

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, April 25, 2013
1:00 – 3:00
Room 238A Morrill Hall

- Present: Sally Gregory Kohlstedt (chair), Linda Bearinger, Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman, James Cloyd, Chris Cramer, Will Durfee, Nancy Ehlke, Michael Hancher, Scott Lanyon, Russell Luepker, James Pacala, Ned Patterson, Paul Ranelli, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, George Sheets
- Absent: Brian Buhr, Elaine Tyler May, Alon McCormick
- Guests: Provost Karen Hanson, Vice Provost Robert McMaster (Office of Undergraduate Education); President Eric Kaler
- Other: Deb Cran (Office of the Provost); Chief of Staff Amy Phenix, Jon Steadland (Office of the President); Ken Savary (Office of the Board of Regents)

[In these minutes: (1) discussion with Provost Hanson; (2) admissions issues; (3) committee business; (4) statements from the Senate Research Committee; (5) discussion with President Kaler]

Professor Kohlstedt convened the meeting at 12:05 and welcomed (via Google hangout) the new Committee member from Duluth, Professor Paul Ranelli.

1. Discussion with Provost Hanson

Professor Kohlstedt turned to Provost Hanson for a discussion of a number of items.

Provost Hanson began with graduate education and said that she and Professors Kohlstedt and Hancher agreed that it would be a good idea to consolidate efforts on addressing a number of issues that have been raised. She noted that a survey had gone out and had received an excellent response rate from students and faculty members; the Graduate School is now analyzing and summarizing the responses. The plan is take issues identified in the survey and by senate committees and provide them to work groups or task forces; she said she would stay in touch with the Committee about proceeding.

With respect to e-learning and MOOCs, some of the faculty members who offered the inaugural University MOOCs found the work more onerous than they expected while others did not. Provost Hanson reported that there is an evaluative group reviewing the experience they've had so far with MOOC's and helping to decide what the University should be doing in this arena. She said there are a number of groups at work trying to craft a vision; the University is not trading water on MOOCs but the landscape keeps changing.

* 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.

Administrators and faculty are also looking at where the University can offer more online classes to enhance timely degree-completion. Investing in those courses could compete with investments in MOOCs. In the meantime, Professor Cramer and Dr. Rubinyi in her office are developing a set of principles for choosing the next group of MOOC offerings. Provost Hanson said she did not expect that there will be more than five or so offerings; the number may depend on what resources go into degree-completion programs.

Provost Hanson and the Committee had a brief discussion on the collection and reporting of longitudinal data on faculty and instructional P&A numbers. Professor Lanyon reported that there is an ad hoc subcommittee with members from the Committee on Faculty Affairs and the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure that is trying to identify recurring data needs; he said he expects it will report later in the semester. The question for the faculty is the national issue of the shifting proportion of tenured and tenure-track faculty in colleges and universities and the extent to which that is happening at the University.

Provost Hanson encouraged the development of a plan on what data and information the committees want each year.

Professor Cramer noted the existence of a policy requiring each college to develop a personnel plan indicating the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty, contract faculty, P&A teaching staff, and so on; Professor Lanyon reported that there is also a joint subcommittee working on revisions to the plan. The proposal will come to this Committee at some point.

Provost Hanson turned to salary-equity matters and noted the recent return visit of the University's consultant from the University of Wisconsin, Professor Murray Clayton. The data do not show huge problems but there are questions about certain areas. She has talked to the deans about the need for colleges to have a mechanism to deal with salary-equity issues and that the mechanisms need to be institutionalized. Some deans worry that it is so late in the term that they will have difficulties addressing any big problems that show up, but thus far the colleges have not faced any "big" problems.

Professor Bearinger asked Provost Hanson what she is saying to deans of colleges that were not included in the original analysis (i.e., the colleges of the Academic Health Center). There was cause for concern a year ago, and if the situation is the same as it was, the concern remains. She also objected again to excluding cross-college comparisons when at least one college is predominantly women.

