Senate Research Committee
Monday, January 23, 2006
1:15 - 3:00
238 Morrill Hall

Present: Steven Ruggles (chair), Mark Ascerno, Dianne Bartels, Lyn Bearinger, Arlene Carney, Christopher Cramer, Penny Edgell, Genevieve Escure, Paul Johnson, James Luby, Tim Mulcahy, Brian Reilly, Maria Sera, Virginia Seybold, Charles Spetland, Barbara VanDrasek, Ed Wink, Michael Volna, Jean Witson

Absent: Richard Bianco, Dan Dahlberg Sharon Danes, Robin Dittman, Kathy Ensrud, J. Stephen Gantt, Jake Granholm**,** James Klaas, Mark Paller, Thomas Schumacher, Virginia Seybold, George Trachte

Guests: Brittany Lloyd, David Lee

Other: WinAnn Schumi

[In these minutes: Enterprise Financial System project; Human Tissue and Specimens in Research and Teaching]

        Professor Ruggles convened the meeting at 1:15 pm.

1.   Enterprise Financial System project

        Professor Ruggles welcomed Ms. Brittany Lloyd, and she and Mr. Michael Volna presented an update on the Enterprise Financial System. They distributed supporting materials, and noted that the new financial system enhances the sponsored and nonsponsored financial management capabilities of the University, and that the system is part of the necessary infrastructure for a top 3 public research university, as well as being a transformational project within the President's strategic positioning efforts. The project from January 2004 to July, 2005 included a joint analysis and design for budgets, general ledger, and chart of accounts; implementation of the treasury module; and plan for Phase 2. Implementation of Phase 2, underway in August 2005, encompasses accounts payable and employee expenses; accounts receivable and billing; asset management; endowments/treasury; grants, projects and contracts; general ledger; chart of accounts and management reporting; and purchasing. It also includes technical, functional and change management teams. Ms. Lloyd referred to the handout distributed and highlighted the fact finding summary, which illustrated the progression of the current proposal/award process. The grants fact-finding summary recommendations include retaining EGMS for proposal preparation and routing, as well as the use of full PS Grants suite to replace remaining grants systems.   She acknowledged that having data in one format is critical in moving forward as a Top 3 institutions.

        Ms. Lloyd reviewed the reasons for the recommendations which include the data being in one format; integrated F&A expenditures and allocations; enhanced functionality; commitment control; and

continued use of EGMS proposal preparation. Some parts would be eliminated: for example, EGMSi and CUFS. Ms. Lloyd reviewed the EFS project timeline and work plan, and summarized the analyze phase. Upcoming activities include preparing for conference room pilots (system simulations) and documenting future business processes. She said that determining what system modifications will be completed to enhance delivered functionality and a critical milestone will include input from the committee. She went on to cite the implications for sponsored research. These include retention of EGMS; certified approvers; enhanced financial competencies; roll out strategies and more accessible financial data. Mr. Volna expounded on the enhanced financial competencies, saying that he was working with departments to establish policies and procedures. He emphasized that the purpose was to simplify the lives of departments, and noted that there hasn't been an effective means of communicating functionality of the system. At this point, they were trying to ensure that end users can use the system as needed.

Mr. Volna also noted that many end users expressed concern that their jobs would be eliminated if the system changed and he assured the committee this would not be the case. Professor Edgell asked who the typical end users were, and Mr. Volna replied that in identifying end users, five or six key roles have been identified which include initiator, preparer, approver and end user. Professor Edgell and Mr. Volna agreed that the system needs to be flexible for the initiator. Mr. Volna stressed that flexibility lies not in the system but in the policy. Once the policy is set, the system needs to accommodate it and the vision they are working toward is striking the right balance from policy to initiator to end user so it works more effectively and efficiently for everyone. Ms. Lloyd added that as the project continues, they are focused on the integrity of the strategic initiative, and she emphasized that if the launch occurs as planned, there will be much more data available in the central database. Professor Edgell pointed out that various tracking capabilities and report generating functions are essential to small foundations who don't like working the bureaucracy of large institutions and that flexibility in such would help in dealing with smaller foundations. Ms. Schumi said it would be helpful to forward such comments to the task forces. Professor Bearinger asked that the various needs of the departments be kept in mind as the project moves forward, particularly concerning the financial management of training grants as well as research grants. Bearinger indicated that the financial reporting and monitoring of training grants differ from research grants, particularly if they are cross-school, cross-disciplinary training grants. Professor Cramer added that when it comes to reporting, there should be a mechanism to remind principal investigators (PIs) when a report is due. Ms. Lloyd said that she would see that this was taken into account. Edgell asked if there was a system for NIH grants, for example, by which grant reports can be organized by codes that the NIH uses vs. those of the University. Lloyd said there are rules and ramifications if that is not set up properly and that they would continue to run scenarios. Volna said this too would be taken into consideration.

Mr. Volna added that they'd tried to consult with a broad variety of people who might be affected by policies, and in making the changes, they analyzed and canvassed all who might be affected.

Professor Escure asked for clarification regarding travel policies, and Mr. Volna outlined the policy, noting that as of January 1, the University had changed the per diem policy. He noted that the new policy established, clarified and simplified per diems, and said that the university will pay out up to $300,000 more in per diems but the money saved on administrative costs far outweighs this.

Returning the discussion regard the Enterprise Financial System, Ms. Witson asked if there was a way the initiator could trace how grant monies were being spent, rather than just seeing the balance. She noted that PIs have a difficult time tracking expenses and asked if the new system will be clearer and if PIs will have access to that data. Ms. Schumi responded that reports are available on the web and tell how much is available, how it is budgeted, and percentages allocated. Categories may be chosen based on account numbers and one can go on-line any time to track these figures. Mr. Volna asked if she was using reporting tools developed by AHC, and   Professor Bearinger added that in the School of Nursing this information was accessible on-line with immediate updates. Professor Bearinger also suggested that, given

some shadow reporting systems had been developed, presumably to address gaps in the current systems, these be considered in identifying ways to adapt the new system to meet current needs for grants management and reporting. Mr. Volna said that his department had identified many shadow systems across the University and they were then trying to incorporate practical aspects of such shadow systems, with the intent of eliminating such redundant systems. The goal was to provide functionality after identifying the nature of the shadow systems.

Professor Ruggles thanked Mr. Volna and Ms. Lloyd for presenting the information to the committee.

2.   Human Tissue and Specimens in Research and Teaching

Professor Ruggles welcomed to the meeting David Lee, Director of the Anatomy and Bequest program. Mr. Lee presented a draft of the policy regarding procuring, using and disposing of human specimens used for research and teaching, and said that the draft had been established due to an audit of the bequest program. There were concerns that specimens were coming to the University but not through the bequest program; the development of the bequest program was to establish a consent process in the donation and procurement of human specimens. He pointed out that many donation programs are problematic and use unsavory and unethical practices. He expounded on the reasons for the policy, and explained that the use of donated bodies is regulated by the 1987 Uniform Anatomical Gift Act. According to the act, the University must ensure that individuals who donate bodies or the body parts give informed consent to use these remains for research and teaching. The Anatomy Bequest Program has mechanisms for verifying that vendors have obtained informed consent for the specimens they handle. When the research or teaching activity is complete, the specimen must be disposed of according to environmental health and safety regulations, and the wishes of the next-of-kin. The Anatomy Bequest Program ensures that final disposition meets both health and safety regulations, and contractual obligations. Mr. Lee noted that the policy indicates that donations should be facilitated through the program directly, so the donations come through the appropriate channels and are appropriately documented, and appropriate final dispositions are made. He indicated that they are working on a final draft policy for the University.

Professor Bearinger asked about the relationship between HIPAA and body donation, and how one affects the other. Mr. Lee said that bodies are assigned a number for the system, which allows students access to the information about the specimen but there is no name attached to the specimen. Further, students are reminded to follow HIPAA regulations.

Mr. Lee went on to say that although a uniform anatomical gift act was initially effective, many for-profit body programs exist which have no policies in place. He said that University was trying to be proactive in the matter, as many private companies are not doing due diligence in the distribution and implantation of body parts. Professor Cramer asked if there were periodic inventories of bodies, to which Mr. Lee responded that the bequest program has a very good tracking mechanism in place and the audit confirmed that. To answer Professor Escure's question about definition of the terms *vendor* vs. *donor*, Mr. Lee clarified that a vendor processes the body and supplies the needed parts, and charges fees accordingly, though it is illegal to sell bodies. Whereas a donor makes a statement during his or her lifetime that they would like to make a gift of their body at the time of death, and the family must give consent to that when the death occurs.

Professor Ruggles thanked Mr. Lee for the information. The meeting concluded at 2:25.

-- Mary Jo Pehl

University of Minnesota