

Minutes\*

**Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee**  
**Friday, February 10, 2012**  
**10:00 – 12:00**  
**300 Morrill Hall**

Present: Barbara Elliott, Christine Marran (co-chairs), William Craig, Joseph Gaugler, Teresa Kimberley, Jessica Larson, Paula O'Loughlin, Gary Peter, Paul Porter, Terry Simon, Carol Wells

Absent: Yusuf Abul-Hajj, Arlene Carney,

Guests: Professor Lyn Bearinger (chair, Senate Research Committee), Vice President Tim Mulcahy

[In these minutes: (1) 7.12 statements and funding requirements; (2) agenda items presented to Provost Hanson; (3) academic freedom and external research support]

**1. 7.12 Statements and Funding Requirements**

Professor Marran convened the meeting at 10:00 and turned to Professor Wells to start the discussion. Prior to the meeting Professor Wells had provided a memo to Committee members in which she made the point that "although one could evaluate a faculty member's performance on a collective number of criteria, e.g., publications, grants, teaching, etc., it was likely a violation of academic freedom to require (as a litmus test) [in a department 7.12 statement] that the faculty member engage in research that others had deemed fundable." She pointed out that "if grant funding was a litmus test, we would exclude someone like Barbara McClintock who was not funded. Dr. McClintock grew corn in her laboratory, observed the colors of the kernels, and discovered mobile genetic elements or 'jumping genes,' for which she received a Nobel Prize." She also said that it was "my impression that 7.12 revisions may include clear requirements that faculty engage in fundable research, while paying attention to standardizing this requirement across departments." She inquired if this was a topic for this Committee to consider.

The question is whether there can be a specific requirement for external funding and/or how much or what type of funding is required, Professor Wells amplified. In days when funds are short, the University relies more and more on outside funds, and a major source of funds for some departments is indirect-cost-recovery, also known as Facilities and Administrative (F&A) funds. Some grants are better than others; the best ones are from NIH, which carry 51% F&A funding, and they (in the Medical School) are all encouraged to seek NIH funding. There are many NIH grants but the mainstay is the R01 grant, which typically amounts to \$200,000 to \$250,000 per year and carries a 51% F&A rate.

Professor Marran said she understood that university F&A rates are not consistent across institutions. Professor Wells said that is correct; the University's rate used to be about 48% but has been negotiated up to 51%. The rate is negotiated every few years and the University makes the case for its

---

\* 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.

rate. The University's rate is modest. It is low for a metropolitan university, Professor Gaugler commented. Professor Wells agreed; the University seems not to be able to make the case for a higher rate, she said.

Professor Wells explained that in the course of discussions in the Medical School about why departments do not yet have approved 7.12 statements and why some of them are being returned for further work, the issue of whether grants can be required for tenure arose. Can a 7.12 statement include a requirement for an R01 grant for tenure? If so, could it require two such grants? (Currently, about 10% of NIH R01 grant applications are funded.)

This Committee discussed the issue in 2008, Professor Wells recalled, and had two associate deans join a meeting to talk about unrealistic hurdles to tenure, including a requirement for R01 grants. There has been discussion in the Medical School about requiring them. Her view, Professor Wells said, is that such a requirement would be a violation of academic freedom because it forces faculty members to do research in fields that others have deemed fundable—and people like Barbara McClintock would not receive tenure at Minnesota with that kind of policy in place.

A more modern example is foundation support for grants, Professor Kimberly said. They are not federal but some foundation grants are large and highly competitive. They are not NIH but they do offer F&A funding. If one is in an area of research that is not as popular with NIH, it is still possible to obtain funding. Would that be adequate to meet the policy, she asked? Or must the funds come from NIH? That is what is being discussed, Professor Wells said. Vice President Friedman did not agree with her, she reported, but the question should be resolved. It is broader than NIH; can a department require external funding for tenure? She said she cannot operate her lab without funding, but does not believe that the University should exclude someone who does not have external funding.