Provost Hanson said that the analyses are internal to the colleges and do not address the larger question of whether women are underpaid. This second study was a replication of the study conducted in 2011 that used salary data from 2007. Later this summer, they will begin the analyses of the salary structure for tenured and tenure-track faculty in those colleges in the AHC that were not included in the original and replicated study. She said she has told all the deans that they should have an equity mechanism in place and need not wait on the results of the Clayton study. Professor Bearinger asked if the deans are expected to work with the faculty in creating the mechanism or if it is to be solely an administrative process.

Provost Hanson said there are differences across colleges in how they approach the matter. In the first year the process may not have gone below the dean's office but the processes can be reshaped in the future—but there should be salary adjustments this year if problems are identified, and there also needs to

be a mechanism in place to address problems that may arise. She has spoken with the Women's Faculty Cabinet about this; there is a patchwork across the University, with faculty members involved in merit decisions about faculty members in some units. For those cases where they have not been, it will be a culture change to get them involved—not that administrators oppose the involvement, but it opens discussion about what achievement in the field means. The discussions are healthy but they can be difficult.

Professor Bearinger asked if this Committee should communicate with lead faculty committees in each college about how equity issues should be addressed. Professor Cramer observed that this Committee has not historically been involved in college governance except for the membership of the Academic Health Center FCC chair on this Committee. Professor Kohlstedt related that the dean had taken the leadership in her college but agreed with Provost Hanson that the process will vary across colleges. Presumably the provost's office will keep an eye on what gets put in place. Then perhaps the Committee should communicate with the AHC colleges, Professor Bearinger responded. Professor Patterson said that this issue is high on the list of his committee (the AHC FCC).

Professor Ropers-Huilman recalled that the average difference in men's and women's faculty salaries, according to the first study, was about 2.2%. Has that changed? It has not, Provost Hanson said. What will the University do to ensure that another analysis won't demonstrate the same difference again in, for example, three years, Professor Ropers-Huilman asked? Provost Hanson said there would be continuing analyses and that they can be done internally.

Professor Kohlstedt said that the Committee would like to see the breakdown of where issues exist. If overall the situation is the same, it is still likely that some numbers are diverging and some converging; the dean and college faculty need to look at the situation in the colleges.

Professor Ropers-Huilman asked when the next report would be available; Provost Hanson said it would be soon. Professor Ropers-Huilman expressed the hope that the report itself would be provided, not just general information. Provost Hanson said that there has been concern about obtaining the data before salaries are set, but the report might follow salary-setting, and the deans are amenable to taking action this year, depending on the results of the replicated salary study.

Professor Bitterman asked if there has been any change in the process for setting initial salaries. While steps can be taken this year, it is more of a challenge to look back. His department found a high correlation between starting salary and where one is now; starting salaries were statistically lower for women. Has anything been done about that? Not systematically, the provost said, and initial salary can depend on other offers. But she agreed the problem needs to be addressed.

It was agreed the Committee would take up the full report when it is issued.

Professor Ranelli asked about two matters: resolution of the problems with electronic mail (Google) within the Academic Health Center, which Professor Kohlstedt said the Committee would take up with Vice President Studham, and a few departments without approved 7.12 statements, which are still in the vice provost's office.

Professor Kohlstedt asked that when the administration appoints ad hoc committees on a topic, it would be helpful to know that they have been appointed and who is serving on them so that individuals

who have concerns about that topic can bring them to the group. Provost Hanson said that is a good point. She said, apropos of the Faculty Committee on Academic Technology that she and Vice President Studham appointed, that it is not making policy, it is an advisory committee gathering faculty viewpoints.

Provost Hanson turned to a few points she wished to note. She expressed the hope that faculty members participated in the public events for candidates for Vice Provost for Student Affairs; she hopes to make an offer very soon and welcomed additional thoughts.

The CLA dean search is starting; Provost Hanson said she has met with the associate deans and CLA chairs about the direction of the college and has solicited nominations from CLA faculty, staff, and students for search committee membership. Dean Fisher, of the College of Design, is chairing the search committee and all other members will be CLA faculty, staff, and students, and the committee will start its work very soon. She intends to hold listening sessions before the end of the semester to help develop the position description and then launch the search late this spring. She hopes the committee can identify finalists by the early fall, so that campus visits could proceed early in the fall semester.

