

SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE*

November 18, 1994

Minutes of the Meeting

PRESENT: Allen Goldman (chair), Jean Kinsey, Mark Snyder, Susan Hupp, Jeylan Mortimer, WinAnn Schumi (for Tony Potami), Signe Betsinger, N.L. Gault, Paul Sackett, John Basgen, Eric Klinger, Mark Brenner, Henry Buchwald

ABSENT: Liz Eull, Dongli-Su

OTHERS: Fred Bently

The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

Resolution about the place of the Graduate School and Vice President for Research

Professor Goldman reported that he received a letter from Senior Vice President Infante regarding the role, within the organizational structure of the University, of the Vice President for Research. This was in response to the resolution forwarded to the President by the Committee expressing concern that in any reorganization of the administration of a Research University the administrator responsible for the research and graduate training enterprises should have a voice in the highest councils. Members agreed that the response did not directly answer the Committee's concern. It was suggested that the resolution and the response be sent to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy. Another person suggested writing to Infante asking him what the response meant - maybe the Committee didn't make its message clear. The question was...."where is the graduate school," said another member - he did not answer that. Professor Goldman will write another letter asking for clarity.

Resolution on Research Climate

Professor Goldman reported that the Resolution on Research Climate was reviewed by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs at a joint meeting with the Research Committee. It was then modified and was forwarded to the Consultative Committee. It seemed that the modifications confused the issue but raised the question of whether the Resolution on Research Climate was even more important in the broad sense than the original context. FCC asked that the Resolution be reworked in concert with members from SCFA. Eric Klinger and Susan Hupp agreed to represent the Research Committee. Professor Goldman will contact Dan Feeney, Chair of SCFA about representatives from SCFA.

Conflict of Commitment Policy

Professor Brenner lead the discussion on the Policy on Conflict of Commitment. He explained that the Academic Integrity Committee has been working on this policy for some time - approximately nine months. The Research Committee is the first group to discuss the draft. He noted that several other groups would be reviewing the draft and that it most likely would return to the Research Committee at a later time. This

*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 represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

policy is intended to supersede the Consulting Policy, he said. It is clearly an extension beyond consulting - it includes all other activities that one engages in outside of regular appointed duties, except for what is described as "personal life." He then proceeded to walk the group through the document.

A major change in the proposed policy is that there are some activities that are identified that should be considered as part of one's normal responsibilities and should not be considered to have to be accounted for in the sense of time commitments. In the past when one served on editorial boards or as officers of a society, etc., it counted toward the total time limits if you were on a B appointment - this proposal says that they don't count anymore. It is considered service and everyone is expected to do service. Faculty should have a plan with the department head as to what is reasonable at the outset, before engaging in these activities. Professor Brenner referred to section III, page two which describes service within normal boundaries to be encouraged.

Does this imply that a department head would have to either meet with or receive a report from a faculty member each year indicating what their workload is, questioned a member?

Professor Brenner responded, yes, it is the assumption that there should be some ongoing coordination on an annual basis between faculty and department heads.

Would the yearly faculty activities report constitute this communication, asked one member?

Absolutely, responded Professor Brenner. Relative to workload plans, he said that it has been pointed out that it is very difficult today to conceptualize having a Conflict of Commitment Policy in the absence of a workload plan. He said that he sees this (3.1) part as clarification for providing some latitude to the faculty.

Relative to external/internal consulting - this suggests that if you do more than seven, even if some of those are one-time commitments, you need permission for each and every one.

Professor Brenner responded, yes, after the seventh day and beyond. The "onesies" add up to be a real number that could impact on performance. There has to be some juncture where the administrator says "wait a minutes...let's talk about this."

This is not going to work from the faculty's perspective, commented another member, you can't continue to do lots of "onesies" because the time frame which you have to commit to the client as such that you can't go back to the University between times.....it will either inhibit what faculty can do or it will be violated.

Professor Brenner said that it will need to be clarified whether you ask permission for each time (over the seven). It is his understanding that you would ask the permission during the annual discussion and presented all at once....for example, the faculty may know that he/she will be engaged for 20 days of consulting....this should be discussed at the onset.

He went on to discuss the section on activities (5). Some of these activities create a conflict or competition for time commitment for the University. Others represent competition to the interest of the University or they may. These are different he said, in that those that limit ones time have to be dealt with one way and affect full-time people. All Academic Employees (appointments of 50% time or more) must obtain written approval before engaging in any activity that is noted as one that might compete with the missions of the

University.

Is this to be interpreted as times that you are away from the University...is that the intent of the document? Not necessarily, he said. It means time on behalf of somebody else, regardless of where you are at. This should be made clear, it was suggested.

Dr. Brenner then walked the group through the specifics of activities.

What if you are conducting sponsored activities for another organization, could that be conducted under the auspices of the University, asked someone? Normally, some of those monies would come back to the University, he said.

One member provided the following example: If there was an activity in a social organization that you thought you couldn't do here, then you could develop a non-profit organization outside and funnel the research funds through that. Dr. Brenner said that this was a good example and should be looked at.

Does ownership of the outside company receiving the research funds have any bearing on it? If the faculty member owns it, is it different than if the faculty member works for somebody else that owns it, queried one member?

Dr. Brenner suggested looking at all of these issues in two ways: 1) do we have the right concept; and, 2) do we have the right language? He asked members to give him feedback if they disagreed with the philosophy and if the language is right.

Right now there is almost no oversight of internal consulting, is there a lot of internal consulting? Yes, in some areas, responded Dr. Brenner. The policy is to identify the rules and expectations for allowing reasonable time for doing normal duties and reasonable time for extra activities. The issue is not about income, it is about time, Dr. Brenner noted.

Members spent some time discussing internal consulting and extra compensation.

Dr. Brenner moved on to discuss instructional activities. He noted that there are number of instances where the faculty are teaching for other entities within the community for a single course. There are many different levels of representation. For example, it seems somewhat strange that the University of Minnesota's name is used behind the professor's name and then the course is offered at another institution.

One member pointed out that time and competition are issues relative to instructional activities. The question was then asked about summer months. Dr. Brenner responded that during the summer appointment, neither time or competition is relevant - it is your time. What about the 50% time employee? This is a gray area, he responded. The boundaries are reasonable for the full-time employee. As the appointment is less and less, it is not reasonable to make it too restrictive. One member commented that if you are paying someone less than 100%, you have a lot of nerve to tell them what they can do with their time. The best way to beat the policy is to get an appointment less than 100% time, quipped another.

Dr. Brenner moved on to item "g" which talks about an academic employee teaching for CEE for extra compensation during the term of appointment. He said that they feel that this has the potential conflict of

time and these activities need to be considered outside activities in the sense that there is limit as to how much one can engage in it.

One member asked if courses offered under CE&E would be inloaded under the implementation of U2000? CE&E may have to go to departments, with cash in hand, and have the department provide it as an inloaded basis, Dr. Brenner said. It's a great idea as long as the cash comes, interjected another member.

Carol Carrier's office did a data run to determine how many people were teaching one course in CE&E - the norm is around 2-3 courses, although there are people who are teaching 5-7 courses. Individuals who engage in a great number of courses can dig themselves in a hole, but because the consequences of it is that they are not in a position to use what is normally expected of their 50% time to conduct their research. The outcome is decrease in merit recognition and the only way to financially survive is to do more. To take that away will create an endangered academic species who will feel very cornered by this, Dr. Brenner said. The policy is not designed to take it all away, he reiterated. The questions we must ask ourselves are: does it provide an even playing field? Are we doing our job? Are we credible to our state?

One member asked if there was some way to state that this is not only to look at the prohibition but where department heads could help faculty understand ways that they could expand their activities. The way it reads now seems punitive. Dr. Brenner took note of this.

Dr. Brenner briefly walked through the sections on International Projects and the handling of these activities - specifically, handling overload pay and time limitations. Individuals on B Appointments and receive a grant for the summer, they will not get additional days. This is not written in the document. Language clarifying this should be incorporated in the document, members agreed. One member suggested that it be spelled out that it is not appropriate to cancel classes and that the faculty member has an obligation to the student customer.

One member suggested that this section be revisited by Dr. Brenner's committee.

Dr. Brenner welcomed additional comments and/or suggestions. Members should forward those to him. Before closing, he noted that sections 8-12 were almost totally lifted from the existing policy and that section 13 has been revised to reflect current practice.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

- Vickie Courtney

University of Minnesota