The University is the only place that does basic research because of faculty curiosity about questions. Professor Wells cited the example of Thomas Brock, who was funded by the National Science Foundation to investigate bacteria that survived at 160 degrees in the hot springs at Yellowstone National Park; he made these bacteria available to all other researchers by depositing them with the American Type Culture Collection. Twenty years later (in the 1980s) Kary Mullis, working at Cetus Corporation, acquired the bacteria and used an enzyme isolated from one of them, called Taq polymerase, which became the key idea that facilitated modern methods of DNA replication and became a fundamental tool in basic molecular biology research, in clinical testing, and in forensics. Hoffman-LaRoche eventually bought the pertinent patents from Cetus for \$330 million, and Kary Mullis received the Nobel Prize in 1993, the only one awarded for research at a biotech company. The original key discovery made by Dr. Brock was done as basic research. Industry does not do that kind of research, Professor Wells said, and she is asking that the University leave room for this kind of exploration in society. So her question, she reiterated, is whether there can be a specific requirement for outside funding for tenure. And thus a requirement that excludes those who do not have such funding?

Professor Gaugler said he believed that Vice Provost Carney had said that departments could not require two R01 grants. Is she still reviewing 7.12 statements for the Medical School? Some have been returned, Professor Elliott reported. Professor Gaugler said he understands that there might be some language in a 7.12 statement requiring that a faculty member have external funding but that it could not be so specific as requiring two R01 grants. Professor Elliott agreed and said that the new 7.12 statement for her department does not have language specifying numbers of grants, publications, and so on to

achieve promotion or tenure. The University, however, is a big enterprise, and those who are hired need to be research entrepreneurs.

Professor Gaugler went on to comment that there is an administrative side to the question. Faculty members can do research in whatever field they wish, but there are costs and benefits. There is also a great deal of unfunded research important to any discipline. He said he was not sure that this is an academic-freedom question. Disciplines have to be open to various viewpoints, which makes them stronger; if they are only in the business of chasing dollars as a marker of quality, there will be weaker contributions to the discipline. It is both, Professor Wells said. One can look at the value to society of both basic and applied research: One can test products, but those products typically come out of basic research. If the University does only applied research, there will likely be a 15-20-year gap before the absence of basic research is recognized. It is difficult to do basic research without funding, but should the University exclude research that does not have funding?

This is more an issue of promotion and tenure, Professor Marran observed, and the next agenda item is more about academic freedom. The Committee needs to decide if it wishes to make a statement about the specificity of requirements in 7.12 statements. That is, can a department require, as a condition of tenure, research in a field that someone else has decided should be fundable, Professor Wells added.

It's an important question, Professor Elliott commented. If a faculty member gets an "out of the box" idea, one that others have not imagined, that idea will not have been anticipated by funding agencies. Fundable projects are based on ideas that agencies' thought leaders have anticipated; research that changes the paradigm of a discipline is rarely anticipated and therefore rarely funded. The tenure question is whether the University wants to promote and tenure only people who have fundable research, which in turn could limit the number of Nobel laureates and truly creative scholars on the faculty.

Professor O'Loughlin said that the question for this Committee is whether there can be a funding requirement in a 7.12 statement. Professor Gaugler opined that a 7.12 statement could have funding requirement for tenure—he would not agree with including such a requirement, but a group of faculty could decide to include it. Faculty performance is judged by a number of factors, Professor Wells observed, including publications, grants, invitations to speak at national and international meetings, etc. It would be better to put them together as a requirement because, for example, she could be publishing in *Science* and *Nature* but have no funding.

So the faculty could not adopt such a requirement, Professor Gaugler asked? This Committee could suggest they should not, Professor Marran responded, but in the end it is the unit that decides. It varies by the unit culture, Professor Wells said; hers is one that requires funding, and she observed that she would have to think long and hard about voting to promote and grant tenure to someone who did not have external funding. The best practice would be to allow a variety of forms of funded research but not require specific grants, Professor O'Loughlin said. Requiring a specific grant could very well be a violation of academic freedom.

Professor Kimberly pointed out that the 7.12 statement should accurately reflect the culture and what a probationary faculty member will be judged on—that is the "contract" offered by the 7.12 statement. There is a lot of angst about what people whisper: "Do I need three publications per year?" "Do I need an R01 grant?" And so on. But those requirements may not be in the 7.12 statement. There

should be no surprises about whether a person is meeting expectations, particularly regarding the need for external funding.

Professor Wells related that her thinking on this issue has evolved. When she was a probationary faculty member, she wanted to know exactly what she needed to do (e.g., she had to have 25 publications), but was told that the department could not be that specific because the culture was difficult to precisely define. For example, what if the publications were in high-tier or low tier journals?

If the 7.12 statement is violated, a faculty member has standing to go to the Senate Judicial Committee, Professor O'Loughlin pointed out, in response to Professor Kimberly's comment. If the faculty follow a culture at odds with the 7.12 statement, the department has a problem. The 7.12 statement is as much for the protection of the faculty member as anything.

Professor O'Loughlin said that this Committee could endorse some best practices in writing 7.12 statements that are supportive of academic freedom and share those thoughts with colleagues throughout the University. Doing so might result in some of these restrictive practices not showing up in 7.12 statements, thus avoiding a seemingly endless back-and-forth with Vice Provost Carney.

Professor Simon reported that he had served on his college's Promotion and Tenure Committee when it had a case from a department where a candidate did not have an R01 grant. It had never been stated that someone had to have one, but because the candidate did not, the department said the person should not be promoted. The candidate had other funding, and had statements in support of the candidacy for promotion and tenure, but was never told about the requirement for the R01. A department cannot hold someone to a requirement that it has not articulated. He said he thought it silly for a department to require someone to have an R01 grant if they can obtain funding from other sources.

Professor Marran said she would draft a statement about research funding for the Committee to consider.

## **2. Agenda Items Presented to Provost Hanson**

Professor Marran next reviewed briefly the items she and Professor Elliott had alerted Provost Hanson about.

1. Post-tenure (annual) review and special post-tenure reviews: How are these processes working, how can they be made more effective while ensuring appropriate flexibility for faculty and protecting academic freedom?
2. ITRAAC policy: The International Travel Risk Assessment and Advisory Committee has the authority to delay or cancel certain international travel for students; we suggest changing the policy to make ITRAAC input advisory for doctoral dissertation travel because of its restrictions on those students' academic freedom.
3. Further discussion of the extent of and limits to academic freedom (e.g., that faculty members must teach assigned courses and cover topics agreed upon by faculty curriculum committees, while maintaining academic freedom in the classroom).
4. Discussing appropriate strategies for implementing tenure policy sections 10 (Unrequested Leave of Absence for Disability and Disciplinary Action) and 12 (Programmatic Change) and adopting procedures to facilitate that implementation. (Updated procedures for the tenure-and-promotion process were

adopted in 2011.)

5. Continue discussions on the philosophy and practice of hiring tenure track/tenured faculty versus non-tenure-track faculty. We have been asked by the Faculty Consultative Committee to address this issue and report on it to the FCC.
6. The consideration in promotion-and-tenure decisions of computer-based discourse and alternative publications/work.

Professor O'Loughlin noted that the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs has been discussing the inability of faculty members to take sabbaticals because of the costs. Her campus, Morris, has \$30,000 available to cover the cost of nine faculty members eligible for sabbatical supplements next year. People cannot do what they need to because they cannot go on sabbatical. It is up to the Committee to decide if this is an issue of academic freedom.

The Committee has to decide how to frame the issue, Professor Marran suggested. She said it appears to be a funding issue. Professor O'Loughlin demurred and said it involves the freedom to pursue research.

The last item, Professor Marran commented, is related to the issue of what should be included in 7.12 statements. She asked Committee members to let her know if there are other issues the Committee should be addressing. Professor Elliott noted that the AAUP leadership will be joining the Committee to continue discussion of issues raised in the white paper on academic freedom (i.e., further amplification of work-for-hire and protection of academic freedom for graduate students).

### **3. Academic Freedom and External Research Support**

Professor Marran now welcomed Professor Bearinger, chair of the Senate Research Committee, and Vice President Mulcahy, to lead a discussion of the relationship between academic freedom and external research support.

Professor Bearinger said she was wearing two hats at this meeting: as chair of the Senate Research Committee and as a faculty member since the 1980s who has received research training grants. She noted that the Senate Research Committee has not discussed the issue she is bringing today; the chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee suggested bringing it to this Committee. But as chair of the Senate Research Committee, her primary goal is to consider the impact of policy and practices at the University and their relationship to incentives and disincentives for conducting research. This is a theme of enduring interest and impact for faculty members.

The main question she is raising today is this: When departments and schools require prior approval or will not sign off on grant proposals, are they restricting academic freedom? Professor Bearinger said she would focus only on grant proposals going in at the negotiated rates for indirect cost (F&A) costs.

Professor Bearinger provided some background information on F&A rates. The purpose of F&A funds that accompany research and training grants is to cover the infrastructure and administrative costs of research. The rates are negotiated between the University and the federal agencies, and new rates were announced in December, 2011, that are effective for four years. Primarily there are three levels of rates: 8%, 26%, and 52%, for purposes of this discussion. In comparison with its peer institutions, the

University is in the middle of the range for federal research grants (the 52% rate); the rates for other institutions range from the mid-40 % to the mid-50%. The 1% increase over the previous rate of 51%, while it appears small, will generate several million dollars for the University. The University receives about \$180 million in F&A funds.

The 52% rate is the general rate the University expects for federal and many other research grants (although it does not receive that rate on all grants). The 26% rate is the off-campus rate (when the University does not have facilities costs), and the 8% rate is for training grants (the federal limit).

Professor Bearinger reported that some departments are failing to sign off on proposals that are being submitted at approved, negotiated rates and some are moving in the direction of requiring prior approval. One colleague wrote a large research grant that included several community-based projects and needed the signature of the college's associate dean for research; the faculty member was told that the college would not approve or support it because the costs of administering the grant would be greater than the 26% allowed for off-campus research. (Another department supported the proposal at 26% and the proposal was submitted.) In her view, Professor Bearinger said, when faculty members prepare proposals, they need to know that they will be supported by their department/unit—but, currently, there is a move toward not signing on grants less with less than a 52% rate regardless of their nature. Is that a constraint on academic freedom?

She said she is fully supportive of the University recovering the funds to do the University's business, there are costs of doing research, and she is also aware of the challenges to units to cover their costs—but the University is also saying that it wants its faculty to be productive in research and research training.

There is a particular problem with department/units supporting community-based or off-campus research, Professor Bearinger said. Consider that the University publicly states its commitment to improving the well-being of people and communities throughout Minnesota. One only needs to read the inscription on the façade of Northrop Auditorium: "Dedicated to the Advancement of Learning and the Search for Truth; Devoted to the Instruction of Youth and the Welfare of the State." President Kaler has also said the University is dedicated to serving the welfare of the State, and that must include community-based research. The problem is that current policies and procedures are at odds with current practices that block investigators from submitting grants at approved, negotiated rates.

One strategy might be to consider creating matching grants for community-based research that would provide an offset to unit costs when they only receive 26% in F&A funds. There needs to be a plan in place to support community-based research, similar to the idea of Senior Vice President Robert Jones' office having the capacity to support community-partnered research and similar to the commitment to undertaking inter-professional training, supported by Office of Graduate Education. Units wrestle with the question of how to approve grants when they have no sources of support for those infrastructure costs. But her point, Professor Bearinger emphasized, is that what is sacrificed by saying "no" to investigators who engage in such research is academic freedom.

Faculty who write training grants are also disadvantaged and the institution needs a separate algorithm for calculating the costs and benefits associated with these grants. Training grants contribute to the University's mission (recruiting graduate students and postdocs, supporting tuition), and one of the best predictors of scholarly productivity at a research-intensive university is the quality of post-doctoral

fellows. The University cannot compete without the resources for attracting high-quality postdocs. Thus there is need for an algorithm to calculate the costs and benefits of training grants, that considers other tangible as well as intangible gains. In some units there is an implicit "ledger": If a faculty member has one training grant with the 8% F&A rate, they can't have another one at that same rate and need to get one with the 52% rate. In short, training grants thus become second-class grants, in some schools.

Professor Bearinger said she wished to hear the Committee's discussion about these issues.

Vice President Mulcahy followed Professor Bearinger's comments with the observation that the University has a policy that it will accept grants at the rates Professor Bearinger has reported. For a college or department to not approve grants that carry rates acceptable to the University is not institutional policy. The University routinely accepts grants with less than a 52% F&A rate (e.g., from the American Heart Association and many similar organizations), and its policy is to accept grants from organizations that have a published F&A rate. The question Professor Bearinger has raised is an implementation matter at lower levels.

Dr. Mulcahy pointed out that F&A funds reimburse the actual costs of doing research. The University, using federal rules to calculate it, has a 63% indirect cost rate; the federal government provides 52%, so the University is subsidizing the difference between the rate received and the actual cost. That is just part of the rules of the game. The federal government imposes a 26% cap on administrative costs. The key point is that indirect costs are costs that the University cost-shares. When one sums all the grants the University receives, the effective indirect (F&A) rate it receives is 37%, so there is in effect about a 25-cent subsidy for each dollar of research funding at the institution. So departments, because of the budget model, may be saying that certain research is too expensive because they cannot recover enough of the costs. He said he is not trying to justify such action by departments, he is simply explaining why it might happen.

A number of institutions have made a decision not to do certain types of research, such as stem-cell research, Dr. Mulcahy related. At the individual level, if a faculty member at the University of Minnesota said that he or she needed a herd of elephants to do research, there are practical considerations that come into play. The University policy on indirect costs is this: If there is (for example) a federal grant that carries only a 10% F&A rate, it would require approval because it is below the published rates that the federal government will pay, and a decision to approve it would mean that the department/college would underwrite the indirect costs not covered by the 10% rate. That decision would be at the departmental level.

All of the 52% received in F&A funding goes to the college, Dr. Mulcahy said in response to a query. As does tuition. The college then receives a bill for space, administrative costs, police, etc., that is paid from the F&A funds and tuition revenue.

So the University policy is not enforceable at the department level, Professor Marran asked? Dr. Mulcahy said the University policy is what it will do, not what departments must do. The policy says the University will not raise questions about submitting requests for federal grants that carry F&A rates of 52%, 26%, or 8%, depending on the category. Whether or not it is an academic-freedom issue, it is a problem if departments are saying that faculty members cannot submit grants that carry the accepted, established federal levels of F&A support. If a company pays 25%, and a department wants to accept a grant from it, the University wants to review it because if it does not collect the higher rate, other

departments will be paying for it—but by and large the University accepts such grants. When all other faculty members can obtain grants at the accepted rates, faculty in certain departments should not be barred from doing so.

So the department has the right to set its own policy, Professor Wells asked? There is much departmental autonomy, Dr. Mulcahy said, and the University has not taken the position that departments must accept grant proposals. It does seem to be the case that the departments can make policy in this area. Her question remains, Professor Bearinger said: Does that infringe on the academic freedom of faculty members to pursue scholarship? Faculty members should not have to shop around for a grant proposal sign-off; they should know if they seek to write a grant proposal with a recognized and negotiated rate, it will be accepted. The Committee should address that question and also the question of the implicit "ledger" that it is said some units keep.

Professor Gaugler said he'd like a Committee discussion of whether this is truly academic freedom. Units are saying that a grant can't be submitted for administrative reasons. But there should be a unit decision earlier than a day before the grant is to be submitted. What about six weeks in advance, Professor Bearinger inquired? This goes to promotion and tenure, Professor Marran said; Professor Gaugler agreed, citing the example of a junior faculty member expected to obtain funding who applies for a training grant at 8% and the department says "no." That affects the person's progress to tenure.

This issue is one of the effects of decentralization; it affects the department's bottom line, Professor O'Loughlin said. Should there be an appeals process? That could be a problem with timelines for submitting grants. There could also be continuing education about how to treat grants. She said she could see the potential for an appeal to the Senate Judicial Committee if a grant were denied because the denial could clearly affect a junior faculty member trying to obtain funding.

Vice President Mulcahy agreed that timeliness would be an issue. The University negotiates F&A rates with the federal government and agrees to them. In terms of the question about department autonomy that Professor Wells raised, there could be a University policy providing that any grant submitted at the published rate (federal, foundation, etc.) cannot be denied on the basis of the F&A rate the grant carries. One can imagine why a department would deny a grant because it requires the herd of elephants or for other legitimate reasons. But the University should normally accept grants at published rates. Dr. Mulcahy said that this is the first he'd heard of this issue. He has heard complaints about cases where the University declined to grant a waiver to take a grant with lower F&A rates, but he said he did not believe there should be an option to deny grants at the department or college level that carry the rates the University has said it will accept.

This Committee could support that position, Professor O'Loughlin suggested.

Is prior approval a recent phenomenon, Professor Marran asked? Yes, in the last two years or so, in some units, Professor Bearinger said. Usually one thinks about peer review when contemplating academic freedom, Professor Marran said; why not let a grant go forward and be peer reviewed rather than require prior approval? The sign-off by the University indicates that it will accept the grant if awarded and that it has adequate resources to do the research, Dr. Mulcahy explained—it is a pre-award assurance to the sponsoring agency that there will be resources available to the PI. So it is an infrastructure-based decision, not an idea-based decision, Professor Marran asked? It is, Dr. Mulcahy affirmed. He has encouraged Sponsored Projects Administration (at their suggestion) to think about

whether a dean and department chair also need to sign off on grants. His office is willing to go with one signature, but some colleges and departments wanted the right to see applications and to sign off on them.

This is an academic freedom and RESPONSIBILITY issue, Professor Gaugler said. Faculty members should inform their units in a timely way what they propose to study. But there should be a difference between notification and peer review at the department level, Professor Bearinger said. They should be separate. It is reasonable to require approval if a grant is submitted at below the published, accepted rates, and Vice President Mulcahy could set parameters about what departments and colleges can do or not, such as being barred from not approving grant proposals with the negotiated F&A rates because of the F&A rate.

They revised the policy on indirect costs to provide that the University will not force a department to accept lower rates than the negotiated rates, Dr. Mulcahy said, but that policy allows departments flexibility. They did not anticipate MORE restrictive policies at lower levels of the University.

What about the "ledger," Professor Marran asked? One question is about the timing. Someone could be denied a grant request because of where it falls in the budget cycle. That could be an academic-freedom issue; has it happened? Not to his knowledge, Dr. Mulcahy said. The "ledger" is a metaphor, Professor Bearinger observed, and she sees it as an academic-freedom issue because for someone whose career is teaching, as suggested on the Northrop façade, the idea that faculty members should be limited to one grant that has an 8% F&A rate until they first get one with higher rate.

From a business standpoint, the implicit "ledger" is not a good idea, Professor Gaugler said. Why stop someone who is good at getting and administering grants, an expert in training grants, but require them to get another grant at 52%? In the case of one department, there must be approval for any grant that carries less than a 20% F&A rate, Professor Bearinger said, a stance that betrays a lack of understanding of training grants. Dr. Mulcahy said he agreed with Professor Gaugler: There is need for recognition at the institutional level of the need for more training grants, not fewer. A department policy restricting training grants works against the interests of the institution.

This seems like a violation of academic freedom, Professor Kimberly commented, and also a problem with a department culture and administration. How can a committee such as this one affect a department with a bad culture? One assumes that a department administrator in a unit with a lot of grants would approach the faculty as a group and say that the department has a budget problem that needs to be dealt with.

What the Committee can do, with respect to its charge, is figure out how to get the message out to the University that all forms of research are equal, Professor O'Loughlin said. She is interested in civic engagement and was part of the civic-engagement task force about ten years ago. What links these issues together is the protection of the faculty right to pursue different forums and levels of funding. With respect to culture, a department may be told by the Vice President for Research that it cannot deny a grant proposal, but it may say that it can because it does not meet standards and is out in left field, and the department could feel that its academic freedom has been infringed. The department could tell Vice President Mulcahy to "forget it." But the idea that all forms of research are equal is a part of academic freedom. This could be part of continuing education on academic freedom, she concluded.

Vice President Mulcahy said, in response to Professor Kimberly, that he believed this is a problem of a subculture and does not represent the institutional culture, so is easier to change. Implementing a policy takes the issue off the table and avoids conflating it with academic freedom. He said his office could draft a policy on sign-off on grant proposal submitted at the pre-approved F&A rates.

Professor Gaugler commented that this issue illustrates the intersection of academic freedom with the University mission and the corporatization of higher education, where some research might lead to the immediate production of money but the production of high-quality scholars and future research collaborators. Many may not see that outcome.

If a granting agency has no set F&A rate, then what happens, Professor Marran asked? Professor Wells said that a faculty member should go to the department chair first. Dr. Mulcahy agreed that there is more room for negotiation when there is no predetermined F&A rate; when the rate is lower, the department ends up underwriting a larger share of the indirect costs. All universities received less than their real costs for research and the "loss" varies by type of grant. Everyone knows that institutions have greater than 8% costs for training grants, although he does not know what they are in that case, Dr. Mulcahy said, but in all cases the institutions recognize the value added and that the University is receiving other benefits, so it accepts the suboptimal return on F&A costs.

Professor Marran adjourned the meeting at 12:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota