

Minutes*

**Senate Research Committee
Thursday, February 12, 1998
433 Johnston Hall
1:00 PM**

Present: Len Kuhi, Chair; Phil Norcross, Marilyn DeLong, Robin Dittman, Burle Gengenbach, Eric Klinger, Scott McConnell, Albert Nakano, WinAnn Schumi, Fay Thompson, Ed Wink, Mark Paller

Guests: Frances Lawrenz, David Hamilton, Moira Keane, Dick Bianco

Regrets: Mark Brenner, John Finnegan, Dorothy Hatsukami

Absent: Bianca Conti-Fine, Kathryn Rettig, Barb Van Drasek, Karl Kistler

[In these minutes: Cost-Benefit Analysis Resolution, Animal Care Policy, Grants Management Committee Update, NIH Update, Overhead Rates, Vision/Meeting with VP for Research]

The University Senate Research Committee met at 1:00 PM on Thursday, February 12, 1998 in 433 Johnston Hall on the East Bank of the U of MN. The minutes from the Research Committee meeting held on Friday, January 23, 1998, distributed to committee members via e-mail prior to the meeting, were approved as written with the following change: Dorothy Hatsukami was present at the meeting.

COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS RESOLUTION.

Professor Len Kuhi reported that the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) reviewed the cost benefit analysis recommendation at its meeting on February 5. The recommendation was written by the Research Committee due to concern about the increasing costs, time, and energy resulting from greater detail in policies and procedures required not only here at the University of Minnesota, but at the federal level as well. The general response of the FCC was very positive, and the discussion revealed additional concerns which were incorporated into the draft: 1) increase in the number of regulations from funding agencies in Washington; and 2) the over-interpretation of those in the development of University policies and procedures. The recommendation is presumed to carry more weight if it goes forward as a resolution passed by the Senate, and all senators present at the meeting were encouraged to attend the Senate meeting on February 19 to help pass the resolution.

ANIMAL CARE & USAGE POLICY.

Dick Bianco and Moira Keane distributed copies of the Board of Regents Policy on Animal Care and Use to committee members for their review. Dick Bianco reported that the last review of this policy was in 1978, and that the current draft now more accurately describes the program and how it functions today. The policy reviews the use of live animals throughout the University system before the animals are

*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.

purchased. Dick noted that it has also been helpful to bring animal and human subjects under one review committee.

The Animal Care Committee previously reported to the Senate, but the reporting line now requires dual administrative oversight with the committee reporting to the Vice President for Research and the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences. Concern was raised about the role of the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences in this all-University consultation process, and Dick clarified that the actual reporting is to one or the other depending upon the department in which the situation occurs.

Committee members suggested and discussed the following revisions:

- Rather than reporting to both, the committee could report to the Vice President for Research, but in consultation with the Senior VP for the Health Sciences.
- Reconsider the use of the word "privilege" in Subd 7. Obligations of University Faculty, Staff and Students when it reads, "The use of animals for University teaching, research, or service purposes constitutes a privilege with many attendant obligations."
- Eliminate the phrase "and experienced" and replace it with "and supervised" from the sentence in Subd 7. that reads, "University faculty, staff, or students involved in the care and use of animals shall be appropriately qualified and experienced for conducting procedures on animals."

The committee also requested review of the procedures section of this policy which would provide greater detail about how the policy guidelines would be carried out. Dick Bianco informed the members that the procedures are currently under development and will be forthcoming to the committee at its next meeting. It was recommended that the procedures be completed quickly since the Faculty Affairs (SCFA), Educational Policy (SCEP), and Senate Consultative (SCC) committees will also need to review the policies and procedures related to Animal Care and Use before being brought to the Senate.

The Research Committee emphasized two final points: 1) they would like to review the procedures accompanying this policy as soon as possible; and 2) they feel the Animal Care Committee should report solely to the Vice President for Research.

GRANTS MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.

Professor David Hamilton provided committee members with a summary of the proposed revisions to the grants management process at the meeting on January 23; the Research Committee supported this effort. (as well as the Faculty Consultative Committee). Although Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences Frank Cerra sent a letter to Professor Hamilton appointing him as the chair of the Grants Management Committee (GMC), his acceptance of the position is still in the process of negotiations. He added that the written materials explaining the objectives of the Grants Management Committee requested by the Research Committee at its last meeting are forthcoming.

One of the objectives of the GMC is to create a discussion forum on the World Wide Web for comments not only by the Research Committee, but anyone at the University. The web page will be monitored on a regular basis and will advertise the committee's business and solicit feedback throughout the process. It is hoped that the use of an electronic and common media to communicate with others about the grants management process will also accelerate the timeline for completion of this project. Professor Hamilton assured Research Committee members that although information will be brought to University personnel via the Internet, the committee will continue to be updated at its monthly meetings as well.

Professor Hamilton reported that he has been meeting with several committees in the past few weeks, including two meetings this week. He added that Research Committee members Scott McConnell and Burle Gengenbach have taken very active roles working with the Roles and Responsibilities Subcommittee; Eric Klinger will also be assisting with the Training Subcommittee. Due to the expertise of the members on the GMC and its subcommittees, as well as the rapid pace at which the process is moving, it is hoped that the project will be completed in time to meet the April 15 deadline.

NIH UPDATE.

Professor David Hamilton informed committee members that a report was sent in by e-mail and Federal Express to the National Institute of Health on February 1; there has been no response to date.

OVERHEAD RATES.

The January 23 issue of the Chronicle for Higher Education was distributed to committee members for their information. The document listed the overhead rates at the top 100 universities in federal research-and-development awards. The University of Minnesota ranked 9th and was listed as increasing 7% from 1991 to 1997, with \$202 million in federal awards for research and development (1995).

VISION OF THE RESEARCH UNIVERSITY.

A white paper titled "The Future of the Research University," and written by Vic Bloomfield, Sara Evans, Len Kuhi, Judith Martin, and Barbara Reid, was distributed to committee members for their review; this paper was commissioned by the Faculty Consultative Committee in January, 1997. Professor Kuhi asked all committee members to review this document prior to the next meeting and to think about the future of this University as a research institution..

Professor Kuhi noted that he was scheduled to meet with the new Vice President for Research, Christine Maziar, after the meeting and asked committee members to provide a list of concerns that they would like brought to her attention. Committee members suggested the following points for Professor Kuhi's meeting with the new VP for Research:

- Should the position of VP for Research and the Dean of the Graduate School be separated into two separate positions? The FCC has strong sentiment that they should be separated, and yet it was noted that although the position is a broad assignment, there are several times when it is advantageous to be knowledgeable of both issues. However, concern was raised that the graduate school position may suffer due to the broad scope and heavy workload of the research position.
- It is awkward to guarantee funding to students with grants that don't follow the student calendar. For example, it is common for research grants to end mid-year, and yet graduate students working on the research projects must continue throughout the school year. Is there any way for research and the graduate school to consider ways to integrate the two schedules?
- Will IMG encourage or discourage collaboration among departments across campus? What about investing in areas of strength versus bringing people together to try something new? Should we assess opportunities and test them out so that existing or new confederations will be supported versus trying something new and realizing that although it was a good idea, it just didn't work out.
- The needs and rights of post-doctoral students should be investigated at the University. For example, a post-doc obtaining a grant often loses health benefits because their employment status changes at the University.

Senate Research Committee
February 12, 1998

4

Professor Kuhi informed committee members that he will bring the above issues to the attention of the new Vice President for Research.

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 PM.