

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting

April 19, 1996

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.

PRESENT: Allen Goldman (chair), N.L. Gault, Joel Eisinger, Dorothy Hatsukami, Mark Snyder, Susan Hupp, Kathy James, Marilyn DeLong, Mark Brenner

REGRETS: Henry Buchwald, Jeylan Mortimer, Tony Potami, Christopher Wiley, Kathryn Rettig

GUESTS: Jane Whiteside, Halil Dundar, Erica Brandt, Rita Rosenthal

OTHERS: Fay Thompson

[In these minutes: Discussion of the Third Phase Critical Measures; Intellectual Property Policy; Analysis and Redesign of the Function of the Office of the Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School; Introduction of the Roles and Responsibility Document for Sponsored Research]

The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

THIRD PHASE CRITICAL MEASURES

Drs. Jane Whiteside and Halil Dundar provided an update of the Third Phase Critical Measures Discussion Draft. Dr. Whiteside pointed out that previous input provided by the committee regarding the interdisciplinary and applied measure are reflected in the current document. She explained that if you think about it, the second phase measure called scholarship, research and artistic accomplishments, is about the work of the faculty - there could be a section highlighting some of the important accomplishments and recognition of faculty - inevitably some of those will be interdisciplinary and some will applied, she said. The definition of what is applied and what is interdisciplinary will be left to the people doing the work, she said. What this means is that as the reporting out occurs on the scholarship, research, artistic accomplishment measure, there would be an overall statement/description of the activities of what were reported and a subset of that would pick up on the interdisciplinary and applied work. She directed members' attention to page 20 of the document.

She then asked for reactions. One member said that he was satisfied with doing it this way. Others agreed.

The next point of discussion was about Academic Reputation of Undergraduate, Graduate, and Professional Programs. Dr. Whiteside said that they struggled with this measure and have received numerous opinions about it varying from saying that it shouldn't be measured in this way at all to this is one of the more important things to hold up in a critical measure. Concerns about it range from communities of color and faculty of color who say that these reputational rankings are only reflection of the status quo and have nothing to do with many of the disciplines that are important to people who may be in the less traditional fields. Comments

were also made about the NRC rankings because it only represents a part of what the institution is about; other concerns have been raised about the methodology of some of the rankings, including the NRC rankings. She said that it seems logical to include what is in these three areas, such as the rankings and ratings, into the earlier measures (i.e., in the highlight section of the scholarship, research, and artistic measure).

On the undergraduate education side, they determined that there aren't a lot of credible ratings, she said. They have creatively tried to think of ways to look at the reputation of undergraduate programs such as the ACT test because the perception of quality (i.e., academic reputation) has been found to be one of the major determinants of student college choice. ACT data are also relatively comprehensive because approximately 90 percent of the state's college-bound high school graduates take the ACT test, she said. It also allows a breakdown by campus, by racial/ethnic group, and by test-score quartile.

Isn't there a danger of this approach localizing the University, it was asked? The ratings, it was said, no matter how flawed one might think them to be, are an important measure in determining a lot of things. For example, 30 years ago the English Department was ranked either number 1 or 3 and now it is far from the top - this means something in terms of lack of investment and/or lack of management in the College of Liberal Arts that has led to a decline. If one were to see a change such as this, it is a critical measure upon which people making decisions in the University ought to react. Dr. Whiteside asked for clarification....should the NRC ranking be a high level measure? Yes, was the response, if we really intend to be a national research university, then we should pay attention to the NRC rankings.

Dr. Whiteside pointed out that the Legislature has attached \$5 million to the University's base funding to the achievement of some improved levels of performance in those categories. In other discussions, she said, concerns were raised that if this measure is at a high level there could be expectations and that numerical goals could be attractive to the Legislature in terms of tying funding to it. It works both ways, it was said, why not go to the Legislature and say...."our English Department used to be ranked 2 and now it is 30....give us the funding to make it number 15.

The issue of choice among students taking the ACT seems to be very sensitive to economics and region, and not necessarily reputation, another commented. There are many factors that determine where one goes to college. Others agreed that the reputation of an institution was not the main factor for an individual's choice of college.

What about the retrospective view, one queried? Dr. Whiteside responded that there is another measure in the second group called post graduation experience which is a survey of alumni asking them about their retrospective view of the University and their educational experience. Have out-of-state students been asked why they choose to come here, one asked?

The trouble with the reputation assessment at the undergraduate level, one said, is that the undergraduate experience is so diverse that what might be perceived as a really positive feature of the institution in one set of individuals could be viewed as a serious negative to another group of individuals and vice versa.

Dr. Whiteside asked for additional input regarding the measurement of professional programs. It was said that it may not be possible to find something for everything, but as time goes on the enterprises that don't rate themselves eventually will. Measurements used in Medicine include tracking placements and clinical departments have a certain number of slots to fill with new graduates who apply from across the country, Dr. Gault said.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DRAFT POLICY

Erica Brandt, Director of the Copyright Permission Center, presented the Intellectual Property Draft Policy. She said a committee has been meeting since October to determine what areas of intellectual property relating to the University that needed to be addressed: a) the University as creator of Intellectual Property; b) a broker or distributor of Intellectual Property; and c) a user of Intellectual Property. The committee was divided into three different working groups: one to work with data, with educational materials, and one with electronic issues. The committee developed the draft policy.

Ms. Brandt said that the committee struggled with the issue of fair use as it relates to the use of copyrighted materials by members of the University community. She directed members' attention to page three of the document. The sharing of profits from intellectual property that is created at the University was also a popular discussion item, she said. It is suggested that any profit (income less direct development cost) will be divided 50-50 between the developer(s) and the University. It is suggested that the 50% assigned to the University be divided among the University and the units within the University having interest in the Intellectual Property.

One member expressed concern about the 50-50 rather than allowing it to be determined by a period process. Dr. Brenner pointed out that the first part of the policy is meant to be Regents Policy, the second part of the policy, starting with Implementation Guidelines and Procedures is administrative policy that can be updated without Regental approval.

Some time was spent discussing the expanded definition of "work product." It seems, said one, you have to protect "work products" which may have financial value and at the same time preserve academic freedom and the ability to disseminate things freely.

Does this apply to books and texts, it was asked? Ms. Brandt replied that it did. Does it mean that the University should get royalties on books? How is it decided whether a book is written on University of Minnesota time or personal time? A patent would be shared, Ms. Brandt said, but a copyright would not. The issues around work product and copyright generated a lively discussion. There isn't a problem with work products of a research program, the real problem, it was said, is what the distinction is between writing a book for a course and generating a software package? Dr. Brenner said that tradition has acknowledged that it is a part of scholarly activity to write books and in most cases the amount of income from it is nominal - generating a software package may be different. One member jokingly said, the distinction is that the University gets a cut if you make a lot of money, if you don't, then they won't care! This is a situation that as a result of creativity and intellectual activity, you could create great wealth - books don't usually do it, another interjected.

What is the main thrust for the policy, it was asked? Ms. Brandt responded that is to assert a proprietary interest by the University over Intellectual Property that is created here. The draft policy will be circulated for further review and will be brought back to the committee most likely in the Fall.

Members recommended that clarification be made regarding what is meant by "text" on page two of the document, under Expanded Definition of Work Products.

UPDATE ON THE ANALYSIS AND REDESIGN OF THE FUNCTION OF THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH AND DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

Professor Goldman reported that he is chairing a committee charged to look at the analysis and redesign of the functions of the Office of the Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. The committee is at a point where is it asking for input, comments, etc. He asked that members forward such comments to him via e-mail. One member asked if the committee will consider whether the idea of provosts is a failed experiment? Professor

Goldman responded that the experiment has not been in progress very long but to assume for the purpose of exercise that the system will continue and then the issue is what role should be played by the Graduate School and the Dean and Vice President for Research in a provostal system and perhaps a system in which there is RCM.

OTHER BUSINESS

Members agreed to move the May 17 meeting to May 10 since Dr. Brenner is not available on the 17th. The main agenda item for the May 10 meeting is to discuss the Roles and Responsibilities Document. Dr. Brenner said that the document has the objective of trying to address all of the major steps involved with the conduct of sponsored research from conception of the grant - to operation of the grant - through the closing of the grant. It identifies the respective roles and responsibilities of who does what. Dr. Brenner said that the document will be the framework from which the policies will flow and as automated systems are built, they too will reflect the transactions. He pointed out that the document will be on the Web.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

- Vickie Courtney