

SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE*

October 19, 1992

Minutes of the Meeting

PRESENT: Paul Sackett, John Basgen, V.S. Mangipudi, Daniel Feeney, N.L. Gault, Essie Kariv-Miller, Anne Petersen, Robert Jones, Signe Betsinger, Sara Evans

REGRETS: Eric Klinger

ABSENT: Jonathan Wirtschafter, Albert Yonas, Tony Potami, Susan Markham

GUESTS: Mark Brenner, Fay Thompson

Paul Sackett, Chair, welcomed new and returning members. He reviewed the charge and membership of the Committee. Members were reminded that the next scheduled meeting will be on November 16, 1:30 - 3:00, Regents Room. Future meetings will be planned, keeping in mind that Professor Klinger, Morris Campus, has a distance to travel.

Professor Sackett announced that the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning invited the Research Committee to its October 27th meeting for a discussion on Indirect Cost Recovery. Professor Sackett informed the group that as chair of the Research Committee, he serves as ex officio on that committee. He asked members if they would like a larger representation at the meeting. Members concurred that Professor Sackett could serve as the Committee's representative and bring back any issues that the Committee may need to respond to.

Members expressed an interest in learning more about Indirect Cost Recovery. Professor Brenner said that he would be happy to do this. He added that there are two parts - 1) how we collect the ICR funds and 2) how they are distributed. Professor Brenner stated that the Committee may want to consider inviting Marilyn Surbey, ORTTA, to an upcoming meeting to provide an overview of how the ICR funds are collected and he would be able to provide an overview of how they are distributed.

Anne Petersen, Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School, met with the Committee to discuss the points of mutual interest as well as provide an overview of her areas of responsibility. Vice President Petersen came to the University in March of last year. She came here knowing that the institution historically ranked in the top ten of research universities as well as a number of graduate programs. Many institutions are working under severe fiscal constraints, this includes the University of Minnesota. She stated that she did not come here with any illusions that the job would be easy. There are other challenges as well that go beyond fiscal issues, she said. There is an overall feeling that the research universities have not been serving the country well, she added. The key, she said, is to make sure that the University remains at the top.

Vice President Petersen went on to discuss some of the elements that could diminish the research enterprise. For example, she said, there are units that view the 0100 money that they get as money primarily intended for undergraduate education. This would begin to starve both graduate education and research. This is not

*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.

the premise by which the money is given by the state, she added. The state funds us as a research university and the money is suppose to be directed toward all of the missions of the institution. This is an internal threat to continued excellence, she stated. Vice President Petersen cited other examples of internal threats to excellence. She referred to the area of research on water. There are eight centers at the University, approximately 125 faculty, but no program directed toward water. Funding for the centers come from different areas - the University has around \$1 million invested in this research area. Collaboration is an important element in bringing resources together. She recommends that people come together to discuss federal research funding opportunities.

Another threat to the University, in times when funding is tight, she said, is in the nature of the faculty. One way of dealing with retrenchment is to fold in all vacated positions through retirement or resignation. We need to be mindful of what this means in an area that is of strength to the institution. If you compromise, to what extent can it continue to be strong? There needs to be a counter force in the University to deal with these kinds of issues, she added. If you continue to fold positions and are not recruiting, the next generation of faculty are missed.

She expressed her concern that any interdisciplinary efforts that have been launched will be threatened by the cutbacks because they don't have the same kind of departmental base. She went on to discuss how to have continued vitality while dealing with the fiscal issues.

Vice President Peterson moved on to discuss the review of excellence in the institution. As a starting point, information about areas of excellence at the institution is being gathered. This in itself is a challenge, because what do you use as an indicator of excellence? In many areas you can use research funding and citation data, she said. Memberships in the National Academies and the issuance of national awards are other indicators that might be looked at, she added. She said that the areas that demonstrate continued strength should be protected from any cutbacks as well as areas that are emerging. For those areas on the decline, you might try to reverse them or determine that support can't be continued.

Vice President Petersen said that she would like to see a Strategic Planning Committee, comprised of faculty, overseeing the process. She said it is also important for discussions to be conducted broadly before any actions can be taken. She added that she personally does not believe in closing units, but sees reorganization as an alternative. There have been some units closed but it is not at a massive stage and she does not anticipate that it will come to that. It is in the institution's best interest to think about how to do things better and to support the strengths and to continue in a positive direction, she concluded.

Vice President Petersen moved on to discuss the efforts underway regarding the function and organization of her areas.

Early in the Spring, a review committee was appointed to deal with the perceptions of the problems in the Graduate School. The charge she gave the committee was to look at graduate education. She asked them to think about what facilitates outstanding graduate education and then to look at what we have from that perspective and make recommendations about what we need to do to ensure we have the best. The review committee is chaired by Paul Johnson. A report from the group is expected in mid December.

Vice President Petersen reported that Tom Etten has been hired as a Federal Liaison and will be on board in November. Mr. Etten will represent the University at the Federal level and reports directly to her.

More should be done to represent science and scholarship in the media, she said. Science writing for national outlets is one mechanism to get more exposure for the exciting things that are happening here. She would like to see the University doing more in this area.

Another area that falls under her purview is that of academic integrity. A number of activities have been planned in this area:

- A conference will be held in November to focus on the issue of University-industry research collaborations.
- A committee has been appointed that will focus on academic integrity. Mark Brenner will chair the group. Paul Sackett has agreed to serve on it. The committee will focus on policies and practices related to academic integrity.
- An external task force, upon request by the Board of Regents, will look at the broader set of issues under the rubric of public-private partnerships. The task force will be asked to develop operating principles.

Vice President Petersen concluded her presentation by discussing the organization of her office. Many of the areas will stay where they are, such as ORTTA and the various centers. The Graduate School will be in Johnston Hall - primarily on the third floor. The fourth floor will comprise the administration.

It is her intent to establish an External Advisory Board for Research and Graduate Study. This group will be made up of individuals from within and without the state to look at the various issues.

Vice President Petersen asked for the Committee's reaction, comments and/or suggestions to supporting excellence in the institution.

One member stated that he was pleased to know that work is being done to build relations and solve the problems.

Another member commented that the key to excellence is in the recruitment of faculty and that the Dean of the Graduate School should be involved in the hiring process at an early state not only by the signing off on appointments. Vice President Peterson agreed and said that there is some ambiguity as to what her role is in this area and that it is currently being reviewed.

Lastly, a faculty member commended Vice President Petersen for conducting a review of graduate education and suggested that the "personal approach" ought to be reviewed as well. She added that this is one area where the University is lacking and that it is a serious problem. Vice President Petersen responded that she would bring this issue to the attention of the review committee.

The Committee thanked Vice President Petersen and commended her for her efforts.

Professor Sackett asked the Committee to direct its attention to the Fred Morrison letter regarding the issue of ownership of data. The questions at hand is whether there are University policies or rules about this issue, and if not, should the Committee develop such a policy. The Committee should think about this and be

prepared to develop a response to Professor Morrison's letter. This will be one of the main agenda items at the November meeting.

Professor Brenner commented that the Research Committee could make recommendations to the Academic Integrity Committee.

Professor Brenner asked that the Committee look at the most current revisions of the Academic Misconduct Policy at its next meeting. At the September meeting, the Board of Regents raised several issues and asked that the policy be reviewed and brought back to them. Professor Brenner stated that one of the first activities of the Academic Integrity Committee is to look at the issues that surfaced at the Regents meeting. The main item is to refine the definition of academic misconduct. The policy will go through the governance structure - to the Research Committee on November 16, the Consultative Committee on the 19 of November and to the Senate on December 10. The policy will go back to the Regents in January.

Meeting adjourned.

- Vickie Courtney

University of Minnesota