

Minutes*

**Senate Research Committee
Monday, March 5, 2012
2:15 - 4:00
238A Morrill Hall**

- Present: Linda Bearinger (chair), Alvaro Alonso, Margaret Catambay, Paul Cleary, Jerry Cohen, Maria Gini, Greg Haugstad, Seung-Ho Joo, Frances Lawrenz, Tucker LeBien, Jennifer Linde, Timothy Mulcahy, Kola Okuyemi, Federico Ponce de Leon, LaDora Thompson, Alexander Thorkelson, Kyla Wahlstrom, Karen Williams
- Absent: Melissa Anderson, Arlene Carney, Anna Clark, Robin Dittman, Marc Dunham, Demoz Gebre, Thomas Vaughan, Lynn Zentner
- Guests: Kate McCready (University Libraries); Mary Luther (Human Resources), Catherine Fitch (Minnesota Population Center); Professor Russell Luepker (Epidemiology), Vice Provost Henning Schroeder, Kevin McCoskey (Sponsored Projects Administration)
- Other: Emily Lawrence (President's Office); Nan Wilhelmson (Human Resources)

[In these minutes: (1) report of the chair; (2) networking tools and faculty expertise database; (3) research scientist position; (4) training grants]

1. Report of the Chair

Professor Bearinger convened the meeting at 2:15 and began with several updates.

-- The Committee's statement on research that is not externally funded was presented to the Faculty Senate for information. Nothing more will be done with it immediately, but University Relations may make use of parts of the statement for various purposes in the future.

-- President Kaler joins the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) once per month and at the last meeting he provided a preview of his State of the University address.

-- A number of FCC members met with a number of department chairs and heads at several lunches; some common threads emerged in the discussions: A concern about administrative support for faculty and the department/division heads, about pay and support for key administrative staff; metrics for judging graduate programs; support for graduate students; and recognition that there are different goals involved in hiring chairs and heads across the many departments.

-- She brought to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee an issue that has arisen about departments or colleges that are not signing off on grant proposals because the F&A (indirect cost) rate is too low, and so it would cost the unit too much money to support the grant (e.g., a training grant that only carries an 8% F&A rate). (Vice President Mulcahy joined that discussion.) She limited the discussion to proposals that carry negotiated rates or posted rates the University has agreed it will accept. (Associate

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

Vice President Webb later clarified that the 8% F&A rate for training grant is not negotiated—it is just set at 8%, therefore called a "published" rate. Professor Cohen commented that 8% was the first indirect-cost rate established by some federal agencies in 1956, and it just remained at that level for some types of grants, even though it is not related to any measure of costs.)

The reason she went to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee is because if probationary faculty members cannot get department or college sign-off on a grant proposal, but are expected to obtain grant funding, that situation could be an infringement of their academic freedom. The upshot was that Vice President Mulcahy agreed to add language to an existing policy providing that departments and colleges may not decline to approve a grant proposal solely because they do not like the F&A rate—if the proposal carries an F&A rate that the University has indicated it will accept. (Vice President Mulcahy said that since the meeting with Academic Freedom and Tenure he has spoken with Associate Vice President Webb about the question. She informed him that it is rare for departments and colleges to decline to approve a grant on the basis of the F&A rate, so the circumstances do not warrant an entirely new policy, but the objective can be achieved with a small amendment to an existing policy. He said he or Ms. Webb would bring the proposal to the Committee.)

2. Networking Tools and Faculty Expertise Database

Professor Bearinger now welcomed Ms. McCready from the University Libraries to provide information about SciVal, and to solicit feedback on how information about these new research tools can be disseminated best to our faculty.

Ms. McCready provided a handout with additional information (between the * * *).

* * *

SciVal is a suite of products including an extensive database of publication citations (Scopus), a tool for collaboration and scholarly networking (SciVal Experts), and a funding opportunities database (SciVal Funding) from Elsevier. The project is co-sponsored and implemented by the Office of the Vice President for Research and the University Libraries.

The University of Minnesota's instance of SciVal Experts, called **Experts@Minnesota**, will create Web-accessible profiles of University faculty based upon their collegiate and departmental affiliations as well as their publications. It will be an upgrade to the current <http://www.experts.umn.edu> website that profiles some of our faculty. The University will provide SciVal with public data on faculty (names, contact information, department and college affiliations, and grant information) to form the basis for these profiles. This public data from the University will be matched with publication and funding data harvested from the Scopus and SciVal Funding databases. Once the profiles are completed, relevant and timely funding opportunity recommendations will be matched to individual scholars/researchers in the system. If they choose, they will receive email alerts, on an ongoing basis, based on their profile information and customizable descriptions of research interests. Note that these funding recommendations include federal, foundation, and non-US sources of funding.

