

Minutes*

**Senate Research Committee
Friday, January 23, 1998
433 Johnston Hall
1:00 PM**

Present: Len Kuhi, Chair; Phil Norcross, Marilyn DeLong, John Finnegan, Burle Gengenbach, Eric Klinger, Barbara Van Drasek, Karl Kistler

Guests: Frances Lawrenz, David Hamilton

Regrets: Mark Brenner, Bianca Conti-Fine, Scott McConnell

Absent: Robin Dittman, Dorothy Hatsukami, Kathryn Rettig, Albert Nakano

[In these minutes: Grants Management Committee, NIH Update, Oversight of Cloning, Recommendation for Cost-Benefit Analysis, Vision]

The University Senate Research Committee met at 1:00 PM on Friday, January 23, 1998 in 433 Johnston Hall on the East Bank of the U of MN. The minutes from the Research Committee meeting held on Friday, November 14, 1997, distributed to committee members via e-mail prior to the meeting, were approved as written.

GRANTS MANAGEMENT.

A organizational chart describing the Grants Management Committee (GMC) was distributed to committee members. Professor Len Kuhi, Chair, introduced Professor David Hamilton who came to inform the committee about changes being made to grants management. Professor Hamilton reported that the Research Committee would have an unaccustomed role in the grants management process and added that he will return to each meeting to continue discussions with the committee on this subject. He reported that the GMC met recently and discarded the original agenda due to concern about the fact that Mark Brenner would no longer be the Vice President of the Graduate School and that without a reporting line, they were unsure how their recommendations would be implemented. The GMC drafted a set of questions addressing the issue and forwarded them to the President's Executive Committee consisting of Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences Cerra, Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks, and President Yudof who met to discuss the issue. The GMC will be reformulated and Professor Hamilton was asked to take charge of this effort at the University; he agreed to head the GMC with WinAnn Schumi as the full-time project manager. Since then, Professor Hamilton has been meeting with people to formulate ideas and get the process back on track. Driven in part by the recent developments with NIH, but also because President Yudof wants to decentralize many central functions, responsibility for issues that will arise in the future are going to be placed on college deans and departmental offices. He added that the committee will be expanding to include two Research Committee members: Burle Gengenbach and Scott McConnell; two more faculty (PIs) and associate deans for research will also be added to the committee. In addition, there will be a group of ex-officio members: Ed Wink, ORTTA; Terry O'Connor,

*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.

U Comptroller; Robert Kvavik, Associate VP; Mark Bohnhorst, General Counsel's Office; and Norma Allewell, Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Education. Professor Hamilton assured the Research Committee that the Grants Management Committee is made up of a strong group of people with a great deal of expertise.

Professor Hamilton reported that the roles and responsibilities aspect of this process must be addressed immediately and should be resolved before the GMC can progress in any of the other aspects. The processes have been grouped into three distinct subcommittees: Central Processes, Departmental Processes, and Training. He added that because all of the processes require technology, the Office of Information Technology will continue to play a crucial role in the electronic grants management system, electronic routing and approval, and financial transaction and reports.

Although the Grants Management Committee met weekly in the past, this year's committee will meet less frequently and will make decisions on the recommendations of the subcommittees, which will meet more frequently. The committee can approve, deny, or return for changes anything brought to it by one of the subcommittees. If approved, recommendations will be immediately forwarded to the President's Executive Committee, which is charged with the implementation of those recommendations. Professor Hamilton added that the timeline for this project involves a commitment through June, 1999.

The following issues related to the grants management system were discussed:

- The reporting process through the Academic Health Center
- Communication and strategy between the training silos around the university
- The decision to continue the CUFS system
- The human resources intercept with the grants management system
- The boundaries of the various considerations of the Grants Management Committee
- The role of the colleges in this process
- The automation of the grants management process
- The additional costs associated with decentralizing

The Grants Management Committee has two primary goals: 1) to get the university off exceptional status with NIH, and 2) to make the University run more efficiently. Although the first goal can be measured quite easily, the second goal will take a longer period of time, as well as prompting the need for ongoing evaluation.

A motion was made, seconded, and approved that there was consensus among the Research Committee to support the work of the Grants Management Committee.

NIH UPDATE.

The Grants Management Committee is responsible for resolving all of the issues associated with NIH. It was suggested that a document be produced to summarize and clarify the details of the grants management reorganization to complement the organizational chart distributed to committee members.

Professor Hamilton reported that the University received from NIH a critique of its progress to date. The critique contained both general and specific issues that were reviewed by the Grants Management Committee, which has been in the process of responding to the issues. The GMC is currently working on a formal work plan to send to NIH by February 1, 1998. He added that Mark Brenner is the lead worker

on the plan which should be drafted by next week, and then forwarded to President Yudof, Executive VP & Provost Bruininks, Senior VP for Health Sciences Cerra, WinAnn Schumi from ORTTA., and himself for review.

NIH made their last site visit to the University in November, 1995 and may be returning for another site visit in the fall. NIH has already been informed about the roles and responsibility documents and other reports on the Web, but they are concerned that these materials are not properly organized or that they are being presented in a way that is not easily accessible and understandable. Professor Hamilton noted that it is necessary to improve the training and communication among faculty because NIH will most likely test principal investigators during the site visit. Concern was raised about the substance of the EGMS training and whether or not faculty members are taking the training seriously.

OVERSIGHT OF CLONING.

Committee members were faxed materials related to the oversight of cloning prior to the meeting. Upon Mark Brenner's request, the committee reviewed three recommendations made by the Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) in an attempt to ensure that experiments are reviewed by the proper bodies:

1. Oversight of the ban on cloning of humans clearly should be handled by the Human Subjects Committee;
2. Experiments involving the cloning of animals should be reviewed by the Animal Care Committee;
3. Experiments involving the cloning of plants should be exempt from institutional review.

It was suggested that it be made clear that plants are exempt unless there is involvement of recombinant DNA; it was also recommended that a cloning box on the BA23 form be added. The committee approved the recommendations with the suggestions set forth above.

RECOMMENDATION FOR COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS.

A draft recommendation for a cost-benefit analysis was prepared by Professor Kuhl and distributed to all committee members by e-mail prior to the meeting. The recommendation resulted from concern that was raised at the November meeting about the increasing numbers of policies and procedures taking up large amounts of investigators' time and energy. Professor Eric Klinger presented his recommendations for changes on the draft to committee members, including the addition of existing policies with the new policies, the clarification of the nature of the problem, and the justification of the concept that both the cost and benefits be seen in terms of concrete changes that have emerged as a result of the regulations. Regulations include those that limit research or require additional reporting or activity on the part of investigators that is not specifically directed at producing research. Professor Kuhl offered to talk to the Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee regarding how the committee should proceed with this recommendation.

VISION.

Professor Kuhl asked committee members to begin thinking about the direction the University should take in respect to research and what message should the committee convey to the new Vice President for Research.

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 PM.