

Minutes*

**Senate Research Committee
Monday, October 25, 2004
1:15 - 3:00
238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Gary Balas (chair), Dianne Bartels, Victor Bloomfield, James Cotter, Dan Dahlberg, Sharon Danes, Kathy Ensrud, Steven Gantt, Michael Hughey, Paul Johnson, James Luby, James Orf, Mark Paller, Virginia Seybold, Thomas Schumacher, Maria Sera, Charles Spetland, George Trachte, Barbara VanDrasek, Jean Witson

Absent: Aleksa Babic, Christopher Cramer, Robin Dittman, David Hamilton, Ryan Lukas, Michael Volna

Guests: Winifred Schumi (Oversight Analysis and Reporting); Mark Bohnhorst (Office of the General Counsel); Wendy Lougee (University Librarian)

Other: none

[In these minutes: (1) update on compliance issues; (2) student license for intellectual work from a class; (3) libraries as part of the research infrastructure]

1. Update on Compliance Issues

Professor Balas convened the meeting at 1:15 and turned first to Mr. Schumacher for a report on compliance matters.

Mr. Schumacher said there were three areas of interest to the Committee:

- risks: where the government and the administration see risks
- program compliance expectations because of external changes
- outreach activities to make compliance easier and less expensive

With respect to the first issue, Mr. Schumacher provided the Committee with a slide of a graph entitled "Campus Compliance Risk Profile—Heat Map" with risk along the Y axis (from low to high) and impact along the X axis (from low to high). There are three areas of risk: red (moderate to high impact and moderate to high risk), yellow (running from high risk but low impact to low-moderate risk but high impact), and green (ranging from high risk/low impact to low risk/high impact). Examples in the red zone (high) include environmental health and safety, grants administration, athletics, clinical services, and human subject research. Examples in the yellow zone (moderate) include privacy/HIPAA, fiscal, animal research, and technology transfer. Examples in the green (low) include human relations, access, trademarks, foundations, and dining services. The graphic did not include student affairs, campus safety, emergency plans, or other "non legal" issues.

* 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 graphic was provided to the Compliance Council to inform the discussion about the scope of compliance, to identify activities in which the University engages that expose it to legal risk. It does not include all business risks. How did activities get on the chart, Professor Balas asked? These areas are objective. They are risks largely because of the nature of work involved. These activities are highly regulated and involve inherently “risky” events and appear on compliance programs at other institutions. Grants administration, for example, is in the high risk band because of the high volume; the impact is high because of the consequence (financial, reputational, or safety) of a breakdown.

The risk is the likelihood an event will happen. In Human Resources, at an institution with 20,000 people, it is a statistical certainty that there will be a breakdown, but the impact is likely to be low. The same is true for a conflict of interest—it is generally unlikely that a conflict would have an institutional impact, although there are exceptions. The graphic is informed by his having worked with people in all of these areas, Mr. Schumacher said, and the activities and associated risks and probabilities are probably true for most major research universities.

Mr. Schumacher next drew the attention of Committee members to the 2005 work plan for the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) of the Department of Health and Human Services. This information is distributed by the OIG in order to let organizations fix their own problems; it is a list of things the OIG is worried about or sees problems with. The great majority of the issues are related to Medicare; the list he distributed, Mr. Schumacher said, represents what affects the University. Among the issues the OIG will focus on are these:

- charging administrative and clerical salaries to grants and distinguishing between direct and indirect costs; it is important the University do the same for everyone. Researchers should talk to Sponsored Projects Administration (SPA) about any questions; if the University does not treat similar expenses similarly, there is the risk of double reporting and of violating the institution's commitment that all are doing things the same (so if SPA says "no" to a request, it is usually for the purpose of institutional consistency)
- recharge centers
- level of commitment (this is not about researchers putting in time on a grant, it is about the amount of time proposed and whether or not the researcher can actually live up to the commitment)—did institutions commit more than 100% of an investigator's time when applying for grants. Professor Seybold noted that this is important; researchers do not receive all the grants they apply for, so how does the OIG account for time that was not put in? When the researcher next applies for a grant, Ms. Schumi said. But does the change get entered in the NIH or other federal records, Professor Seybold asked? What is what she reports connected to what NIH hears?
- royalty income
- employee conflicts of interest at NIH: this is an important public concern, and more of an issue than it was 10 years ago, especially with human subjects research. Mr. Schumacher emphasized that if a researcher acts in good faith and discloses a potential conflict of interest on the REPA form, and it is handled through the management plan

process, the University will defend the individual if problems arise; if the researcher does not disclose a conflict, the University has the right to deny defense and indemnification to the individual.

Does he also look at whether the University provides sufficient funds to manage risk, Professor Balas asked, or does he hand that issue off to the President? Mr. Schumacher said he is concerned about administrative support for research; if the government says the University must push forms, then someone must do it. He said he has not done an audit of what is needed, which is beyond the purview of his office, but he does advocate with the President and Executive Committee about providing the funds that are needed. He is supposed to monitor compliance, Professor Balas observed to Mr. Schumacher, and then tells this Committee that he needs more resources; is that request heard centrally? It is, Mr. Schumacher said, but it is a matter of squeezing blood out of a turnip—but his points are heard.

How does the information get to the individual PI, Professor Orf asked? How does he make sure information about compliance gets to researchers? Mr. Schumacher distributed copies of a Compliance Checklist Outline, a small booklet, and said that it is one way; it was developed by the people involved in compliance. He noted that he had established a research compliance committee when he was appointed. He asked the committee how to improve the information provided to researchers; they also conducted focus group discussions with faculty. One message they heard was that faculty want to know what they need to worry about, when, and who they should go to for help. He then asked various units where they fit in compliance and then developed a lifecycle of compliance that covers a research project from beginning to end. The outline also includes a compliance checklist that helps identify potential landmines and what to do about them. They are TRYING, Mr. Schumacher said, trying to improve in an integrated way to respond to research needs and have talked to faculty about what is needed. This seemed to be an efficient, cost-effective way to help researchers; the final version of the booklet will be distributed at Responsible Conduct of Research training, to the DDD list, and in hard copy to every PI—and more copies will be provided to anyone who asks for them.

Mr. Schumacher asked what Committee members thought about the distribution and about the concept.

Professor Orf said it was a good idea. How frequently do things change so that researchers would need to know about them? They tried to put the outline at a level that things do not change often (if one uses human subjects in research, go to the IRB). The goal is to get people to think about things in time and these will not change. If 5% of researchers use the outline, and it stops 10 problems, it will have been worth it. If they can promote compliance in a way that researchers think about research, it will provide a good service.

Professor Balas said he liked the concept and that all elements of research are linked. Part of compliance is access to all the forms that are needed; it would be helpful if there were a web-based version that one could click on for links to forms. Ms. Schumi said that the Compliance Data Base Integration Project will do just that; they are working on it. E-research central will also have all the information anyone needs. Mr. Schumacher said there will be links; the goal is not to create a new structure but to do something practical this year that would be effective. Is this on the right track?

Professor Sera said she would be surprised if a researcher were not aware of the issue in the outline; it is so general, so basic, and it could be more specific. Mr. Schumacher said the items were

included in the outline because he has seen all these problems. He said he did not believe that all researchers do realize or understand them. For example, the section asking whether the research is correctly classified as a gift or grant indicates when they need to talk to SPA or the Foundation about whether terms of a "gift" may make it in fact a grant under the regulations. Professor Sera said when they do ask, they will get two answers; there are so many questions that the institution faces a challenge in answering them. Calling SPA (or the Foundation about gifts) will eliminate 90% of the problems, Mr. Schumacher said; there may be 10% the University needs to sort out.

Professor Balas noted that the outline contains a large number of telephone numbers. Will there be someone there who is able to point to an expert who will answer the same question the same way each time? That is something this Committee can keep pushing on, Mr. Schumacher said. If someone calls and gets two different answers to the same question, they need to complain about it. Sometimes, he noted, different calls provide different information to the people who answer, so that may be the cause of different answers sometimes. Professor Balas said he wanted to be sure that the organizations listed in the outline buy into the process and know they will receive calls on the topics that the outline identifies. The units have had an opportunity to participate in formulation of the outline, Mr. Schumacher, and could have changed it.

Ms. Witson said it provided a good overview. Are there plans to go into specifics? The University has a lot of exposure to risk because so many researchers are involved in clinical trials; even if people have taken a course on compliance, they do not understand all its elements. There are people to call, but the problem is when someone does not know he or she has a problem to call about. In human subjects research, for example, the University should be more assertive and force education on people; there is so much regulation of human subjects research that if compliance is left to the PIs, they may not know to go look at what is needed. Mr. Schumacher agreed. The question, Ms. Witson said, is who is responsible for educating faculty across the University? The IRB? They would likely not agree that that is their responsibility. In some ways education is centralized, in other ways it is decentralized, Mr. Schumacher said. The University is looking at a systematic education program that approaches people by their roles—by what they do.

Dr. Paller suggested the Committee take up the topic of the appropriate educational mandate for certain kinds of research; it would be helpful for the faculty governance system to register its views. If the Committee felt it were appropriate, developing and implementing a program would be much easier. They can develop a program in six months; the question is whether it would be appropriate. Such an approach would be setting different thresholds for doing different kinds of research, something that needs careful consideration. That is where the world is moving but it cannot be expected the administration would be able to do it well without faculty participation. Mr. Schumacher agreed; they assume faculty are experts, but where do they say they want to do something more?

Where does the Senate resolution on the responsible conduct of research fit in, Professor Seybold asked? How is this different? That resolution calls on faculty to receive continuing education, Mr. Schumacher said; what he believed Dr. Paller was talking about is requiring specific training if one is doing certain kinds of research. Dr. Paller reported that he is working with research coordinators who must take 12 hours of training on good clinical practices—something they are not taught in school but that is assumed they will pick up or be mentored on. This is like advanced instruction, Professor Seybold commented.

Mr. Schumacher next commented on the rising expectations driving a model compliance program and noted a public affairs release concerning corporate compliance and ethics. It is a model all recipients of federal funding are expected to follow. After Enron and Tyco, and other public scandals of corporate irresponsibility, as well as a review of compliance programs, the government changed expectations, standards, and compliance programs. A major change is an expectation of an engaged management. He has done two things in this respect, Mr. Schumacher reported: The Executive Committee is the compliance and oversight committee; he talks with it four times a year about compliance, and he formed a smaller compliance working group comprised of the offices of vice president for research, vice president for university services, audits and the general counsel.

Finally, Mr. Schumacher reported on an outside reporting line that the University will establish. There has always been an audit hotline, but the University needs an effective system for reporting compliance concerns from any area of the University. There is no standard protocol on what to tell callers, which is a concern, so he has recommended to the Executive Committee that the University outsource the service to a company that will take a call, record the information, and send it to the right person at the University. This would not be a new cop, he said, but a way to report concerns that any person in the University community can use. The Executive Committee approved the recommendation and the University is in the process of evaluating vendors.

Is there a way to ensure that the vendor lives up to its obligations, Professor Balas asked? Mr. Schumacher said the University has issued a Request for Proposals; one of the companies in the business has about half the Fortune 500 companies while another has a lot of universities as clients. The company would have a number dedicated to the University of Minnesota. He said he was confident because of the size and scope of the companies that use the service; it will be around for awhile. The University cannot wash its hands of the problems and must be sure the company is doing its job, Professor Balas pointed out. Mr. Schumacher agreed and said the University will deal with the calls; he said he is less concerned that the University will get the quality it pays for than he is about people knowing how to use appropriately the information that they receive from the service. As for the 13 different numbers/lines that people can call now about compliance concerns, they want to stop and refer calls to this service where they can.

How does the company deal with confidentiality, Professor Bartels asked? The same way the University does, Mr. Schumacher said; some things are public, some are not. Generally they try to hold things in confidence, and can help keep things private before the investigation and closure on the matter, but once something is completed and not otherwise protected because of the type of information in a report, it is public.

Professor Cotter noted Mr. Schumacher's concern about the potential lack of resources for compliance. Where is his greatest concern, he asked Mr. Schumacher. Education? Reporting? There is a best practice model for compliance, Mr. Schumacher said, that calls for identifying risks, having standards, educating people about the standards, identified roles for people to take action, and so on. His biggest concern is following the model. He said the best way to avoid mistakes is education. He said he is most worried about breakdowns in the system that expose the University to the biggest risks, and spends more of his time focusing on those areas.

The Committee concluded that it would be useful for faculty to have the outline on a website in addition to distributing hard copies to researchers and others. His vision, Mr. Schumacher related, is that the outline will sit on a bookshelf where it will be used often as a good summary of research issues.

Professor Balas thanked Mr. Schumacher for his presentation.

2. Student License for Intellectual Work from a Class

Professor Balas recalled that the Committee last year talked about a document that students are (sometimes?) asked to sign when they take a course that could generate intellectual property. Professor Fred Morrison suggested a revision to modify the form so that students did not have to give up all of the intellectual property rights when they take a class.

The current and PROPOSED NEW [to be deleted] language on the form is this:

In consideration for the opportunity to enroll in the above course and other valuable consideration:

I understand that, in the course of my participation in the above course, I may create certain written documents, software, discoveries, or other works. I agree [that] TO GRANT A NON-EXCLUSIVE LICENCE FOR all such writings, software, discoveries, and other works, developed by me, alone or with others, [shall belong solely and exclusively] to the University. I will execute, without additional compensation of any kind, all papers necessary to establish the University's [rights] LICENSE in such writings, software, discoveries, and other works; secure patents and other intellectual property rights in the same; and protect and defend such rights.

Ms. Witson asked what the form meant. As revised, it would mean that the student could take his or her contribution and work with it separately from whatever the University might do, Mr. Bohnhorst said. If it is possible that there will be marketable intellectual property from a course that is, for example, supported by equipment from a company, the company may not want to support the class unless it gets an option to an exclusive license to intellectual property resulting from its equipment—basically all research agreements with companies are that way. If there might be marketable intellectual property in that instance, the revised form will not work because one could not give the company an exclusive license.

It is important that students know what they are giving up, Professor Balas said; they need to understand that if they develop something, others will sell and market it. If they are the creator, they would still receive the creator's share, Mr. Bohnhorst said; there could be a millionaire emerging from a course if a student invents something marketable.

Ms. Witson asked if a student gives up rights to compensation. If a student takes a course and invents something the University wants to market, is there anything that says the University owns it? This form is rarely used, Mr. Bohnhorst surmised; if a student takes a course, pays for it, and invents something, it is the student's. University intellectual property policy provides that if one creates something, one owns it, Professor Seybold said; this form does make reference to the University's policy. She said she did not understand the context of this form. Mr. Bohnhorst said the presumption is that a student will own whatever he or she creates in a class, but there will be exceptions that need to be documented with a form such as this.

Dean Bloomfield said that with respect to copyright, at least one professional society holds the copyright to materials but provides that anyone may use the materials for teaching if there is no charge for

it beyond duplicating expenses and materials can be put on websites. It might be more useful to talk about permission to use rather than licenses. He suggested the form be redrafted with "permission to use" language. Professor Balas said he thought the issue had nothing to do with non-profit organizations but rather with something the University wants to use. Dean Bloomfield agreed and said that Professor Morrison's point in general speaks to what he was saying.

Professor Balas suggested that the Committee ask the Office of the General Counsel who uses the form, if it is anomalous, and if it is ever used. If it is used often, the Committee is unaware of it. Mr. Bohnhorst said he could explore those questions, although cautioned that he may not be able to provide data.

What would be the reasoning of a faculty member who decided ahead of time that he or she wanted to use the form, Ms. Witson asked? Mr. Bohnhorst said he knows of one time in the last three years that the form has been used, when a company sponsored a course and wanted an option to an exclusive license to any intellectual property that emerged from it because it did not want the students shopping the intellectual property around to other companies. Professor Seybold again asked that the form be put in the context of the University's intellectual property policy. Some colleges (e.g., Architecture) may have arrangements for the use of materials; the Committee will want to preserve that which is useful to both students and the University. Ms. Witson said she would like to see a sentence on the form telling the student that normally anything they produce in a class they own and that this form diverges from the usual policy. She said she was not sure that students understand what they would be giving up. Dr. VanDrasek suggested a parallel change in the title, indicating that this is an exception to the intellectual property policy.

On a related matter, Professor Balas said that he has received software from a company, at a discount, but the agreement contains a clause providing that anything he develops on the software can be distributed for profit by the software company. He said he has seen this of late in a number of agreements—they give a discount but reserve the right to use anything developed. Does a faculty member have the right to sign such a form? If the software is used on a federally-funded project, the University owns the intellectual property and the faculty member cannot give it up because he or she does not own it.

Mr. Bohnhorst said he has not seen such an agreement but he would not advise faculty to purchase software with those conditions attached. They see those kinds of clauses in material transfer agreements and fight off these "reach through" clauses. He said he would mention it to colleagues in the General Counsel's office. This might be worth mentioning to faculty, that they should not give up intellectual property rights just because software might be cheaper if they do.

3. Libraries as Part of the Research Infrastructure

Professor Balas now welcomed University Librarian Wendy Lougee to the meeting to discuss the role of the libraries as part of the research infrastructure.

Ms. Lougee said that she would present a mix of information that might be of interest to the Committee's discussion of infrastructure, including how the libraries relate to indirect cost funding, some peer data, and where they might go in the future. She distributed copies of a set of PowerPoint slides.

The indirect cost funds the libraries receive are not directly related to the attributed costs of the libraries in the university's indirect cost rate. Since the implementation of IMG, the Libraries have received a fixed amount (\$1.5 million) from ICR. At the time IMG was instituted, a portion of ICR was swapped for state funds. This past year, the Libraries funding included additional dollars that were from ICR sources. However, at this point, the Libraries ICR dollars fall short of its attributed costs by almost \$1 million. The major source of funding for the libraries is O&M funds (about half from state funds and half from the University fee), a shift from before 2003, when the majority came from the state. The idea of the swap away from ICR funds toward state funds was to protect the libraries from variations in ICR funds (and what has happened is that state funds have declined considerably since). Now the libraries are more heavily funded by University Fee revenue (45.6% of libraries revenues) in order to protect them from state cuts (state funds now make up about 35.6% of libraries revenues).

Ms. Lougee turned next to a slide about the "information economy" in response to recent questions about changes in the way information is funded. The Libraries license electronic content (journals, news, databases) for the campus. When they do so, units or individuals who might have previously purchased the same content for their own use, can realize savings by utilizing the licensed content. There are often big differences between the costs of print vs. electronic. For example, a print subscription to SCIENCE costs about \$100 for an individual and about \$400 for the library; the libraries' electronic license for the campus costs about \$10,000. Departments save money, but only a small proportion of the total cost. Similarly, Library software licensing for programs like RefWorks (citation management tool) saves departments (with 4,500 current accounts, that is roughly the equivalent of \$500,000 in individual software purchases). There are also new models evolving. There are trends toward new types of journal models called "open access," in which the content is freely available to all. Typically these are funded through author fees per article. The publishers (whether professional societies or other organizations) need some way to generate money; it has been suggested that libraries pay "membership" fees in order that authors' fees can be waived. Mr. Spetland reported that there have been about 50 articles from University authors in the last couple of years whose fees were waived because the Library purchased a "membership". (The costs to an author can be as much as \$1000-3,000 per article.)

There is some evidence that units are not purchasing as much information (books, journals, newspapers) as they used to, although it is not possible to know if this is due to Library licensing. Studies elsewhere suggest that approximately 25-30% of all content on campus is purchased outside the library system (i.e., by units). A small investigation made the Library at the University showed that unit purchases of books/journals (on non-sponsored funds) dropped by about \$400,000 from 2002-2003.

The Committee asked how well the libraries are doing, Ms. Lougee noted that the Libraries have dropped significantly in North American rankings. The Association of Research Libraries, consisting of 114 university libraries, publishes an annual composite index ranking using five variables (volumes held/added, serial subscriptions, operating expenditures, number of staff); Minnesota has dropped from 14th to 19th since 2000. It had held steady at about 14 for decades. Institutions that have passed Minnesota by include Wisconsin, Princeton, North Carolina, Indiana, Chicago, and New York University. On selected variables, the University dropped by different amounts:

- volumes added: 18th to 26th
- current serials: 29th to 35th
- operating expenditures: 12th to 22nd
- monograph expenditures: 39th to 50th

-- monograph purchases: 64th to 66th

Do these rankings capture the right metrics, Professor Balas asked? Ms. Lougee said there are other measures being considered (e.g., learning outcomes, service efficiency), but there is a recognition that there is a baseline related to these core variables of content and staff. The measures cover what is important and the University is not doing as well as other institutions. But while it has dropped in significant measures, satisfaction has increased, according to survey data. Graduate students and faculty—the people most interested in research—see two problem areas: content access and "personal control." "Personal control" is a measure of how easily a user can independently access and manage the information they need. The Libraries are behind in technology infrastructure to support this important aspect.

Ms. Lougee provided the Committee with examples of "information communities," where a disciplinary web environment is created to bring together relevant content, data, tools for information analysis (e.g., visualization, statistical, mapping), and communication tools. Libraries are already engaged in many of the component pieces of these environments and can help in creating these communities by compiling data, providing tools, and building an on-line research community. The University of Virginia library, for example, has created such a community around the study of Tibet and the Himalayas; there is another one for space physics and aeronomy research (not created by a library). These often have several partners that contribute content.

Dean Bloomfield said these last two examples were striking about the future. Older scholars often write review articles, which are important contributions but static, but are seen as a faculty responsibility. These sites are seen as library-produced, not faculty-produced. Many of these on-line environments also have more traditional journals and books associated with them and do include faculty-produced content, Ms. Lougee commented; information produced by libraries is also included. Some libraries are also running publishing entities or engaged in protecting the intellectual output of institutional work with scholarly societies.

Professor Sera said it is hard to interpret the rankings of libraries. Is the University of Minnesota down or have other institutions gone up because they are doing more? The University dropped from 18th to 26th in volumes added, but are they adding enough and are people satisfied? Satisfaction is important, Ms. Lougee agreed. The libraries at the University of Michigan, for example, have always been funded at inflationary increases (journals have increased 9-12%, books by 6-7%). Minnesota has rarely had inflationary increases; they needed \$900,000 last year and received \$150,000 (with additional one-time money from Provost Sullivan and through internal reallocation). The question is the breadth of academic programs at the University and the extent to which the libraries are meeting the satisfaction level. They are not meeting the breadth or depth necessary to support programs.

How do other institutions deal with these problems, Professor Orf asked? They either grow their resources or they rely on inter-library loans, Ms. Lougee told him. Electronic content often cannot be shared through interlibrary loans, she noted, or can be shared only with great difficulty. There are not many good options. Cutting journals means increased inter-library loan costs for borrowing materials for University faculty and students. As they cut content, the libraries lose revenue from sales of article copies to corporate users. Long-term, issues at the heart of publication include what rights are given away by authors and where things are published. She said she hopes to share information with faculty about what

they can cross out on contracts that would allow the libraries to deal more flexibly with information locally.

Dean Bloomfield recalled that the escalating costs of science journals led to the development of the Tempe Principles; have they gone anywhere? A lot has happened since then that has emerged from the ferment, Ms. Lougee said. There are international principles concerning open access, NIH is proposing that open access must be available within six months for federally-funded research, and the CIC is deciding whether to take a stand on the issue. There will be more instances of open access but without a way to fund them, so there will be challenges like membership fees or paying to have an article published. Many in fields funded by NIH are used to page charges, Dean Bloomfield said, seen as part of the cost of doing research. Some in other fields, however, are not used to such charges. Those are usually a direct charge to a grant, Professor Balas said, while the libraries are supported indirectly.

Professor Balas asked Ms. Lougee what her vision for the libraries is if she were to receive the money she needed; what would be growth areas or projects she has in mind were she to receive part of the funds requested for the research infrastructure. Some of the money would go into content, Ms. Lougee said, and they would begin to collaborate with academic units to develop programs of support that serve individual program/discipline areas. This might include more integrated information environments to support research and learning. The libraries need technology to create and sustain these environments as well as librarians and technologists to help design them and to make the necessary tools available.

Is there any way of accounting for external community use of the libraries, Dr. VanDrasek asked, and to define them as a state resource? They have data on the physical use of the libraries, Ms. Lougee said, and in the past estimates of external use ranged anywhere from 10 to 18%. As more of the content is electronic, which cannot readily be shared with external users, people must come into the libraries; they have no data on that use of electronic content by non-University users. They also have data demonstrating the libraries to be the largest lender in the United States, with 70% of the use within Minnesota. They serve the state enormously.

Professor Balas thanked Ms. Lougee for her presentation, welcomed new student Mira Reinberg to the Committee, and then adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota