

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

October 2, 2014

Minutes of the Meeting

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 reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

[In these minutes: Intellectual Futures Discussion, Graduate Student Experience, Research Data Management Policy, Miscellaneous Committee Business]

Present: Rebecca Ropers-Huilman (chair), Chris Uggen (vice chair), William Durfee, Eva von Dassow, Linda Bearinger, Gary Cohen, Gary Gardner, Joseph Konstan, Kathleen Krichbaum, Susan Wick, Colin Campbell, Jigna Desai, Karen Mesce, Jean Wyman

Regrets: Maria Gini, Dale Carpenter, James Cloyd, Janet Ericksen

Others attending: Susanne Vandergon (attended portion of meeting on Research Data Management Policy)

Guests: Andrew McNally, president, Council of Graduate Students (COGS) and PhD student in American Studies; Nicole Scott, PhD student in Cognitive Sciences; Claudia Neuhauser, director, University of Minnesota Informatics Institute, Office of the Vice President for Research

1. Professor Ropers-Huilman called the meeting to order. She began by saying she has been giving this year's intellectual futures topic a great deal of thought, and would like to propose this year's conversation be on faculty governance. Professor Ropers-Huilman explained she thought this would a good topic because she has been hearing a lot of ambiguity from a number of individuals, who are differently positioned across the University, about the definition of faculty governance, the appropriate role of consultation, the need for a definition of consultation, and other similar issues related to governance relationship and purposes. In earlier conversations, members expressed interest in talking about shifts in tenure and the variety of faculty roles, the corporatization of universities in terms of how they operate, the diminished role of the state and the increased role of federal agencies and corporations in funding core campus work, which could be covered in an overarching discussion about faculty governance. She asked for members' input about the proposed topic.

In Professor Konstan's opinion, this could be a good topic, but in order for it to be a productive discussion, faculty governance would need to be discussed broadly, e.g., the role of faculty in the institution, as opposed to simply the Senate and its committees. Professor Ropers-Huilman said she would like to frame the discussion by prefacing it with what are the things in the external environment that are having an effect on the relationship of faculty to their universities.

After some discussion, members agreed that this would be a good topic as long as it was framed broadly. Professor Ropers-Huilman thanked members for their input.

2. Professor Ropers-Huilman welcomed Andrew McNally, president, Council of Graduate Students (COGS) and PhD student in American Studies, and Nicole Scott, a PhD student in Cognitive Sciences, who were invited to talk about the graduate student experience, which continues to be an important issue.

Mr. McNally said he and Ms. Scott appreciate the opportunity to come before the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) to talk about the graduate student experience. He noted that improving graduate education requires addressing more than just the financial issues. COGS has been talking about promoting the visibility of graduate education and the work graduate students do. The goal is to inform the community about the value of the work graduate students do and to think about graduate education as a public/common good versus a private choice. He then highlighted a number of areas of concern for graduate students:

- Funding for graduate students.
- Improving graduate student professionalization and teaching resources. Besides academics, graduate students want training to help prepare them for careers, especially careers outside of academia.
- Recruiting and retaining a diverse graduate student population.
- Funding for graduate student fees that are not included in graduate assistant packages.
- Providing resources for graduate students who are also parents.
- Improving advisor/advisee relationships. COGS is in the process of drafting a bill of rights that summarizes graduate students' basic rights and responsibilities.

Professor Ropers-Huilman thanked Mr. McNally and Ms. Scott for this information and solicited members' questions and comments, which included:

- Besides granting graduate students a set of rights, the bill of rights can be used as a recruitment tool for faculty. While initially the thought of a bill of rights for graduate students seemed adversarial, it actually makes a lot of sense.
- Professional development opportunities should be centralized at the college level and offered more frequently.
- It is long over-due that these issues are finally being addressed and taken seriously. It will be important, however, to prioritize and strategize around issues that something can actually be done about. For example, the odds of fixing graduate students fees are much more likely than changing visa rules for international graduate students. The issues outlined highlight how different graduate students and programs are across the University.
- The University has put a lot of effort in improving the undergraduate experience, but has neglected the graduate student experience. The more visible the issues, the more likely solutions will be found.
- It will be very important that strategies for implementation be identified in order to achieve desired outcomes for the issues that were mentioned. Regarding a bill of rights, a University-wide statement on this is long overdue. There are issues on

protecting the integrity and proprietary interests of graduate students' findings and should be included in the bill of rights. Ms. Scott said COGS plans to convene focus groups next week to get input on the draft bill of rights. Before the bill of rights is brought back to the FCC for input, it will first go to the Graduate Education Council as well as the Academic Freedom and Tenure (AF&T) committee.

- Graduate students absolutely have the right to be treated with dignity and respect, get credit for their work, etc. A number of faculty, however, do not feel it is their responsibility to help graduate students find a job. Ms. Scott mentioned a website (<http://www.gradvising.umn.edu/>) the Graduate School recently put up, and the best practices link on this site will be included in the bill of rights.
- While across the University there are a number of career skills/professional development courses, the problem is accessing the courses and knowing when they are offered. This information is not adequately communicated to graduate students. Mr. McNally agreed and said it would be great to have a centralized resource containing this information.
- Graduate education funding was the number one issue that came out of the FCC retreat this year; faculty are worried about this issue. The FCC believes more resources need to be dedicated to graduate education.
- Regarding the bill of rights, it needs to be made clear who is responsible for what, e.g., expectations for researchers, expectations for teaching assistants. Graduate students need some level of centralized support for professional development, writing CVs, etc., but, in addition, they need specialized support from within their individual colleges, and/or the Graduate School.
- If the University is to be a significant player as a R1 university, it needs to be able to attract the best graduate students and produce the best PhD candidates. Without a funding model that supports this, however, it will be very difficult. There needs to be some centralization of standards to maintain a level of quality.
- Regarding authorship language for the bill of rights, there already exists language in the research conduct policy. All the issues identified today are critical, and, would suggest using a logical model, e.g., who to contact for a particular issue. A suggestion was made to invite the graduate students back to another meeting as well as other guests appropriate for the topic, e.g., Dean of the Graduate School, the Vice President for Research, etc. Lastly, the *University Support for Training Grant Proposals* (<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/resolutions/trnggrantres.html>) that went to the Faculty Senate in May 2013 needs to come back to the FCC for further discussion. The administration's response to this document was inadequate.
- Rights sound great but until someone has responsibility for delivering on these rights, they mean nothing. It will be important to figure out who is responsible for delivering on particular rights. Second, a graduate education report should be compiled annually and made available to graduate students as well as prospective graduate students. In writing the bill of rights and working through the issues impacting graduate students it will be important to have realistic expectations.
- Regarding recruiting and retaining a diverse graduate student population, there are already a number of programs and partnerships that do this. The issue does not

- seem to be a lack of programming or will, but rather a lack of effectiveness, and it is unclear as to why. It would be interesting to convene a joint group of faculty and graduate students to review the recruitment processes that are in place with an eye toward looking at whether there could be systemic problems, which are having an impact on the success rate of recruiting a diverse pool.
- The 2013 *Report of the Special Committee on Graduate Education* (http://academic.umn.edu/provost/graduate/2013_Special_Committee_on_GraduateEducation-Final_Report.pdf) contains recommendations, which should be looked at again and can also serve as a reason for convening faculty and graduate students to look into this issue further. Best practices of successful programs should be shared across the institution.
 - Frequently, under-represented minority students say they want to go into “helping fields,” e.g., medicine, law, in order to help their home communities, which leaves a number of traditional arts and sciences graduate programs at a disadvantage when it comes to recruiting minority students.
 - The Page Education Foundation (<http://www.page-ed.org/>) supports Page scholars who are high school students who will be moving into post-secondary education. Part of being a Page scholar is to mentor younger students. The Dove Fellowship out of the Office for Diversity in Graduate Education should also have a mentoring requirement.
 - Graduate students need certain skill sets when they finish their PhD to go out and establish their careers. Regular courses to develop these skills need to be offered. In the sciences, for example, if someone is hired as a PhD, they will be hired to manage other people. Having said that, how many graduate students take a personnel management course?

In light of time, Mr. McNally thanked members for their feedback and said the conversation was very helpful for advancing COG’s agenda. Professor Roper-Huilman added that the FCC values graduate students and wants to help in these efforts.

3. Professor Ropers-Huilman welcomed Claudia Neuhauser, director, University of Minnesota Informatics Institute, Office of the Vice President for Research, who requested to come before the committee to provide information on the Research Data Management Policy. Copies of the draft administrative policy, *Research Data Management: Archiving, Ownership, Retention, Security, Storage and Transfer* had been distributed to members for review prior to the meeting as well as FAQs and the procedure for transferring research data.

Dr. Neuhauser began by providing some background information and noted that an internal audit of the University of Minnesota’s research data storage in June 2013 uncovered a number of essential findings, but the two most critical were:

1. Identify a strategy to capture research data management needs (particularly storage needs).
2. Determine who has authority over and is responsible for data management.

The audit revealed that many people did not know who is responsible for data management and who has authority in making data management decisions.

In the spring of 2013, Vice Presidents Herman and Studham charged a committee, which Dr. Neuhauser chaired, on developing a policy that would address the concerns of the audit. The goal was to develop a data management storage policy that would clarify roles and responsibilities around data storage.

Dr. Neuhauser outlined the composition of the committee and talked about the extensive consultation process used to develop the policy. Additional highlights from her presentation included:

- While data management is the joint responsibility of all employees at the University, four offices in particular have primary responsibility 1) the Office of the Vice President for Research, 2) the Office of Vice President and Chief Information Officer, 3) the Office of the Vice President for Health Sciences and 4) University Libraries.
- The research data definition in the policy is the same definition used by the federal government but was expanded to include research of scientists and scholars. This was done to make it clear that the research data management storage requirements are not just for federally funded research.
- Most of the data covered by the policy is digitally recorded, but it also includes laboratory notebooks, etc. The policy does not include laboratory samples. Physical objects are treated separately.
- The PI is defined as anyone responsible for research, e.g. an individual, group of individuals. Decisions about who will be responsible for the research data need to be made before a project begins.
- While the University owns the data, the PI is the steward of the data and controls who has access to the data. The PI is also responsible for determining what data should be preserved and what data should be destroyed. PIs that encounter a situation where they are uncertain about how to store data, should talk to their college and if the college is uncertain it needs to be escalated to central administration.
- Students own the data if it is part of their academic work unless an exception applies, e.g., if a student is employed by the University, if a student uses substantial University resources in their research, or if another agreement was made. For example, if a student is employed by the University or uses substantial University resources in doing their research, the University would own the data. At the request of another Senate committee that was consulted with on this policy, a form has been drafted that students will be asked to sign if the University is designated as the owner of the data. This form is currently under review by the Office of the General Counsel for enforceability. In addition, the same group raised the issue of volunteers and ownership of data. It has been decided that under these circumstances, the University owns the data unless there is another agreement.
- The Vice President for Research, the Vice President and Chief Information Office, the Vice President for Health Sciences and the University Librarian/Director of Libraries (depending on the campus) appoint a Use Case

Categorization Scheme (UCCS) committee. This committee is advisory to the aforementioned group who appointed it.

- Solutions for securing research data may differ by college depending on their capacity to do so.

Members' comments and questions:

- Are there agreement templates that researchers can access for special situations, e.g., agreements with other countries? Dr. Neuhauser said for complex agreements it will be necessary for the college and OGC to be involved to make sure there are no problems. The forms that are attached to the policy will be standard forms for straightforward situations. The UCCS committee could also be helpful in special situations.
- How will this policy solve more problems than it creates? Please provide an example of a situation where a lack of a policy has created a problem. Dr. Neuhauser said there were five essential findings in the internal audit and a lot of them had to do with responsibilities and authorities, which this policy addresses. There has been no clarity up until now around who is responsible for data storage and with the increase in data at the University, this is a serious issue. Ownership of data has historically been dealt with informally. For example, if a student is doing research as part of his/her academic work, this policy now clarifies ownership of the data. The policy, in many ways, protects faculty from problems that could arise later. This is a data management policy and not just a data storage policy.
- Have the University Libraries been involved in drafting this policy? Yes, replied Dr. Neuhauser, they have been involved throughout the development of the policy.
- Has the Minnesota Population Center been consulted on the creation of this policy? Dr. Neuhauser noted they have not been consulted specifically about this policy, but she talks with them regularly about related matters.
- Who decides what "use of substantial University resources" means? This was addressed in the Copyright Policy and that language has been put into this policy, said Dr. Neuhauser. If it is a resource that typically other people would not have access to then this would be considered use of substantial University resources. Both this policy and the Copyright Policy avoided trying to quantify this in terms of dollars.
- Was there student representation on the committee that drafted this policy? Also, are there plans to talk with the various student groups once this policy has been finalized? No, said Dr. Neuhauser, students did not serve on the committee that drafted the policy, but there are plans to vet this policy more broadly, once approved. She agreed ongoing education about the policy would be important.
- Situations in which students come in with their own data should be addressed in the FAQ document. Dr. Neuhauser agreed this would be a good FAQ question.
- It is more common than not that post-docs have their own data, and because post-docs are not students, they are employees of the University (they have their own special job code). Therefore, it will be particularly important that the language

around post-docs and ownership of data be explicitly clear. Dr. Neuhauser noted she is aware of the post-doc situation and also mentioned fellows as another special category because they are not employees of the University.

- This policy will help in situations when the University is entering into collaborative agreements with other institutions.
- The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) was consulted on this policy, and, while members were not willing to enthusiastically endorse the creation of any new policy, it did not strongly object.
- A number of federal funding agencies are requiring researchers to make their data available to the public, so is this included in the management piece of the policy? Yes, it is included in the management portion of the policy, replied Dr. Neuhauser. When it comes to data sharing, the PI has the right to decide what to share, unless there are other agreements to the contrary.
- What happens to the data when faculty leave the University? There is a portion of the policy that specifically deals with transferring research data, said Dr. Neuhauser. The policy outlines procedures for how research data is transferred when faculty leave the University and come into the University.
- Are physical data included in this policy? No, said Dr. Neuhauser, physical data are not included. The federal government makes a distinction between research materials and research data.
- Where is the dividing line between what data is covered by this policy versus copyright policy? Dr. Neuhauser explained that the policies operate in parallel and there is not always a clear separation of the two policies. Data, per se, cannot be copyrighted.
- When leaving the University, do researchers have to leave a copy of their data? Dr. Neuhauser responded that more than likely deans would allow researchers to take their data and would not ask for a copy to be left. However, if it is part of a grant, the University has an obligation to keep the data for at least three years after the end of the grant. Under certain circumstances, the University has the obligation to take care of the data, but, if it does not, and decides not to store the data because it is too expensive, it could tell the researcher he/she is on their own.

Professor Ropers-Huilman asked Dr. Neuhauser what she would like to see as an outcome of this discussion. Dr. Neuhauser said she would like it if the committee would be willing to issue a statement of support. Professor Ropers-Huilman asked members if they would be willing to endorse the current draft or if they would like to see the final draft before they endorse it. Professor Durfee made a motion that the committee endorse the policy before them, and the motion was seconded. In Professor Cohen's opinion, he would like to see the final draft before he would feel comfortable endorsing it. Dr. Neuhauser reported that before the policy becomes final, there is a 30-day public comment period. If there are significant changes to the current draft, the committee should see the revised policy. Having heard these comments, Professor Durfee revised his original motion to the effect that the committee supports the general principles and intent outlined in the draft policy. Dr. Neuhauser said she does not foresee any substantive changes to the policy. Members unanimously approved the amended motion.

Professor Ropers-Huilman thanked Dr. Neuhauser for consulting with the FCC on this policy.

4. The remaining time was spent on committee business. Professor Ropers-Huilman announced that she and Professor Uggen were working with the Provost's Office on a forum on free speech, academic freedom and climate. On the heels of the Condoleezza Rice event at the University of Minnesota and the Salaita scandal at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Professor Uggen explained Provost Hanson will be hosting a three-hour forum (October 21, 2014 from 1:00 – 4:00) with faculty talking about free speech, protected speech and academic freedom. Professor Durfee said that in his opinion this discussion should be broader than just faculty and bring in all voices – faculty, staff and students. Professor Ropers-Huilman said she and Professor Uggen would keep members apprised of further details about the forum as they learn more.

Before adjourning, Professor Bearinger reported that Diana Harvey, chief communications officer, University Relations, is leaving the University and asked if members were aware of this. Members indicated they had not heard about it. In Professor Bearinger's opinion, this is something the FCC should have been informed about because this is an important position. Professor Cohen suggested that Professor Ropers-Huilman and Uggen talk with President Kaler about his thoughts and priorities around the University's public relations efforts. Over the last several years, a number of faculty are concerned about the messages the University chooses to put out and used the "Troubled Waters" documentary as an example.

5. In light of time, Professor Ropers-Huilman adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate