granted to a state system that included MNSCU and all other institutions? Ms. Lougee said the price models for licenses vary depending on the title. Some are based on campus FTE, some are based on the number of simultaneous users allowed. By and large, publishers have executed very few state licenses. Minnesota, through MINITEX (an agency based at the University, funded by HESO) does engage in some licensing of core journal titles for the entire state. The creation of large consortial or state licenses is complex, since publishers can view them as eroding potential revenues from corporate or individual institutional purchases.

Professor Chapman complimented Ms. Lougee on the presentation; he said it describes the situation very well in a few slides. He noted that in the case of a print subscription, if the University suspends a subscription it owns the materials it has received; does it keep what it has received electronically if it suspends a subscription? In the growing majority of cases, electronic licenses convey ownership, although there are still some pricing differentials between leasing access vs. ownership. Even if the library owns the content, however, the costs of actually maintaining the content locally and developing that infrastructure could be prohibitive. Consequently, there is an incentive to keep the licenses active and rely on publishers maintaining and serving the content to users.

Other points from the presentation were these:

-- The University is devoting a smaller proportion of its library acquisition budget to electronic content than many of its peers (i.e., about 20% by Penn State, about 17% by research libraries generally, about 14% by the CIC schools on average, and about 12% by Minnesota).

-- From national surveys that included Minnesota, the libraries are learning that users want more electronic content but they want the print materials retained, they want anytime/anyplace access but also want the physical facilities more functional (e.g., new types of on-site services), and they want more specialized staff support as well as tools for independent inquiry and navigation. (And they want all this for free, Mr. Pfutzenreuter observed.) Undergraduates tend to be heavier users of library facilities than are graduate students or faculty. Graduate students and faculty are heavy users of electronic content.

-- New publishing models include new subscription models, open access journals (typically involving author payments for publication), e-prints, and institutional repositories (services to manage publications of an institution's own faculty). With respect to the last, Professor Campbell said he knows a lot of faculty who put preprints on the web so that people can download them; it is not clear how long that will be allowed. Ms. Lougee said that publishers vary in accepting manuscripts that were previously available on the web or allowing authors to post content on personal websites. Authors need to realize they have some ability (depending on the publisher) to strike publisher clauses in copyright agreement. Some disciplines (e.g., math) have created a network of e-prints through self-posting of manuscripts on personal websites.

Are the libraries in a position to help someone find items that may exist on department repositories or on individual faculty web pages, Professor Konstan asked? The libraries have always provided assistance in finding information and increasingly services are responding to these types of needs. Ms. Jaguszewski commented on the Science and Engineering Libraries participation in online and real-time reference services to assist users regardless of location or time. Her library also has a pilot program to provide librarian office hours onsite within academic departments to aid in research and instructional support.

There is also the "deep web," Professor Campbell commented. Ms. Lougee explained that over half of the content delivered through the Web does not actually "live" in the web and is not retrieved by search engines (this includes the majority of publisher resources). Libraries are actively engaged in development to create more robust retrieval tools to integrate resources of the so-called "deep web."

It would be useful to have a draft copyright release form for authors, Professor Alexander said, or to have guidance on what to look for in such forms. Ms. Lougee said the libraries are interested in

forming a more formal copyright assistance center (and have asked for support for such a service through the compact process). It might also be helpful to keep an archive of what terms are acceptable to different publishers, Professor Konstan suggested; such information would help junior faculty know when not to give up the copyright. The copyright rules often vary considerably between publishers and even within publishers, depending on specific editors.

Professor Campbell reflected that this is the Finance and Planning Committee and that it consults on finance and planning matters; it should hear about tradeoffs in the future, he said. In the compact process, are the libraries treated like a college? While academic in nature, the libraries are different in that they have no tuition revenue, Ms. Lougee replied; nearly all income is from the University. Professor Campbell recommended that Committee members read the longer document prepared for the Regents that Ms. Lougee had provided; it gives a good sense of what happens to the libraries with a flat budget.

Ms. Lougee observed that the libraries needed an additional $900,000 in collection support this year simply to maintain the status quo in collection commitments. It has received the additional $500,000 in royalty income, which will help. There is a process in place to consult with faculty and departments on journal cancellations. Mr. Spetland reported that the planned journal reduction will be about 1200 journals, across all disciplines (a reduction of about $450,000). He said that the libraries would like to be able to do more than simply maintain the status quo; while some journals can be cut because they are no longer useful, at the same time there are new journals and electronic resources that the library would like to add in order to keep up with the work that faculty are doing.

Professor Konstan said that their librarian talks with the faculty about how often items are used and the cost per use. The consensus in their case was to cancel more than the librarian requested and obtain things that they do not now have. Seeing the actual costs led a number of faculty to realize that what they might request would not be worth the cost. Ms. Lougee noted that the libraries also need to engage faculty in a dialogue about trends within disciplines that affect how information is created and shared. This information is critical to future planning.

A cut of $450,000 for journals will affect everyone, Professor Campbell said. It is often hard to describe the impact, Ms. Lougee said. Information use is so amorphous and diffuse that it is difficult to tell the impact of reductions on any one department or field. Have they lost ground in the 2003-04 budget, Professor Alexander asked? The libraries received a cut of $630,000 and have also needed to reallocate an additional $600,000 internally to handle increased operational costs. The recently committed $500,000 in new royalty money will help, but by no means matches inflation.

Is what they are seeing in journal prices an economic crisis in publishing costs or monopolistic behavior by publishers, Professor Feeney inquired? It is not a pure monopoly, Ms. Lougee said, but it does reflect consolidation in the publishing industry, something that the federal government has examined in the past. The problem is an inelastic market; journal prices go up but there are fewer cancellations than might be expected from libraries. Professor Konstan speculated that the process was more corrupt: Publishers pay good money to editors, buy dinners, and so on, and provide benefits that professional societies cannot offer; all publishers have to do is get a few high-profile names in a field to identify with a journal and it will be successful. One can fight this on an individual basis but to be effective an entire discipline must fight. Ms. Lougee commented that several movements have emerged in the last several years. Perhaps most notably, the Public Library of Science launched a petition among scientists to avoid

involvement with some publishers. In the end, few scholars were willing to break ranks with high-prestige journals.

On the question of information literacy (discussed in the Libraries report to the Regents), Professor Konstan said that it is not an appropriate subject for this Committee but argued that the University should require demonstration of such literacy at the undergraduate level. Departments could provide instruction; so could the libraries. Is there any model for such a requirement? Ms. Lougee said there is the beginning of language about information literacy in accreditation standards. The libraries do have a substantial number of program offerings for undergraduates, and a recent addendum to its compact request to greatly expand the Libraries educational services to undergraduates.

Professor Campbell asked Ms. Lougee if there had been any response to her report to the Regents. They were concerned about competitiveness and service to the state, Ms. Lougee said, and raised questions similar to those raised at this meeting. One outcome of the report is that the libraries are being asked to provide advice on proposals for new academic programs, noting the level of library resources available to support the new program.

What else can the Committee do on behalf of the libraries, other than communicate the message about the problems, Professor Campbell asked? There is an institutional question about "how much is enough?" Ms. Lougee said; the CIC provosts have wondered whether the libraries are not a bottomless pit given the high inflation in publisher costs and high demand among users. There is evidence that the University of Minnesota’s libraries are not funded as well as peers, but the real loss may be the opportunity costs. Libraries (through collections, services, and educational programs) can contribute significantly to the overall health and vitality of academic programs.

Professor Warwick suggested that the libraries create a new category of friends: Industrial friends of the periodicals. Ms. Lougee said they do have a corporate friends category, membership in which grants borrowing privileges to corporations, and they also have fee-based services for corporations. The libraries are currently reviewing the rates charged to corporations. One additional outcome of journal cancellations is that the libraries corporate income is jeopardized as there are fewer resources to draw on in these services. Professor Campbell said that Ms. Lougee's predecessor was sometimes frustrated at the constraints he faced in fund-raising. Fund-raising is difficult because the libraries have no alumni, Ms. Lougee commented, but the University Foundation had been very supportive in this last year of the Campaign. While the libraries have a reasonable donor base, individual gifts are typically not large. Many citizens of the state expect the University libraries to be a public good and feel entitled to access by virtue of tax support.

Professor Campbell thanked Ms. Lougee and her colleagues for joining the Committee and asked her to keep it posted. He said he believed the Committee would support the libraries as a common good at the University. It does need to be made clearer how the libraries fit into academic priorities, he said.

4. Financial System Replacement Project (PeopleSoft versus Oracle)

Professor Campbell now welcomed Associate Vice President Cawley to the meeting, joined by Mr. Volna, to provide an update on the Financial System Replacement Project.

Mr. Volna distributed copies of a set of slides and reviewed the history of the University's financial system going back to the purchase of CUFS. He noted, as he had at previous Committee meetings, the potential financial risks and impacts of a CUFS failure, depending on how long the system might be down. He also recalled that after an extensive and participatory process, the University had selected PeopleSoft as the vendor for a new financial system. He emphasized that at the beginning of the process it was NOT a foregone conclusion that PeopleSoft would be the vendor chosen; they relied on the expertise and advice of over 200 people across the University to review the vendor proposals.

The University negotiated with PeopleSoft and obtained a proposed contract--shortly after which time PeopleSoft announced it was buying J. D. Edwards and then Oracle announced its hostile takeover attempt of PeopleSoft. Since that time, the University has slowed down its negotiations and has been waiting to see what happens.

In the meantime, the University proposed to begin a "trail blazing" project in 2003-04, rather than a full-blown implementation project. They are proposing that the University will purchase PeopleSoft software and necessary hardware as soon as practical after negotiations are completed, will present a full budget and implementation plan in 2004-05, and begin full implementation in 2005-06. The "trail blazing" project consists of doing a test-drive of the system using existing funding and staff to test critical decisions that have to be made; this will help minimize the cash needed to hire consultants to implement the system--it will allow full implementation with most of the major decisions already made. The "trail blazing" project will take about 18 months.

Professor Campbell noted that Messrs. Cawley and Volna had been in meetings with PeopleSoft earlier in the day. Mr. Volna explained that PeopleSoft would prefer that the University buy the system in September, so the purchase counts in their third quarter corporate sales, but he and Mr. Cawley have been adamant that the University will not do so because it has not consulted with this Committee or with the Board of Regents for several months to inform them where the discussions stand and what might happen if Oracle buys PeopleSoft.

The terms and conditions of the University's proposed contract with PeopleSoft expires on September 12, a date originally set so that the Regents could approve it, Mr. Cawley told the Committee. The pressure on PeopleSoft will be the same in the fourth quarter as in the third, however, and the University believes it must have the extra time for internal communication and consultation.

Professor Warwick, noting the potential financial risks and implications if there is a CUFS failure for 1-2 days, 2-5 days, 5-10 days, and so on, asked what the probability is that each of those events would happen. Mr. Volna replied that his answer must be somewhat like that given by stockbrokers: Past performance is no guarantee of future performance. CUFS has gone down 4-6 times per year, 2 or 3 for a measurable period with an impact across the campus. Have there been any 2-5 day interruptions, Professor Warwick asked? Not since the system was installed in the early 1990s, Mr. Volna said. It is, however, an aging product, Professor Campbell observed. The problem is lack of vendor support, Mr. Cawley said, and the links to other products make support of CUFS and related systems exceptionally difficult. CUFS cannot be upgraded, so the other systems cannot be, either. The likelihood of an interruption is greater with CUFS than PeopleSoft; in the latter case, the University has contracts which provide for immediate service in the case of an interruption. CUFS becomes more and more risky as time passes, he said.

Professor Konstan said that if there is a lack of internal support for moving forward with a replacement project, it would be useful to have a table illustrating the annoying elements of CUFS that would be eliminated with a new system. There are a lot of examples, he said. He also asked if Oracle had submitted a bid when the original request for proposals had been issued. They did not, Mr. Volna said; they had indicated they would, but then decided not to. Is that worrisome, Professor Konstan asked? It is, Mr. Cawley said, but on the other hand Oracle is not a bad company; the University uses its products. But Oracle does not have the history of supporting higher education that PeopleSoft does.

There are a lot of good reasons to use the "trail blazing" approach rather than the $20-million-for-consultants approach, Professor Konstan said, but it does mean the University has about four more years with the existing system. If CUFS were to fail catastrophically, the University would be required to make a cut-over to the new system in an emergency situation. And if the University is going to put people on the "trail blazing" effort, people who are not otherwise idle, what is given up? Mr. Volna said they recognize the risk of the approach, and one "deliverable" of the "trail blazing" effort is that there be a rapid implementation plan that could provide minimum services required (e.g., accounts payable vendor checks) if necessary. As for the staff, the Enterprise Systems have had recurring funding for several years in order to avoid the use of consultants; that funding will be used to provide the staffing necessary for both day-to-day support as well as the "trail blazing" effort. There will be no new funds required.

Mr. Pfutzenreuter said the University began the Enterprise System funding a few years ago because he had concluded it was "nuts" for the University to be paying $500 per hour for consultants when, for the amount of money involved, it could hire people and move them around to projects as needed. Mr. Cawley added that they are ready to do this project and have evened out resources so that people now helping Admissions and Records and Human Resources, for example, could be moved to the "trail blazing" project. He said he believed the "trail blazing" project would pay off extremely well for the University, at low risk and low cost, allowing the University to spend much less later, during full implementation, and significantly reduce the risks that arise during system implementation.

Some will no doubt ask how the University will pay for the project, Mr. Pfutzenreuter observed. The University has the Enterprise tax, which has been used to retire previous enterprise system projects. The balance of the debt has been cut by about $6 million per year. If this system were to cost $20 to 25 million, it would add to the existing Enterprise deficit and extend the time of the tax about three and one-half years. It would NOT involve an increase in the tax.

Professor Feeney said that if there is known to be hostility between PeopleSoft and Oracle, and if the University moves forward on the "trail blazing" project, is it then committed to PeopleSoft? Or are there options for re-bidding the project? Or can the University make a decision but delay implementation for a couple of years? Mr. Pfutzenreuter said there are sunk costs in the effort that would be wasted if the University were to re-open the RFP and change vendors. Mr. Volna said the University will need to know the vendor before it does the "trail blazing" project; it needs to decide, as an institution, if it will decide or continue to wait. There are attractive parts of the proposed agreement with PeopleSoft: Maintenance agreements for the human resources and student systems purchased earlier are expiring, and the proposed contract includes good pricing for maintenance in the future. They decided today that the University must evaluate whether to buy or re-bid the financial systems project, no matter the outcome with Oracle. The contract with PeopleSoft includes a provision that any new owner must pay the University five times the cost of the contract if it fails to deliver--an amount that would pay the substantial

part of any new system the University might have to purchase in the event a PeopleSoft system were not to receive the contractually-obligated support.

Mr. Cawley pointed out that Oracle has committed to supporting PeopleSoft products for ten years. The University will have to decide if it believes Oracle, but he repeated that the University has a good relationship with Oracle. If the Oracle-PeopleSoft deal goes through, and there is a 10-year guarantee, he said he would feel a lot better about using the PeopleSoft product.

Professor Konstan said he thought this was a well-thought-out process. He said that if it were not because of the cloud of uncertainty surrounding the future of PeopleSoft, he would urge the University to purchase the system. Professor Campbell agreed. He said he was impressed with the project charter presented to the steering committee for the new financial system (of which he is a member by virtue of being chair of this Committee); he said the process inspires confidence--but there is still much uncertainty.

Mr. Volna said that an update would be provided to the Regents at their September meeting and that there would also be a report to the Twin Cities deans, to UMD, and to others. It would be best for the University if PeopleSoft would extend the offer through October so it could be brought to the Regents for action at that time, with a decision that the faculty and the President could support.

Professor Campbell noted that Mr. Volna was scheduled to join the Committee several times this year for a report on this topic. Professor Feeney said he felt much more comfortable with what was going on now that he had learned the details.

Professor Campbell thanked Messrs. Volna and Cawley, and adjourned the meeting at 4:05.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota