

SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE*

October 27, 1995

Minutes of the Meeting

- PRESENT:** Allen Goldman (chair), Henry Buchwald, Elizabeth Jansen, Joel Eisinger, N.L.Gault, Kathy James, Kathryn Rettig, Susan Hupp, Mark Brenner, WinAnn Schumi (for Tony Potami)
- REGRETS:** Mark Snyder, Jeylan Mortimer, Dorothy Hatsukami, Christopher Wiley
- ABSENT:** Marilyn DeLong, Rob Super
- GUESTS:** Jane Whiteside and Halil Dundar (Office of Planning and Analysis)

The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

Dr. Buchwald stated that he disagreed with comments made at the meeting regarding grant mismanagement and requested his comments be recorded in the minutes. Grant mismanagement, at this University, was determined by several outside consulting groups and by the NIH audit, he said, and centered the responsibility squarely on central administration and said it was institution-wide. Every outside assessment that we have had says that grants mismanagement was institution-wide. It is, therefore, reasonable to state that its institution-wide grants mismanagement caused the NIH to put the institution on exceptional status. He went on to say that we cannot blame all of this on the Medical School or one department or one or more individuals. As long as we continue to do this as a University, we are not going to solve the problem. Secondly, the University is implementing principal policies that it is now writing retroactively. The gist of these policies are that the principal investigator becomes responsible for anything that central administration says that the principal investigator is responsible for....and not necessarily what the granting institution says the principal investigator is responsible for. This is very troublesome, he said. Finally, central administration has now a proven record that when there is difficulty, the central administration will abandon individuals and research programs that they have stood behind. It is very difficult in this kind of an atmosphere for an individual to do research and have a feeling of belonging to a university that does not have a sense of obligation to its individual researchers, he concluded.

Professor Goldman commented that it is important for the Research Committee to assess the changes that are to be made regarding the way the University treats principal investigators.

THIRD PHASE CRITICAL MEASURE DISCUSSION

Jane Whiteside, Office of Planning and Analysis, came before the committee to discuss the Third Phase Critical Measures and Performance Goals. Dr. Whiteside explained that the Third phase critical measures are being dealt with somewhat differently, within the governance structure, than with the second phase measures. Drawing the attention of the members to a handout describing the general consultation processes, she pointed out that there are a lot of committee reviewing the measures. Professor Carl Adams, chair of the Consultative Committee, thought it would be useful to have one committee serve as lead committee for each of the measurement categories and to have other committees involved in the supporting role. The Research

*These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

Committee is the designated lead committee for the category called Interdisciplinary/Applied.

The main purpose of Dr. Whiteside's presentation was to provide a general overview of the third phase critical measures. She suggested that the committee get feedback from the supporting committees before the November 17 Research Committee meeting at which time she would come back to discuss the input of those groups.

Directing members' attention to the discussion outline, she reviewed the first and second phase measures. Dr. Whiteside said that from her perspective the third phase measures were more difficult because for the most part very broad and in different ways overlapping with each other and with other measures. It is being assumed that in the initial round of discussions, people will be asked to step back from the words and to really think about what all of the measures have in common with the University's relationship with the outside community. What are the important areas to look at when you think about how the University connects with the outside world...and what does that mean? The discussion process for the third phase measures is similar to the one used for the second phase measures, involving campuses, provostal areas, colleges and administrative units; University Senate and Senate committees; staff committees; student organizations/groups; President Hasselmo's minority advisory committees; and other external groups. The process has two parts: 1) October, November 1995 - identification of the most important aspects of each broad measurement area to include in the measure, using the discussion outline; 2) February, March 1996 - specification of operational definitions of the measures, and (if possible) baseline information and tentative goals, as reflected in a set of narrative drafts.

Referring to the measure Interdisciplinary and/or Applied Programs, Dr. Whiteside called for the input of the committee. She said that in some ways it intersects with the measure in the second category called Scholarship/Research/Artistic Accomplishments because if you think about it broadly, it should presumably include both basic as well as interdisciplinary. Turning to page seven of the discussion outline, Dr. Whiteside talked about three categories: 1) Interdisciplinary, not applied; 2) Interdisciplinary and applied; 3) Applied, not interdisciplinary. This may or may not be a useful way of sorting things out, she said.

One member asked if there was consensus that anything that is applied is applied outside of the institution? Dr. Whiteside responded that we need to spend time figuring out what we mean by applied and not applied. Another member commented that the Family Social Sciences program is excluded because it is an interdisciplinary and applied program that integrates theory, research, applied and outreach. In order to qualify to be interdisciplinary, the program would have to be across departments. In the College of Education, many of the departments are not constructed by disciplinary lines, yet another commented. These comments lead to a lengthy, indepth conversation regarding the distinction between pure and applied research.

Is the word "applied" the right one to use, one queried. It doesn't seem quite right - you want to measure things which have some impact on a societal problems or maybe research that results in developing something - in the immediate sense. Why call it interdisciplinary and applied when there is another measure for outreach? One person's applied research is another person's fundamental research, it was said. Dr. Whiteside responded that one solution would be to have the focus of this category should be the interdisciplinary part and try to figure out what that means and have the applied piece move into the internal/external connection so that one doesn't try to make a distinction between all of the different ways it would have an impact.

What is the objective of the outcome, it was asked? The critical measures are a way of ourselves defining what we mean, what we are driving toward and what we think is important before someone else comes along and does it for us, Dr. Whiteside commented. One member pointed out that the applied definition is very narrow. Another interjected that this could be dangerous. One member suggested the category "applied" go under the measure of outreach. Dr. Whiteside directed members to page eleven of the discussion outline which addresses outreach.

One of the student members made a point that when looking at the critical measures it always being the application of faculty to these things. There are students who do a great deal of the primary discovery and the primary thinking. Dr. Whiteside said that they did hear the students voice regarding this issue but were still figuring out how to respond to it.

Concluding, Dr. Whiteside said that the discussion was very helpful. The committee will meet with her again November to continue these discussions.

GRANTS MANAGEMENT PROJECT

Dr. Mark Brenner provided an overview of the Grants Management Project. The following outline shows where we have been, NIH exception organization, and what we plane to do.

Where we have been:

- . February 1992 - Coopers & Lybrand - Report on Effort
- . July 1993 - Deloitte & Touche - Report on Medical School
- . January 1995 - Arthur Andersen - Diagnostic Report
- . March 1995 - Coopers & Lybrand - 12 Grants Review
- . July 1995 - Arthur Anderson - Second Phase - Work Plan

Arthur Andersen Report

- . Roles and Responsibility
- . Policies and Procedures
- . Education, Training, and Communication
- . System Improvements
 - Central Accounting
 - Department Systems
 - Grants Management within ORTTA
 - Committee Systems - Humans, Animal, Biohazards, Radioactivity
- . ORTTA Redesign

Roles and Responsibility

- . Specified to the responsible position
- . All regulatory requirements have been identified and cross referenced to responsible positions
- . R & R will be placed on WWW and linked to specific policies and procedures
- . Developing award acceptance certification documents to provided compliance information and require PI to sign before setting up account