

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee  
December 14, 1989**

- Present: W. Andrew Collins (acting chair), Norman Kerr, M. Kathleen Price, Burton Shapiro, Michael Steffes, James VanAlstine
- Guests: Anthony Faras (chair, Senate Research Committee), President Nils Hasselmo, Dean Robert Holt, Senior Vice President Leonard Kuhi, Maureen Smith (Brief), Rabun Taylor (Footnote)

**1. Organization and Support for Research**

Professor Collins welcomed Senior Vice President Kuhi and Dean Holt to the meeting to discuss the current University arrangements for support of research.

Dean Holt began by explaining that there are two central groups which deal with research. One is the Research Executive Council (REC), which includes as its members the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, Agriculture, and the Health Sciences, the Director of Research Administration, the Vice Provost for Arts, Sciences, and Engineering, and the Dean of the Graduate School. One difference from the previous structure is that Dean of the Graduate School serves as chair of REC. In response to a question, Dean Holt said that there are no "bench researchers" on REC; everyone who serves does so in an ex officio capacity. REC is an administrative council, not a faculty body.

The second group is the President's Development Committee, reconstituted by President Hasselmo; this group includes the members of REC as well as representatives from the University Foundation, the Foundation Board of Trustees, and the Vice President for Finance and Operations.

REC has a staff, headed by Graduate School Associate Dean Mark Brenner and with representatives from the offices of all who serve on REC. The Advisory Task Force on Planning (the Campbell Committee) recommended that there be a faculty advisory committee to REC; the Health Sciences Research Advisory Committee and the General Research Advisory Committee, meeting together, will serve in that capacity.

Issues which have been or will be taken up by REC include management of the endowed funds/PUF chairs, relationship of the University to the Greater Minnesota Corporation and its proposed research institute, and national matters where the University needs a position (such as earmarking research funds). The faculty committees will be involved in:

- the allocation of funds
- review of new initiatives (especially where they cross college lines) and how they fit in University priorities

---

\* 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.

- how research centers should be financed, the question of large matches from the federal government for new centers (the University could handle the \$15,000-20,000, and up to \$100,000; the match for the Center for Interfacial Engineering was \$5,000,000) and what policies should guide them
- maintenance of research facilities (much recent University construction has been for research, but the legislature is deliberately providing no funds for maintenance; how should the University maintain the hundreds of thousands of square feet it is bringing on line?)

Dean Holt also told the Committee that the expansion of the research activities of the University is much greater than the number of buildings it can acquire. There is a backlog of 40 years of buildings but the research enterprise cannot be held back--so there will be an increasing use of rented space, use of the University's bonding authority, and reliance on private contractors to build space which the University will then rent. (The University has signed a 5-year lease for space in a new building next to the Supercomputer Center; ORTTA will move there.) Dr. Kuhi pointed out that the research activity of the faculty has been driving the need for space so the University builds huge complexes without any guiding policy. This trend, he added, does not take into account undergraduate education, which is usually conducted in the worst buildings on the campus.

Dean Holt pointed out that REC has only met once, so the needed policy development is only beginning.

Professor Faras asked Dr. Kuhi and Dean Holt what the organizational lines of responsibility and authority are as far as research is concerned; who speaks for research on the campus? If an issue is brought up, to whom does one go? Dean Holt said that an issue raised by the faculty properly goes to the Senate Research Committee but that the spokesperson for research is REC. There is some fuzziness, he noted, because REC might send an issue to the Research Committee for advice, and substantive issues would also go to the faculty advisory committees and then to REC for recommendation to the central administration. There is no central spokesman for all issues, Dean Holt said, because issues in agricultural research are different from those in the health sciences. Dr. Kuhi added that the President has considered the creation of a vice president for research and that question remains to be addressed with finality. For the time being, Dean Holt as chair of REC serves as nominal speaker for research interests as well as traffic cop on issues that arise.

In terms of recommendations from the Senate Research Committee, it was concluded, they should go jointly to the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning and to the Faculty Consultative Committee for review and forwarding to the administration.

Professor Faras recommended that representatives from the Research Committee, the Committee on Finance and Planning, and the Faculty Consultative Committee be made voting participants of REC so that the faculty would have a voice in the development of research policies.

Professor Faras warned Dean Holt and Dr. Kuhi that the issue of Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR) monies was a sensitive one and coming to a head. The Research Committee has forwarded to the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning a proposed policy concerning use of ICR funds, but there are two big

issues which must be addressed. One is the fact that fewer and fewer grant proposals are being funded (by NIH, for instance); the more money a program can bring in, the more competitive it will be, and the University should not take money from those units which are successful.

The second issue is the question of dollars needed to maintain research facilities: ICR funds are not returned to investigators but the University "nickel and dimes" them with expenses. Dr. Kuhl expressed reservations about returning any funds to principal investigators and suggested that an alternative may be for the University to use the ICR funds to pay for expenses now being levied against the researchers (that is, use the ICR funds the way they are supposed to be used). At Berkeley, he told the Committee, the funds are used in a variety of ways, mostly as start-up funds and for research equipment; it is, he added, one of the few areas where a university has flexibility in the use of funding.

Dr. Kuhl also observed that the uses of ICR funds is another issue which needs to be taken up by REC; along with maintenance of space, some funds could (and should) be set aside for depreciation of equipment and amortization of facilities. One way ICR funds could be used is to pay off bonds issued to build new facilities. It was pointed out by one Committee member that ICR funds are not "funny money"--there are indirect costs which must be paid.

Dr. Kuhl was asked whether, inasmuch as the University is unable to keep up with building needs for research, there are indicators of the rate of increased space needs. He responded that if one looked at dollars awarded to the faculty in research contracts, they were up 20% over the previous year--and that there is a need to analyze increasing space requirements.

It was suggested that another future agenda item should be the relationship of the research enterprise to graduate training. Dean Holt told the Committee that the quality of applicants to graduate programs, in 80% of the units, has increased noticeably. Of those who accepted and turned down Graduate School offers of aid, 76% of those who went elsewhere went to one of the top 15 research institutions in the country; of those who accepted and came to Minnesota, 50% could also have gone to one of those 15 schools. There has also been a 20% increase in applications to graduate programs--and the applicants are not all foreign students; there has been an 18% increase in domestic applications.

Other issues touched on in the closing stages of the discussion were:

- The differences in ICR rates among private and public institutions; the federal government pays rates to private institutions that are double the rates paid to public institutions. It was argued that steps should be taken to persuade the government to adopt a uniform rate--because the indirect costs are almost certainly the same irrespective of the type of institution conducting research.
- The rapidly rising costs of hazardous waste disposal and the possible sources of funds to pay them; should ICR funds be used?
- The centers program of the federal government has been a boondoggle; all it has done is take away money for research.

## **2. Discussion with Senior Vice President Kuhi**

Dr. Kuhi told the Committee that one big issue on his mind is the MSPAN reports. He said that he is chairing a committee to come up with a University position in advance of the MSPAN 2 report so that we are not broadsided as we were with MSPAN 1.

He also informed the Committee that after some initial reservations about what the MSPAN 2 group might do he is now encouraged. The issues they have identified include:

- access and the actual needs for post-secondary institutions; access to graduation is also a concern.
- financing, including the state formula calling for students to pay 1/3 of the cost of tuition, enrollment-based funding, and financial aid.
- the roles of different segments of the higher education community in the state; these must be settled because there has been an increasing blurring of the lines. The State Universities have been pushing for doctoral programs; he maintained that because investment in research is so enormously expensive it does make sense to set up a parallel structure in the State Universities, especially given the likely stability of funding in the future.
- governance and the role of the Higher Education Coordinating Board.
- delivery methods; there needs to be more use of television to serve outlying areas, more faculty in 2+2 programs, and more recognition of the change in the makeup of the student body (i.e., more non-traditional students).
- articulation; cooperation in transfers.

The University, Dr. Kuhi said, had had to make a quick response to the MSPAN 1 report, particularly on the practitioner-oriented master's degrees--and we keep hearing different things about what the University should do. HECB has decided now that it only wants interim reports until MSPAN 2 is completed, at which time a coordinated response to both reports should be made. In the end, he concluded, the University should "come out all right"; MSPAN 1, he said, was not based on an understanding of what the University is doing or on the actual demand.

## **3. Discussion with President Hasselmo**

Professor Collins explained that the President had asked to meet with the Committee to discuss personnel issues. It was moved, seconded, and voted unanimously to close the meeting.

## **4. Nomination of members, Task Force on Liberal Education**

It was moved, seconded, and voted unanimously to close the meeting to develop a list of nominees to serve on the Task Force on Liberal Education. The list was developed and will be forwarded to Vice President Kuhi next week.

Professor Collins then informed the Committee that Professor Ibele had been unsuccessful in naming a full complement of faculty to the task force on lengthening the probationary period; he had contacted all those individuals recommended by FCC and did not obtain the consent of enough faculty to constitute the task force. It was also voted to authorize Professor Ibele to exercise his own judgment in naming the final members of the task force.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota