

## SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE\*

March 8, 1996

### Minutes of the Meeting

**PRESENT:** Allen Goldman (chair), Mark Brenner, Elizabeth Jansen, N. L. Gault, Marilyn DeLong, Jeylan Mortimer, Christopher Wiley, Kathy James, Joel Eisinger, Kathryn Rettig, Mark Snyder, Tony Potami, Robin Dittman

**REGRETS:** Henry Buchwald, Susan Hupp

**OTHERS:** WinAnn Schumi, Fay Thompson

**GUESTS:** Fennel Evans, Richard Bianco

The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

Professor Fennel Evans provided an overview of the draft of the Roles and Responsibilities for Sponsored Research Grant Management document. The document is the result of the Arthur Anderson report. He directed members' attention to the first page of the document and began walking them through it. He pointed out the definitions of the various roles played by people in the grants process. They are: initiate, notify, no role, expedite, approve, local oversight, institutional oversight, and policy (who is responsible for the policy). Initiate, expedite, and approve involve implicit responsibility for integrity, accuracy, and validity. There is also a statement that says that if you delegate, you take on the role of oversight.

In writing a grant, there are several main steps: 1) proposal process; 2) award process; 3) award acceptance; 4) sponsored project management; and, 5) project closure.

Professor Evans pointed out two important changes and noted that they are still being discussed. The first is that a PI must sign a document stating their acknowledgement and willingness to accept responsibilities and to follow the regulations that go with running that specific grant; and, secondly, the recommendation is that the PI must provide a written justification for any re-budgeting involving changes in salary, travel, and capital equipment not directly authorized in the grant budget.

One member asked why it was decided to have local oversight in some areas and not all? Professor Evans responded that they will go back and conduct an audit on both oversight locally and institutionally on all of the categories.

Professor Evans drew members' attention to the last page of the document which list the areas that the University has as a commitment and an obligation to the research enterprise. This list identifies who is responsible to: a) develop, coordinate, and disseminate U of M policies which are consistent with Federal, State and University regulations; b) negotiate and provide in accordance with federal regulations; c) develop policies relating to research; d) provide U-wide systems that meet the research enterprise requirements; e) maintain; f) coordinate external audits required by regulations; g) provide defense and indemnification for faculty members and staff according to U policy; h) provide proper levels of insurance coverage; i) act as an advocate and spokesperson for University research community; and j)

---

\*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.

establish goals and benchmarks for sponsored project activity. Professor Evans pointed out that the list shows major deficiency on how we do this. Calling this list a tree, he said that an audit will be conducted of all the processes and look at how they are managed. An important role of for the Vice President of Research is to maintain continual oversight and item G is important for the Research Committee, he said, and suggested the committee pursue it vigorously.

Dr. Brenner said that as we expect the PI to have more responsibility, we need to provide the PI and the departments with current information.

Relative to the issue of indemnification, Dr. Brenner said that he has asked the General Counsel for data as to the number of requests for indemnification and percentage of those people who have actually been indemnified. Another commented that there is the question of whether there is due process. Professor Evans told the committee that information regarding roles and responsibilities will be on-line.

What happens if one fails to comply, one asked? Dr. Brenner responded that individuals who fail to comply will not be authorized to receive grants. The area of oversight needs to be flushed out, Professor Evans said. There is a fine line between interference and oversight to insure compliance with regulations, a member said.

#### ANIMAL CARE COMMITTEE

Dr. Richard Bianco, chair of the Animal Care Committee provided the committee with an update on the functions of the office. The goal to professionalize the administrative support of the committee has been achieved with the help of Dr. Brenner, he began. The administrative activities of the Animal Care Committee has been integrated with the Human Subjects Care administrative activities. The integrated office will be called Research and Subjects Office. Two additional staff will be hired and will be located on the 5th floor of the Mayo Building. Dr. Bianco clarified that the reorganization is not in response to any problem but to an over reliance on volunteers. The reorganization also clarifies the relationship between the Animal Care Committee with the institutional veterinarians - the Animal Care Committee serves as an oversight committee to the Research Animal Resources Program.

The Animal Care Committee differs from the RIB in that: 1) ACC has semi-annual inspection responsibilities mandated by the OPRR; and 2) has responsibility for every animal that the Regents own - which means thousands of animals. The Animal Care Committee is comprised of 15 members, including students and two public members.

One of Dr. Bianco's priorities for next year is to obtain a voluntary accreditation body that certifies that your animal care program meets certain standards. The NIH depends heavily on certification, he said. Dr. Bianco spent some time discussing the district court ruling that requires the University to turn over all animal usage forms.

One member asked whether there are reports on complaints, what they were, and the outcomes? Dr. Bianco responded that a written record goes to OPRR, the institution, and to the federal government.

How many active protocols to do you currently have, it was asked? Including the agricultural experimental stations, there are around 2,500, Dr. Bianco responded. There are about 5,600 human subject protocols.

## GRANTS MANAGEMENT PROJECT

Dr. Mark Brenner gave a status report of the Grants Management Project. Regarding research grants activity, the University was required by NIH to have an expanded audit of some of the major research projects. Previously, 16 grants were looked at by Coopers and Lybrand -in addition they looked at an additional 25 grants. Their conclusions found conditions that were not inconsistent with previous reported audits. They did not find major systemic flaws or incidence of abuse, however, the processes leave something to be desired, he said. The NIH site visit report identified strengths, weaknesses and several recommendations. The recommendations include:

### Internal Control and Compliance

- Improve monitoring and control activities
- Clarify roles and responsibilities
- Revise policies and procedures
- Enhance training
- Improve financial informational systems

### Organizational Issues

- ORTTA
- Financial reporting

### Time Line for Action

- Compliance Agreement - April 15, 1996
- Revise Roles and Responsibilities Document
  - Discuss April 1, finalize May 15
- Initiate Training Sessions - May 1996
- Financial Systems
  - Change Business Practices - May 15
  - Pilot Front-end System - July 1
  - Provide Reports to PIs - July 1
  - Pilot GAMS - Phase I - Oct 1

### Revise/Approve Policies

- Code of Conduct - Senate - May 20
- Administrative Policies - ongoing

Due to time, Dr. Brenner quickly walked through the report and suggested members take time to review it more closely.

## TUITION REMISSION PLAN UPDATE

Dr. Brenner gave the committee an update on the tuition remission plan for academic year 1996-97. He distributed a document outlining the tuition plan. Under the plan, all students would be required to pay a base tuition of \$30.00 - currently the system now. For students who take 1-5 credits there would be a tuition band, instead of paying by the credit. This would be \$750.00, meaning they would pay \$780.00, including the base tuition. The alternative to paying for the first few credits would have been paying

\$260-280 per credit. These rates are adjusted for a 7.5% increase over the current tuition. Tuition for 6-12 credits will be \$1,500 per quarter (a student taking 6-12 credits would pay \$1,500 plus the base tuition fee of \$30.00 per quarter). A third band of 13-16 credits will cost an additional \$380 (the total cost for taking 13-16 credits would be \$1,910). The difference of this plan from the others is that once a student has completed their prelim and they have taken 36 thesis credits, they qualify for continuous registration. Students would pay \$300.00 per quarter if they are on an assistantship and \$150.00 per quarter if they are paying their own way. Tuition remission would be capped at 12 credits.

Dr. Brenner said that they contemplated different models of recovering the cost. One was to recover it as a fringe benefit cost, the other as a direct charge to the employer. Regarding the implementation of the direct charge mechanism, the decision is likely to be that a direct charge system would be too difficult to implement for this coming year. The complexities of how to administer it and the cost that will be incurred is not understood at this time. The proposal is to go forward with the tuition plan but to recover the costs as a fringe benefit. He then directed members' attention to page four of the document. Dr. Brenner told the committee that there is a higher fringe benefit rate for supporting a student for 6-12 credits. The reason being is that there is a tuition shortfall that is carried forward for having under-recovered for this year. This needs to be paid off over the next two years. This is an additional cost of 3.4%.

Students in professional degree programs who are on assistantships are disadvantaged by this program, Dr. Brenner noted. Student in these programs typically are taking 15-18 credits. Now they will get 12 credits remitted and their tuition is higher.

Dr. Brenner pointed out that for those students who need to drop out while working towards a degree will be afforded a leave of absence option. A leave of absence can be authorized by the advisor and the DGS of the program the student is in. It can be taken incrementally for a total of two years; or, 1 year for master's degree students.

The Executive Council of the Graduate School has reviewed the plan and voted 8-4 in favor of it. Approval of the proposal is needed by the provosts and VP Infante.

## CODE OF CONDUCT

Dr. Brenner told the committee that the draft Code of Conduct is being circulated to SCFA and Research and then to FCC, SCC and on to the Senate. Dr. Brenner asked members for comments. He said the purpose of the code is to frame some general statements of what is proper, respectful conduct. While most of the points are obvious to many, to others they may not be. Some points made by members include:

- The code should be given out at the graduate student level
- This is an assertion of the culture in academia in a formal way
- Has the Denny Committee reviewed the code?
- Should the policy statement and guidelines be separated and title the section regarding guidelines something different?
- Should authorship and peer review be separated?
- What is meant by the University community? The majority of the document focuses on faculty.
- Concern was expressed about the last sentence in the first paragraph of the Policy Statement...."It is important that these values and the tradition of ethical behavior be consistently demonstrated,

carefully maintained, and transmitted to future generations." Who is this directed at? Dr. Brenner responded that it is directed at those people who represent themselves as agents of the institution. We have no control over the future people transmitting these values, it was added.

Additional comments, etc. should be sent to Dr. Brenner and/or Frances Lawrenz.

#### ESTIMATING THE COST OF SPONSORED RESEARCH

Dr. Brenner distributed a document regarding estimating the cost of sponsored research. Turning to page six, Dr. Brenner said that he believes that we are aggressively moving to aligning the distribution of indirect cost to how they were generated. Essentially, he said, what they have been doing, is transferring some dollars within the institution that have nothing to do with indirect costs. For example, faculty setups or facilities - facilities were not being funded with indirect cost, but yet a part of the recovery is based on the cost of facilities - so they traded dollars with facilities and are now funded faculty setups with state O&M money and funding facilities with ICR. The point is to ultimately show that we are returning the indirect cost to the places that actually generated them, he said. Another major change in the ICR budget for this coming year is that the formula funds will be doubled and will go directly to the units that generated them based on the ICR generated in fiscal 1995, Dr. Brenner told the committee. The units should be notified of the changes late April or early May.

Again, due to time, Dr. Brenner concluded his comments about this item and encouraged members to read the document.

#### ANNUAL REPORT ON RESEARCH

Dr. Brenner distributed copies of the his Annual Report on Research.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45-p.m.

- Vickie Courtney

University of Minnesota