In terms of the interim CLA dean, the provost said, she has also spoken with the associate deans and chairs about the appointment; she does not want someone to serve only as a placeholder. She has asked that the associate deans and chairs think about someone who can serve as an active and visible interim dean, while not having any interest in being a candidate for the "permanent" position. She also invited nominations for an interim dean from the CLA faculty, staff, and students.

Professor Bearinger said that the process being used for Dean of the Medical School and Vice President for the Health Sciences is very different from the process being used for the Dean of CLA and said she would like to see a mechanism that involves more of the faculty. There were two sessions recently for faculty views but many could not attend. Provost Hanson said she is certain that the co-chairs of the search committee would welcome faculty views at any time; Professor Luepker said he did attend one of the sessions and there were not a lot of faculty members present; his college's consultative committee is sending a letter to the search committee.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked the provost for joining the meeting.

2. Admissions Issues

Professor Kohlstedt now welcomed Vice Provost McMaster to the meeting to pick up the discussion on admissions issues, inasmuch as there had been insufficient time to address all the questions the Committee had posed when he first joined it earlier in the year. The questions for today were these:

1. Is there consultation from FCC you'll find useful as the pilot year-round degree programs proceed? What are the questions that need to be addressed in order to plan for future? Do you anticipate new contractual patterns to emerge for tenure-track faculty who elect to teach in the summer rather than during the standard nine-month period?
2. Do you know, or can we learn somehow, whether students with more financial-aid-need are currently getting enough, or right, advising to support good graduation- planning and debt decisions? If something more or different needs to be tried beyond current efforts, particularly with such students (with the most financial need), are there ways FCC can consult and support?

3. While some faculty members find Moodle more simple to use than WebCT, others have complained to us about Moodle and its limitations. What provisions are there for faculty members to provide effective feedback about classroom technology (hardware and software both)? What remedies are possible in this case?
4. What are the procedures for enrolling students in CLA? Has admission to CLA been capped—or the cap lowered—to boost the ACT scores of admitted students? Do you have data on the internal transfer of students from CLA and into CLA from specific other colleges? What fraction want to transfer but are not allowed to?
5. Can you give us an update on the enrollment management plan? Is it being implemented? Is it on track? Are parts on hold? Has reaction to the plan around the U, the legislature and citizens been positive?

Dr. McMaster took up the questions in order. With respect to #1, he said it is his sense about the year-round curriculum that the decision has been made to experiment over the next few years, such as the pilot programs in the College of Design. They are continuing to do an analysis of which undergraduate courses are offered in the summer, which liberal-education courses, and so on. They have a report that suggests the campus is doing quite well in offering a rigorous summer curriculum.

Where the campus is falling short is having 8 different summer sessions; Dr. McMaster said he believes that the core undergraduate curriculum, especially liberal-education courses, should be offered during the regular 8-week summer term because they would like students to be able to take two or three summer courses at the same time. So they would like achieve more consistency and move more core curriculum courses into the regular 8-week term.

Professor Ropers-Huilman asked if there is any evidence in the scholarly literature or from the students that that is what they want. It would seem that variety is attractive. Dr. McMaster said that his student advisory board wanted a more standardized term, in part because with predictable 8-week classes they can work part of the summer—they do not want to be here all summer because of varying summer terms. The May term is where they would like to see study-abroad and other more intensive experiences and the regular summer term should be for enrolling in core and liberal-education courses. There is no plan to eliminate the May term, he assured the Committee, but they are looking at the start date.

Professor Lanyon asked if students demand a different set of courses in the summer from those expected during fall and spring semesters. Dr. McMaster said not; the basic courses are offered because they are meeting demand. He added that they would also like to migrate as many courses to online versions as possible so that students can finish two or three of them during the summer even if they are off campus. There are students that depart the campus and then enroll in courses at their local institutions.

Vice Provost McMaster noted that there is also discussion about beginning spring semester earlier than the Martin Luther King holiday. It was agreed that Professor McCormick would raise this issue for discussion at the Faculty Senate meeting on May 2 when the 2017-18 calendars are brought up for approval.

Professor Ratliff-Crain said that each year a number of UM Morris students are interested in taking Twin Cities courses online during the summer, but the number that are extended term (courses that can be completed over 9 months but are ineligible for financial aid) are a problem. If the Twin Cities can offer a more developed summer online program over a regular term, that could streamline the way students from other campuses could take them.

Dr. McMaster said they have not discussed Professor Ratliff-Crain's first point, about the summer term, but his second point is a terrific idea that he said he would like to pursue.

Professor Bearinger asked if there is a difference in financial aid for online courses versus those that are in-class. Not if it is a standard class offered by the institution, Dr. McMaster said. Summer is a different problem because not much aid is available—which is a big impediment to increased summer offerings.

Dr. McMaster turned to question #2 and provided a table of data about Pell grants (the recipients of which are essentially low-income students, with a household income of less than \$50,000, which is how the University identifies students in the category). Over the last five years, the percentage of all enrolled students (Twin Cities) with Pell grants rose from 20% to 26% (27% in 2010-11, 26% in 2011-12), although that number is slightly affected by a federal redefinition of recipients. About one-half of the Pell-eligible students have an Expected Family Contribution (to the costs of college; EFC) of zero because their family incomes are so low. The University tries to cover tuition and fees for these students through Pell grants, state grants, and the University's Promise scholarships.

Professor Kohlstedt observed that if a very-low-income student received \$5,550 from a Pell grant (the maximum possible), about \$3,500 from a state grant, and about \$4,000 in a Promise scholarship, that would cover tuition and fees, but what about the rest? Dr. McMaster agreed that the commitment to those students does not cover the full cost of attendance, which is about \$25,000; the rest they make up with loans, work, work-study funds, and parent loans. There is a way to talk to students and parents about debt and the use of money, for both low- and middle-income families.

In terms of support for students, not all are in the President's Emerging Scholar (PES) program, but it provides a much more robust support system in advising, peer support, and summer programs. The PES program is the Access to Success program expanded to cover four years because they recognize there is a group of students who need enhanced support.

Professor Bitterman asked where students are coached on financial literacy if they come from a poor family. During Welcome Week there is a session on financial literacy, Dr. McMaster said, and there is a University initiative, "Live Like a Student Now," as well as additional voluntary courses. This fall there will also be a highly-recommended webinar they will want students to take. How will they measure the effect, Professor Bitterman inquired? The proof will be in the levels of indebtedness of students, Dr. McMaster responded. Any student who takes out a loan must have counseling (the federal government requires it), and they look at indebtedness and success: If a student has high debt, is he or she doing well in school?

Professor Cramer suggested there are a number of metrics one could use, in response to Professor Bitterman's query, such as retention rates. Dr. McMaster agreed that it is not an exact science, but they know that as a student's indebtedness increases, they do more counseling.

Professor Ben-Ner commented that for students with an EFC of zero, it is likely they come from a more deprived background and require more attention. Dr. McMaster agreed. If a student feels that he or she has run out of money and needs to drop out, the campus has counselors that try to find money to support the student. Professor Ben-Ner asked about the debt levels of Pell recipients; Dr. McMaster said that his office would have to disaggregate the data in order to answer the question.

Professor Cloyd said it appears the University is doing well for students who are enrolled; does it do anything with students who have applied in order to determine if they can afford to attend? All institutions must post their costs and financial aid, Dr. McMaster replied. The Office of Student Finance goes to high schools and talks about the costs of college and how students can pay for it.

That is also the kind of thing that retiree volunteers could do, Professor Kohlstedt suggested. Dr. McMaster said that is a good idea but financial aid rules and federal regulations are so complicated that he would not endorse the proposal unless Kris Wright, the Director of the Office of Student Finance, were involved.

Professor Hancher said he assumed MnSCU is looking at the same questions as the University; is there cooperation between the two systems? Dr. McMaster said the financial aid officers from all three systems (the University, MnSCU, and the private colleges) meet to discuss issues.

Dr. McMaster turned to question #3 and said he is not involved in it. There is the Classroom Advisory Subcommittee; he suggested taking up the question with it. The decisions about technology are made in the Office of Information Technology with a faculty advisory group.

Professor Kohlstedt asked Dr. McMaster if his office receives much feedback about the way faculty are using technology. Is there a survey? Dr. McMaster was unaware of any surveys, but perhaps the Senate Committee on Information Technology would have additional information.

Professor Ben-Ner observed that many faculty members ponder the balance between the classroom and technology; many publishers and vendors offer services similar to Moodle, some of which are a subset of Moodle and can be incorporated in it. A number of faculty members are thinking about investing in those options; it would help to know what the plans are with respect to Moodle. Dr. McMaster said that with respect to undergraduates, it is important that there be one platform and there is a problem if there are multiple platforms. They do not want to see more than one. Professor Hancher said that the question may be a technical one but it affects classrooms and is a shared responsibility between the Office of Information Technology and the Office of Undergraduate Education because it matters to the classroom experience of both faculty and students. Dr. McMaster agreed.

Dr. McMaster and the Committee discussed question #4, including the relationship between CLA and institution-wide enrollment management.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Vice Provost McMaster for joining the Committee again.

3. Committee Business

Professor Kohlstedt next called for election of the vice chair of the Committee for 2013-14. Paper ballots were distributed; Professor Ropers-Huilman was elected and received the congratulations of her colleagues.

Professor Kohlstedt noted that by longstanding practice the Committee nominates an individual to serve as vice chair of the Faculty Senate, which person also serves as vice chair of the University Senate and as an ex officio voting member of this Committee and the Senate Consultative Committee. The Committee concurred that the individual selected should come from CLA, given the projected 2013-14 membership of the Committee, and a number of faculty members were identified as possible candidates. The Committee voted to delegate to Professor Kohlstedt the responsibility for identifying an individual willing to serve.

Professor Cloyd suggested, apropos of the process of identifying candidates to stand for election to the Committee, that it create a "standard operating procedure."

Committee members next identified potential members of a task force or ad hoc committee on graduate education, presumably to be appointed jointly with the provost. It is hoped that the task force can begin its work this May, gather information over the summer, and hit the ground running in the fall in order to develop recommendations by December.

4. Statements from the Senate Research Committee

Professor Kohlstedt next turned to Faculty Senate docket matters. Although the Committee approved the docket at its last meeting, two new items have come from the Senate Research Committee and one from a Graduate School committee (principles or learning outcomes for graduate education, which the Committee had already voted to place on the docket for discussion). The two items from the Senate Research Committee are proposed for action, one dealing with the Congressional ban on NSF funding for political science research (except under specified circumstances) and the other addressing issues related to institutional training grants. The Committee had voted by email earlier in the week to put the items on the docket; the question at hand at the meeting was whether the Committee wished to endorse the statements.

The statement on the ban on political science research read as follows:

The Senate Research Committee, a 21-member standing committee of the University of Minnesota Faculty Senate, strongly objects to the imposition of the Congressional ban on the provision of funding by the National Science Foundation for political science studies of democracy and public policy research. (<http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/113/hr933/text>) Such a prohibition is a violation of America's long-standing respect for academic freedom and free inquiry and is a sinister precedent for possible future prohibition on other kinds of research that certain members of Congress may not like because it does not conform to their particular beliefs. In essence, the Congressionally-mandated ban constitutes de facto censorship, would stymie needed inquiry, and thus deny citizens access to unbiased scientific analysis of key issues facing the country. We believe, contrary to Congressional action, that research in political science makes a positive contribution to our democracy and to democratic citizenship.

We urge the members of the Minnesota Congressional delegation to move as expeditiously as possible to reverse the prohibition and to take a strong stand against any such prohibitions in the future.

Professor Ben-Ner said that he voted to put the item on the docket but did not vote to endorse it. His reason was not because he opposed it but because there are many other Congressional misdeeds with respect to research; why single out this one? Professor Cloyd recalled that one Committee had urged caution in voting to endorse the statement. What was it? Professor Cramer said he had done so, but only because the Committee had no details about the Congressional action.

Professor Sheets noted that the Committee had been provided an article from *Science* that provided some legislative history behind the provision and a complete legislative history is available on the government web site; the article and the legislative history make it clear that Senator Coburn, who sponsored the amendment to the budget bill, explicitly intended to discourage or eliminate NSF funding only for certain kinds of political science research. Of the examples mentioned by the senator, most or all concern U.S. national politics, such as congressional voting patterns and the content of government web pages. This is a change in policy that will have substantial impact on funding in the field of political science.

Professor Pacala moved that the Committee endorse the statement and said, in response to Professor Ben-Ner's point, that this legislation crosses a threshold, does not pass a smell test, and he believes the legislation untenable. Professor Hancher seconded the motion.

Professor Cramer observed that there are many fields that NSF does not fund. President Kaler, who had joined the meeting, said that the problem is that the federal government is not censoring research, it is simply saying it will not fund certain research, and there is a difference. This is not a censorship issue; NSF also does not fund comparative literature.

Professor Sheets rejoined that the government did not fund comparative literature in the past, but this ban is a change in existing policy; according to the amendment, NSF may indeed continue to fund political science research, but only if the research satisfies the judgment of the Director of NSF, who is called upon to certify that the research is directly connected with furthering national security. In other words, a standard of academic peer-review is not determinative. Instead, political science research is subject to special scrutiny, based upon its content, not its quality. Projects in political science will only be funded if they pass a special review by the Director of NSF. President Kaler observed that in the near future, because of budget constraints, the Department of Energy may need to decide whether it will fund high-energy physics or nuclear physics. Professor Sheets said that would be a decision based on fiscal issues, not on a policy of subjecting one or the other to special scrutiny based upon its content.

The Committee voted 7-1 to endorse the statement; one Committee member abstained.

The second item from the Senate Research Committee dealt with training grants and read as follows (between the * * *):

* * *

University Support for Institutional Training Grant Proposals

In concert with a renewed focus on assuring the quality of graduate education at the University of Minnesota, the Senate Research Committee has considered a number of issues related to the support of institutional training grants at the University of Minnesota. Training grants, typically awarded for five-year periods, provide graduate students and post-doctoral fellows with stipends and a substantial portion of their tuition expenses plus health insurance and an allotment for research expenses. As distinct from an individual training grant to a single student or fellow, the institution that is awarded an institutional training grant selects the students and fellows who will receive support from the grant. Most institutional training grants do not provide full Facilities and Administrative (F&A) or Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR) rates and often limit infrastructure support, i.e., FTE for faculty and staff; nevertheless, they are an important factor in the ratings of academic performance and prestige of research universities.

Institutional training grants provide multiple benefits to the University, including:

- A commitment of funding from training grants, often for the duration of a student's graduate program, attracts outstanding students and post-doctoral fellows;
- Top quality students and post-doctoral fellows become engaged in research at the University of Minnesota and are more likely to join the faculty at research-intensive universities and become productive researchers;
- Grant dollars are given to students that are specifically designated for payment of tuition;
- Holding a federal institutional training grant draws recognition and gives status to the University, the faculty, their research, and the programs supported by these grants; and
- The provision of additional research personnel (graduate students and post-doctoral fellows) through training grants, beyond that provided by research grants, increases productivity and makes the University more competitive for continued research grant funding.

A confluence of factors has led to misconceptions related to the value of institutional training grants:

First, for federally-funded training grants from some major sponsors, including NIH, the Centers for Disease Control, and the Health Research and Services Administration (HRSA), the sponsor-authorized Facilities & Administrative rate (F & A) is 8%, as compared to the current negotiated rate of 52% for most federal research grants awarded to the University of Minnesota. In addition, some federal grants, e.g., NSF-IGERT (National Science Foundation - Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship), exclude costs allocated for student support when calculating the F&A that can be recovered.

Second, our current University budget model in which expenditures drive the cost pool allocations does not distinguish among expenditures subject to F&A recovery and expenditures for which no F&A recovery can be generated. The current mechanism for determining a college's share of central administrative expenses does not differentiate between training and research grants, i.e., the differing nature of the money expended on an external award (e.g., FTE for research employees versus stipend/tuition support to graduate students). Thus, in determining cost pool charges, the University currently includes expenditures made to students, e.g. stipends and tuition, as equivalent to expenditures of salary to personnel employed on a research grant. Thus, with no differentiation on types of expenditures in the cost allocation model, added to the agency-dictated lower F & A rate on institutional

training grants, training grants can easily be perceived as not “carrying their weight” in terms of earned F&A recovery relative to allocation of costs to an RRC.

Third, there is an unwillingness in some colleges, to provide match dollars or contributed FTE to faculty who will be teaching, mentoring, and administering an institutional training grant. Conversely, providing match dollars to a grant can be perceived as adding to a unit’s cost by virtue of holding an institutional training grant.

Fourth, promotion-and-tenure criteria may not adequately acknowledge faculty with training grants as compared to traditional research grants. Faculty may be discouraged from investing in writing training grants while on tenure-track in particular. Rather, they should be valued because they support the educational mission of the University and commitment to preparing scholars. Furthermore, insofar as these training grants do produce publications from research or on related matters of pedagogy, they should be acknowledged in parallel fashion to research grants.

However, due to one or more of these factors, faculty have indicated that some units discourage the submission of institutional training grants, limit the frequency or number of training grants that a faculty member may hold, do not provide matching funds or contributed time, or are unwilling to sign off on training grant submissions. Increasingly, even though a grant mechanism may not require matching dollars as an indication of university support, the proposal may be disadvantaged without such support (except in the instances where match dollars are not allowed).

As a demonstration of the University’s support for institutional training grants and acknowledgment of their role in assuring the quality of graduate education and graduate students and post-doctoral fellows, the Senate Research Committee has identified the following changes that would make the University more supportive and encouraging of training grants:

- 1) Clear designation of a unit within central administration that is responsible for advocating for the acquisition and support of training grants;
- 2) Leadership from the Graduate School to the principal investigators/program directors of training grant proposal for negotiating matching funds from the applicable units (college-level and central administration), if allowed by the grant mechanism;
- 3) Increased resources in the Graduate School for matching dollars for all types of institutional training grants, if allowed by the grant mechanism.
- 4) An annual calculation of the total amount of support given to graduate students that includes all stipend and tuition dollars garnered through institutional training grants;
- 5) A statement included in current applicable University policy indicating that a lower F&A rate is not grounds for denying approval for a training grant proposal.
- 6) A modification of the cost pool structure that differentiates between research and training grant expenditures in determining the central administration “tax” rate at the unit level. In effect, we recommend using the Modified Total Direct Costs (total direct costs minus equipment, capital expenditures, charges for patient care, student tuition remission, rental costs of off-site facilities, scholarships and fellowships, and the portion of each subgrant and subcontract in excess of \$25,000) be used for determining a unit’s cost pool allocation.

* * *

Professor Cloyd moved that the Committee endorse the statement; Professor Cramer seconded the motion.

Professor Durfee inquired about the implications for the recommended change in the cost-pool structure. Professor Bearinger said the recommendation is intended to provide a way to differentiate between types of funders and to modify the way the University assesses costs. Professor Cramer observed that it is a zero-sum game; President Kaler pointed out that there would be winners and losers if an adjustment to the cost-pool structure were to be made. The point, Professor Bearinger said following additional conversation, is to avoid institutional/administrative discouragement of faculty members seeking research training grants.

The Committee suggested a slight amendment to the statement from Professor Durfee, inserting the word "investigate" at the start of recommendation 6. Professor Bearinger accepted the suggestion as a friendly amendment.

The Committee voted 4-2 to endorse the statement; three Committee members abstained.

5. Discussion with President Kaler

Professor Kohlstedt asked the President to touch on a number of topics.

The president said that he was willing to receive a recommendation from the University Senate for a smoke-free campus. He has expressed concerns about the impact on foreign visitors and on employees who will need to walk off campus, but if it is the will of the community, an implementation plan can be worked out.

The president said he believes providing contextual information about grades is valuable and welcomed the proposal from the Committee, which will be on the Faculty Senate docket for information.

The president and Committee members discussed the Fairview-University negotiations as well as the relationship of the Academic Health Center colleges with each other and with the rest of the University.

The president endorsed the idea of an annual informal dinner with Committee members and senior administrators.

The Committee and the president discussed the University's relationship with the legislature.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked the president for joining the meeting and adjourned it at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand