

university of minnesota memo

To David Klaassen

From Martha Kvanbeck, U Senate

- For your information
- For your approval
- Per your request
- For your attention
- Note and file
- Note and return
- Note and forward
- Please advise
- Please reply
- Send copy
- Please see me

For your files I am enclosing material that was handed out at the University Senate meeting held on February 16.

Date 2/17/184

Dear Dr. Magrath:

QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT, Senate Meeting
Feb. 16, 1984

I congratulate you and the other members of the University Community who have been successful in attracting to the University of Minnesota, a football coach possessing a distinguished record of achievement. In their extensive discussion of this addition, the mass media have implied that a generous commitment of funds for athletic facilities has been made. While it is well recognized that our athletic facilities are in need of improvement, it is of concern, to those of us who teach in the trenches, as to what impact any such commitments will have on building capital improvements which are currently scheduled and/or on priority lists. More specifically, will any commitments made for the improvement of athletic facilities have an effect on the capital improvements request for the 1984 legislative session and if so, what are these changes.

Sincerely yours,



Paul G. Gassman
University Senator

From: Sheila Corcoran and Mariah Snyder,
Senators from the School of Nursing

Date: January 30, 1984

Re: Questions for the President

The General Assembly of the School of Nursing has had concerns about merit allocation to University units. Vice President Vanselow and Professor Howe have addressed some of our concerns. However, we still have the following unanswered questions:

1. Will the procedure of retrenching from the base budget of one unit to provide meritorious award for another unit continue?
2. If yes to #1, can another time frame be established for units to respond to the procedure and nominate themselves or others? Units received notice August 17 and nominations had to be submitted by September 30, 1983; during that time a majority of faculty members were on vacation.
3. What selection procedure was used for membership on the special sub-committee? Was the membership only from FCC, SCFA, the Senate Finance Committee? Or was it from outside those committees?
4. What mechanisms were used to obtain input from the total university community regarding the procedures for allocating merit money to units?

Thank you for addressing our concerns.

MS:SC:gb

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

SECRECY IN RESEARCH

MOTION:

The Senate Research Committee recommends that the grant proposal of Professor G. Edward Schuh with the Ministry of Planning for Panama through the United Nations Development Program be allowed despite restrictive language in the Instrument of Agreement.

INFORMATION:

In Article 4 of the Regents Secrecy in Research Policy approved October 8, 1971, the Office of Research Administration is directed to bring to the Senate Research Committee proposed research grants which limit the full and prompt public dissemination of results. The subject grant contains language in Articles 14 and 15 which does not meet Articles 1 and 2 in the Regents Policy on Secrecy in Research. At the urgent request of Professor G. Edward Schuh, who has exhausted alternatives, the Senate Research Committee polled its membership and voted 5 to 4, with one abstention, to allow the Office of Research Administration to approve the Instrument of Agreement.

COMMENTS:

The favorable vote was based on the assurance from Professor Schuh that the agreement between the principals does not call for secrecy despite the instrument's language. The reason for the 4 dissenting votes was a recognition that the signing of an instrument with no intention to abide by it was an improper act.

PERRY BLACKSHEAR, CHAIR

Regents Policy Statement

October 8, 1971

104

SECURITY IN RESEARCH

Article 1. The University of Minnesota shall not accept support from any source for research under a contract or a grant which would restrain the University from disclosing (1) the existence of the contract or grant; (2) the identity of the sponsor or the grantor and, if a subcontract is involved, the identity of the prime contractor if the results of the research must be reported to the sponsor, grantor, or prime contractor; and (3) the purpose and the scope of the proposed research in sufficient detail: (a) to permit informal discussion concerning the wisdom of such research within the University, and (b) to inform colleagues in immediate and related disciplines of the nature and importance of the potential contribution of the disciplines involved.

Article 2. The University of Minnesota shall not accept support from any source for research under a contract or a grant, even though it meets the requirements of Article 1, if the contract or grant limits the full and prompt public dissemination of results or specifically permits retro-active classification, except for reasons found compelling by the University community through the review process outlined in Article 4.

Article 3. The above policy shall apply to any research under a contract or grant which does not limit the full and prompt public dissemination of results at the time the research is undertaken by the University but becomes so limited thereafter. As soon as this occurs, the contract or grant, and the disposition of the results of the research obtained under such contract or grant shall be re-evaluated under the provisions of Article 4.

Article 4. a. The Director, Research Contract Coordination, or some other designated University official, shall report to the Senate Research Committee every proposed research grant or contract which meets the requirement of Article 1. but limits the full and prompt public dissemination of results. If this officer is not certain whether a particular research proposal requires the Senate Research Committee's recommendation, he shall submit the proposal to this committee for its determination.

b. The Senate Research Committee shall recommend to the Senate acceptance or rejection of every proposed contract or grant which limits the full and prompt public dissemination of results during fall, winter, and spring quarters, in sufficient detail to permit informal discussion of the recommendation made. In addition, the Committee shall report on any problems encountered in implementing this policy.

In performing its functions hereunder, the Senate Research Committee shall be authorized to seek the advice and assistance of ad hoc subcommittees competent to pass on the particular matters that may be involved. If some other University committee also has jurisdiction in a particular case, nothing in this statement of policy shall deprive it of that jurisdiction.

c. The University Senate shall review the recommendations of the Senate Research Committee and forward its own recommendations to the President. All proposals which are to be submitted for Senate evaluation shall be accessible to members of the University community (the faculty and students) in sufficient detail to permit informed evaluation and discussion.

over

The following Articles are excerpted from the UNDP/OPE Reference Project Number PAN-83-ROL dated February 7, 1984, which constitutes the Instrument of Agreement between the University of Minnesota and the UNDP:

Please note that Article 14 below violates Article 2 in the Regents Policy Statement while Article 15 below violates Article 1 of the Regents Policy Statement. Article 4 in the Regents Policy Statement forms the basis for requesting this action by the Senate.

Article 14 Confidential Nature of Documents

All maps, drawings, photographs, mosaics, plans, reports, recommendations, estimates, documents and all other data compiled by or received by the Contractor or its personnel under this Contract shall be the property of the UNDP, shall be treated by them as confidential, shall be delivered only to the duly authorized officials on completion of work under this Contract or as may otherwise be specified by UNDP under this Contract. In no event shall the contents of such documents or data be made known by the Contractor or its personnel to any unauthorized person without written approval of the UNDP. Subject to the provisions of this Article, the Contractor and its personnel may retain a reproducible copy of documents produced by them.

Article 15 Use of Name, Emblem or Official Seal of the UN and UNDP

Unless authorized in writing, the Contractor shall not advertise or make public the fact that it is performing, or has performed, services for the UNDP or the United Nations, or use the name, emblem or official seal of the UNDP or the United Nations or any abbreviation of the name of the UNDP or the United Nations for advertising purposes or for any other purposes.

THE PROPOSED RESEARCH ON PANAMA'S PRICE AND TRADE POLICIES

by the

Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics

The University of Minnesota

This proposed research is funded by the World Bank for the Government of Panama. The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) serves only as a contractual intermediary.

The research will make an assessment of current price and trade policy in Panama. The results of that analysis will be used in the design of a significant agricultural sector loan which the World Bank expects to make to Panama. The project is of short duration and has to be completed by the end of May. We will have a full-time person in Panama working with a group of Panamanians. In addition, four of our faculty will have two week trips to Panama to provide technical assistance.

The research and analysis will use publicly available data in rather standard ways. To evaluate how domestic price policies and trade policies impact the economy, we will compare domestic prices with their border price equivalents. In some cases we will use formal models of effective protection. The costs and benefits of these policies will then be assessed, as well as the consequences of changing present policies. The study will also make an evaluation of setting price policy based on cost of production, and suggest alternative means of doing it.