TIMING: This is a three-year pilot implementation.

WHO'S COVERED: The proposed implementation will create profiles for 4,400 UMN-Twin Cities faculty and postdocs. It contains profiles for those people whose primary position categorization on campus is that of "Faculty" (which excludes, teaching specialists, lecturers, and grad students in teaching roles). Research associates (still in planning stage), librarians, and administrators with tenure or on the tenure-track who also have faculty positions, will be included. Visiting faculty are not included.

FUNDING: OVPR and University Libraries will provide base support. Selected colleges will cost-share support based on a tiered model of impact/benefit (CBS, CEHD, CFANS, CLA, CSE and the schools/colleges of the AHC). The Libraries will provide ongoing funding for the citation database, Scopus.

More information can be found here: <http://www.lib.umn.edu/about/experts>

* * *

Ms. McCready outlined the licensing of the SCOPUS citation database. It "indexes peer reviewed publications in all discipline areas, contains 46 million records, 70% with abstracts, includes materials from 19,500 titles, includes over 4.6 million conference papers, provides 100% Medline coverage," and has other features as well. It is stronger post-1996 (the period since then accounts for about 25 million of SCOPUS's records). It is available to all campuses of the University. The Libraries have also coordinated the licensing of the SciVal Funding database—which will also be available to all campuses of the University. SciVal Funding provides information on federal, state, and private foundation opportunities and also allows grant coordinators to manage/track announcements. These two databases are integrated and feed into the third product that was licensed, SciVal Experts.

SciVal Experts "creates profiles, 'seats', for all UMN TC primary faculty, & post-docs. Publication data from Scopus is matched with local data (e.g. public directory information, grant awards) to create a public display of UMN expertise to anyone on the Web. SciVal Funding is then integrated & sends opportunities to seat holders."

There are two other expert databases at the University, Ms. McCready said, one of which is outdated (has not been updated since 2007) and one in the Academic Health Center that pulls information from PubMed—and cannot be expanded beyond that. SciVal Experts pulls data from SCOPUS and SciVal Funding (Elsevier products), to create profiles that matches expertise with funding opportunities (one can opt into notifications of these matched funding opportunities; it is not automatic).

Before the system is activated, there will be individual email messages to all 'seat' holders at the end of the month. The message will explain what the profile will look like, provide opportunities to make changes, or to opt out of the system. There are three possible changes someone can make: (1) a link to a CV, (2) a link to a home page, and (3) add a statement of about research interests. This is all to be completed by early April (but anyone can make changes later as well).

How will the information be updated, Professor Bearinger inquired? SCOPUS is updated daily, Ms. McCready said, and it reviews profiles quarterly. They are working with the Office of Information Technology to automate the delivery of public directory information (e.g., name, campus address, department and college affiliations, etc.)

Can the data be exported into the UMN Profiles, Professor Okuyemi asked? For now they are separate systems, Ms. McCready reported, because, since UMN Profiles covers all research staff in the AHC (a broader collection of job types than will be included in Experts@Minnesota) it will continue. UMN Profiles does not pay a "per-seat charge" as they will do with SciVal Experts. The Direct@Experts system allows a link between the two. They are working to be sure that the data are interchangeable. This is a three-year pilot, she pointed out, and they will review it before the end with the goal of having one integrated system.

Dr. Haugstad asked if they would generate the list of postdocs; they will, Ms. McCready said. All medical resident students? Ms. McCready said not; there are about 460 postdocs that have been identified. There is a set of job titles that should be included, such as Research Associate, Dr. Haugstad said. They are included, Ms. McCready responded—there are four job codes that they include.

How many universities have decided to use this system, Professor Gini inquired? About 30, Ms. McCready reported. Professor Gini said that she's never had SciVal or SCOPUS come up in a Google search; Ms. McCready reported that the profiles for people will appear in Google results. How much does the system cost, Professor Gini asked? Over three year, \$750,000 for the three products, Ms. McCready said, with funds from the sources she identified earlier.

Professor Bearinger asked how best to disseminate information about the system. If one could Google "University of Minnesota experts," would anyone use this system instead? Many people would not start with the University's home page because Google is easier.

Vice President Mulcahy said it is important to note that there is more to the capabilities of this system than just finding someone on Experts@Minnesota. It will allow more sophisticated network development, and SciVal Funding is based on the information that is put in; it will automatically notify someone of funding opportunities if they wish to be notified. He said he has also been told by faculty members that it would be a good idea for the University to get a baseline of the institution's research portfolio so that it would be possible to look in three or four years to see if it is moving. There are a lot of analytical tools that come with the systems that are not part of other engines.

Are there plans to evaluate the system at the end of the three years, Professor Cleary asked? There are, Ms. McCready said. It is possible to track usage and they are developing plans to benchmark and track the usefulness and success of the funding opportunities notices.

When the system is in place, if the data are not updated, reviewers could be excluded, Professor Cohen said. Campuses are moving in the direction of research networking systems. Are there plans to link these databases and keep the information up to date? There are, Ms. McCready said; the Libraries are working with OIT to automate the process of delivering data on a regular basis.

Professor Bearinger thanked Ms. McCready for joining the meeting.

3. Research Scientist Position

Professor Bearinger welcomed Ms. Luther and Dr. Fitch to the meeting and reminded Committee members that Regents Professor Ruggles and Dr. Fitch had appeared before the Committee last December to talk about the need for a Research Scientist position. Their center, the Minnesota Population Center, has a large number of individuals with Ph.D.s who perform a wide array of tasks but for whom there is

only one job classification, no matter whether the person has been on the job for one year or twenty years. And there is no promotional track; these are annually-renewable appointments. Longer terms would help retain these people for research efforts at the University. The Committee decided at that time to examine the question further, and she noted that some faculty members may not think it a good plan to create this position or offer a position that lasts more than a year.

Ms. Luther reported that she had spoken with Dr. Fitch and Professor Ruggles, and they focused more on the issue of career progression and the scope and breadth of the projects that people work on rather than continuous appointments. She talked with them about what units do on their own without necessarily requiring that it be done across the University.

Some units, for example, have established a progression for individuals who hold the "coordinator" position. While this is not ideal and clear progressions should be established University-wide, there is more flexibility in the system than many units may realize to address immediate needs. Any such unit plan needs to be approved by senior administration in the unit.

Ms. Luther said they are aware that there is not an established University-wide process to assess P&A positions for promotion as the one that exists for the faculty, but units can create one. She said she understood that Professor Ruggles and Dr. Fitch believe they have a system that will work. The broader University answer is the creation of functional career progression. The Office of Human Resources is currently working on establishing progressions for Communications, IT, Alumni Relations, and Community Relations staff. Research is scheduled to be reviewed in the future.

Dr. Fitch confirmed that there are more options within the existing system than they were aware of and they have a solution that works for the Minnesota Population Center. Smaller units, however, probably need the job classification system to which Ms. Luther alluded.

Professor Bearinger observed that it is unusual to have so many individuals in this position in a single unit. It would be a greater strain on smaller units that have only a few people in the category. The issue today is not about solving the problem for one center. She went on to relate that in her college, there are a number of clinical faculty positions, but they cannot attract research-oriented Ph.D.s into clinical faculty positions, so a research-faculty appointment would be very useful.

Ms. Wilhelmson reported that it is possible to have term faculty positions, contract faculty, who carry the professorial title but who are not tenure/tenure-track; they can have annual or multi-year appointments. Moreover, there are job codes that each has a different prefix, so one can have a research assistant professor or research professor. Each college has a personnel plan that articulates the titles and categories of faculty hires that are permissible in that college. The School of Nursing has a clinical teaching track, for example, but it is permissible for any college to create a research track as well.

Ms. Wilhelmson also told the Committee that she and Vice Provost Carney will be looking at the policy that requires collegiate personnel plans and they will look at research because it is not directly addressed in the policy (the existing policy speaks to the percentage of appointments with teaching responsibility that may be non-tenured/tenure track).

In response to a question from Professor Bearinger, Ms. Wilhelmson explained that in the college personnel plan, the college indicates how it will use the research professorial title, for example. Those who are given the professorial title, even when not tenured/tenure-track, are expected to carry out all three

of the missions, but the percentages for each can be much different from the expectations of tenured/tenure-track faculty.

Professor Cohen said that his problem with the proposal from the Minnesota Population Center was that they have had people for a long time who seem not to have been subject to peer review. An important aspect of contract faculty, at least in his college, is that promotion is a faculty decision, not something decided by a single individual. That is a critical point with respect to faculty appointments. Faculty members believe that faculty should decide. If someone is not tenured or tenure-track, but here a number of years, they should be evaluated and promoted by a faculty process. The transition from Research Associate to Research Assistant Professor transfers the promotion decision from one person to the person's colleagues. Dean Ponce de Leon agreed: When the appointments are professorial, they no longer belong exclusively to the PI.

Units do not have control of faculty lines, Professor Okuyemi observed, but to appoint to a faculty line is a department decision and it must take responsibility for it. The challenge comes when the department is not willing to create a faculty line for someone. There are individuals in the scientist tracks who also need rigorous evaluation, not just by one person.

Professor Cohen commented that centers without links to an academic department are curious and goes to the question of whether the University should have academic units that are extra-departmental.

Professor Cleary maintained that, in general, postdocs are here to be trained and they should be encouraged to leave to find independent academic research positions once they are trained. At present many of them stay for four years or more, and after the third year become Research Associates. But if one has a Research Associate in his or her sixth or seventh year who wants to apply for a research grant, it helps if they are given the title Research Assistant Professor. He observed, however, that in terms of encouraging postdocs to stay, that is not why the faculty are here—they are here to train people to replace themselves. And it is a demerit, for example, on research training grant proposals, if a department has too many people in it who were trained in that department, Professor Bearinger added.

Dr. Haugstad reported that the College of Science and Engineering does not have Research Assistant Professors so the highest one can go is Senior Research Associate. They fill critical roles but were not necessarily postdocs. The great industrial research labs of the past are gone; the research is done at the universities. Who will do it? Students and postdocs can do some, but they need a senior scientific staff—and they don't want that staff to be leaving the University.

Why is it a problem to have a senior research track, Professor Alonso asked? There are people who do not want to be faculty members and do teaching and outreach, they want to be research scientists. Many universities have such positions.

Ms. Luther said that she does not see it as a problem and that she is looking forward to working with the Research group to review and assess the needs and work across the University in order to establish a career path.

Professor Joo asked about the location of promotion and merit decisions for a Research Assistant Professor. It is at the department level, Ms. Luther said. Is there a limit on the number, Dean Ponce de Leon asked? Ms. Wilhelmson noted that the P&A instructional staff plus the number of contract faculty may not exceed 25% of the number of tenured/tenure-track faculty in a college unless the college files a

supplemental plan justifying a larger number. The supplemental plan must be reviewed by the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee and approved by the provost. So there are limits on the number of people who can come to the University and be devoted exclusively to research.

Professor Bearinger said she was glad to learn that Human Resources is working on the issue and that the Committee can work with it to advance the research interests of the University—and so it isn't just a feeder program for other universities.

4. Training Grants

Professor Bearinger now introduced the topic of training grants. She said she would like the Committee to think about how the University should (potentially) differentiate training grants, which are mostly research, and weigh their costs and benefits.

Training grants typically carry indirect (Facilities and Administrative, or F&A) costs of 8%. Most of them support stipends, tuition, and a small amount of research expense per trainee, and an institutional allotment per trainee, but no faculty FTEs. There are unusual training grants that support faculty and administrative FTEs but those are far less common. She invited to this meeting a number of people who have administered or been involved with training grants to talk about them with the Committee. Professor Bearinger polled the Committee members present about whether they had had a training grant; approximately half of the Committee members had. She asked Vice Provost Schroeder for his perspective on training grants.

Dr. Schroeder related that he had been in the annual compact meeting for the School of Public Health; one of the challenges is the cost of training grants. They have low F&A rates, faculty advising time cannot be attributed to the grants, and applying for the grants takes a lot of time, but everyone in the compact meeting agreed that they are important and that the University have them, especially when fellowship dollars are becoming scarcer. The Graduate School has a line item for matching funds (\$400,000) that can be used to support applications for training grants. That makes funding of grant applications more likely but it does not address the perception that training grants cost money, nor do the grants provide full tuition for graduate students (something those who are reluctant about training grants should recall). He said he has talked to Mr. Rollefson (the finance director for the Graduate School) about this and learned that training grants, despite their low F&A rates, are counted in the research cost pool just as R01s that have a much higher F&A rate, so training grants are at a disadvantage.

Vice President Mulcahy said that the budget model does not discriminate on the source of funds, and to the extent that a research grant counts as an expenditure, it is part of a college's expenditure. One dollar of research expenditure generates 52 cents in indirect-cost funding (if the University receives the full rate negotiated with the federal government), but training grants are charged to the college and they only receive 8 cents on the dollar, and that is where the differential return occurs. Training grants do not receive the same amount of indirect cost money as an R01-type of grant.

Dr. Schroeder asked whether Minnesota is different from other universities in that it makes the colleges pay for training grants just as much as for research grants with higher F&A rates.

Dr. Mulcahy said there are many different budget models and he cannot generalize. There are uncompensated expenses for maintaining a training grant, but there are uncompensated expenses for maintaining an R01 grant, too. Professor Cohen's point is a good one: It is clear where the 52% F&A

rate comes from because it is negotiated with the federal government, whereas it is unclear that the federal government could identify the logic of the 8% rate associated with training grants. He pointed out that the number of R01/NSF-kinds of grants, i.e., individual investigator awards, far outnumbers the training grants that the University receives. The University is not at a "tipping point" and there is no argument about the need for more training grants. Dr. Schroeder agreed and said that is why the matching funds have been increased.

Professor Cohen reiterated his view that every dollar brought to the University is a good dollar, and the worry about ICR should be to make sure there is enough money to run the Office of the Vice President for Research. One should not ask how the costs work in the cost pool—that is "a monster that we have created," and if accounting mechanisms require the University to make compromises that harm its academic objectives, then they need to change. He recalled that he worked for NSF earlier in his career, and the biology directorate at NSF (where all the biology programs are located) had to decide how to spend its funds. It was clear from their consultations with the community that most PIs would rather have a graduate student on a grant than one funded through an *Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT)* grant (<http://www.igert.org/>) or other fellowship mechanism. ("IGERT is the National Science Foundation's flagship interdisciplinary training program, educating U.S. Ph.D. scientists and engineers by building on the foundations of their disciplinary knowledge with interdisciplinary training." The point is that given the choice of (1) getting a bigger grant where one has a funded payroll line for a graduate student to work on one's project or (2) getting a small grant and being able to compete with others for a student on an IGERT (or other fellowship) that may or may not be closely related to one's grant goals and where one may or may not land a graduate student from the competition to work on the new project, most PIs would rather have the funding directly on their grant. The decision to raise IGERT indirect costs to "normal grant" levels was likely in part so decisions would be made on academic principles, not for reasons of cost and indirect. (When IGERT had a lower overhead, then two groups [faculty and administrators] basically favored funding graduate students on a PI's research grants, for one reason because of the linkage to the research program and the other because of the greater indirect-cost rate. Increasing the indirect rate on the IGERT removed one of the objections to that fellowship program.) Nevertheless, PIs would almost all rather have a larger grant funded and get more students on it, than to divert more and more funds to fellowship programs.

Professor Bearinger next commented that she invited Professor Luepker to the meeting because he wears two hats, one as chair of the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning and one as a faculty member who has had many training grants.

Professor Luepker said that he thought Vice President Mulcahy is correct: The cost-pool system does not take into account this difference. He told the Committee that he had a T32 NIH training grant for 15 years. A T32 mainly supports student stipends. He also had a K30 NIH clinical research training grant that only supported faculty, and, until last year, he had a NIH K12 faculty development grant, which supported 23 assistant professors and provided infrastructure support. So there are great differences but all NIH training grants provide only 8% indirect costs. He is also a standing member of the NIH training grants study section; when they read grant applications, if a university is not providing added financial support, it is less likely to be funded (the competition between institutions is ferocious—Harvard, Hopkins, Duke, Stanford, and so on). So while it is a great honor to have a training grant, it is becoming increasingly difficult to support the added costs in an era when all units must pay their own way.

There are two trains coming at each other, Professor Luepker commented: Universities are short of funds and the federal government is saying that universities should provide more support for grants.

There is no ambiguity: a research university needs training grants, Professor Luepker concluded. Many who have been trained on these grants at the University have gone on to become chairs and deans all over the country and they are part of the University's reputation. The institution must figure out ways to get a respite at the federal level, although he did not know how that might be achieved.

Professor Cohen said that NSF no longer allows matching funds on grants and recommends other federal agencies adopt that same policy; it would be good if NIH did the same. (The National Science Board, made up mostly of university presidents, did not like the federal government leveraging its funding through universities competing in the amount of matching funding they would provide, so the Board gradually moved to a "may not" policy on matches—there are a couple of exceptions but generally it is a "no match" policy. They suggested that other federal agencies giving out grant funding should go the same way. It has not so far gone much beyond NSF, but they did suggest that it should.) That would be fantastic if it happened, Professor Luepker said. Until then researchers will need to scratch for additional funds locally.

Vice President Mulcahy said there is a pooling of indirect costs; some say that if one cannot obtain more than X%, one should not do the research. In his view, the University could exercise more discretion in other areas where departments and colleges have waived indirect costs. If the institution waives a 20% F&A rate for a company, everyone pays. The University can be more discreet in how it deals with indirect costs.

Dr. Mulcahy said that the University underwrites many costs. The USDA only provides a 25% F&A rate; one could argue the University should stop taking USDA grants as well. There needs to be a different overall solution so that the University values things that are important, including training grants. There are costs to doing research but the option should not be to say that the University will not do it.

Dean Ponce de Leon said that training grants bring prestige to the college and the University—and that they are not the same across the board. USDA grants do not pay tuition and overhead so therefore they require tuition waivers. The college decision in CFANS is to support USDA training grants as long as the college has the budgetary flexibility to do so. They understand that the college mission and operations are not there make a profit, but there would be a limit on the number of grants the college could support. The fact is that when a college grants tuition waivers to training grants, the waiver granted only applies for college courses. All other courses taken in other colleges have to be paid by the college granting the waiver. This affects the capacity of the college granting the tuitions waivers to support training grants.

Dr. Schroeder agreed with Vice President Mulcahy: It is an important quality marker of a graduate program that it can attract training grants. In the National Research Council study of graduate programs, one metric was the number of first-year students with external support. That is difficult to use as a proxy for training grants since it includes other forms of student support as well, but Minnesota did not do well vis-à-vis its peers on that metric. Incorporating support for students through training grants in program evaluation and metrics may be a way to provide an incentive to write more training grant applications. Professor Bearinger said she was glad to see that training grants were added to the metrics.

Professor Okuyemi said that creating opportunities for postdocs varies by discipline and funding institute at NIH. What they do when they can is build in training for postdocs: It is embedded in an R01 grant; one can justify tuition as part of their fringe, and it comes with full indirect costs in a research

grant. One can sell that as an NIH postdoc since the position is funded by NIH, although the positions do not show up as training since it is not part of a T32 grant. That solution may work in a limited number of cases but it is not a global solution and there is a need for more training positions.

Embedding post-doctoral positions in an R01 does not create a mechanism for attracting post-docs to the University, Professor Bearinger said. In comparison, a T32 is a visible mark of an institution's reputation and a way to attract high-quality graduate students as well. Also, if the University does not offer tuition support, graduate students will go elsewhere.

All of this is driven by the budget model, Professor Cohen said, and it seems stupid. The University says it wants training grants and says it can sacrifice something else it wants to do. That is ludicrous. The University should do the right thing; if training grants are the right thing, the University should do them and not have to give up other grants. It should not have to make compromises to keep the institution from being excellent in research. There is something fundamentally wrong with the system if that is what must happen.

They see something similar on the educational side as well, Dr. Schroeder commented, when they consider the question of thesis credits vis-à-vis the budget model. The tuition model does not provide an incentive to complete thesis credit early.

The current budget model affects college decisions in many ways, Dean Ponce de Leon commented. He said he has listened to discussions in several other committees that have made the point that the budget model interferes with the University's mission. So it is only logical that someone in central administration takes the necessary steps to assess what is being claimed and, if warranted, start a process to make appropriate changes to the budget model. Professor Cohen said the Committee should make a recommendation. Professor Bearinger said she would draft a statement.

Professor Luepker commented that he has been serving on the provost's Budget Model Advisory Committee (which is not the group that originally created the budget model) and observed that the budget model must deal with a wide variety of departments and situations. Three-quarters of departments do not have training grants, something the Committee should bear in mind as it drafts a statement. The Budget Model Advisory Committee listens to suggestions and does not view the budget model as a static system; it needs continuous tuning.

Professor Bearinger thanked the guests and adjourned the meeting at 4:05.

-- Gary Engstrand