

Minutes*

**Senate Research Committee
Monday, October 22, 2012
2:15 - 4:00
238A Morrill Hall**

- Present: Linda Bearinger (chair), Arlene Carney, Jerry Cohen, Greg Haugstad, Mats Heimdahl, Seung-Ho Joo, Mallory Kurkoski, Frances Lawrenz, Tucker LeBien, Richard Leppert, Timothy Mulcahy, Federico Ponce de Leon, LaDora Thompson, Kathleen Thomas, Karen Williams
- Absent: Alvaro Alonso, Melissa Anderson, Robin Dittman, Benjamin Fuller, Brian Johnston, Hinh Ly, Kola Okuyemi, Mani Subramani, Alexander Thorkelson, Thomas Vaughan, Kyla Wahlstrom, Lynn Zentner
- Guests: Professor Joe Konstan, Controller Michael Volna, Associate Vice President Pamela Webb (Sponsored Projects Administration)
- Other: Sue Paulson (Sponsored Financial Reporting), Sarah Waldemar (Office of the Vice President for Research)

[In these minutes: (1) research subject payments, grants for workshops; (2) update on Operational Excellence vis-à-vis research; (3) research infrastructure strategic planning process]

1. Research Subject Payments, Grants for Workshops

Professor Bearinger convened the meeting at 2:15 and noted that Professor Konstan had brought two issues to the Committee for discussion. She welcomed both Professor Konstan and Mr. Volna and asked the former to start the conversation. The two issues were:

Research subject payments: I've worked with a set of PIs (mostly in public health) who conduct large online studies where we never meet the subjects in person. Subject compensation is a large part of being able to recruit people for studies, and the challenges of getting timely payments to several hundred (or in a few cases several thousand) subjects are substantial. Specifically: These are usually small payments (\$10-\$40), each one seems to require substantial processing at the unit and collegiate level, there seems to be no adequate means of batch processing, and a result is slow payment. As I've heard it (with no data to back this up), it probably costs us between \$60 and \$100 to process each payment, summing the time and effort at each level of the system. While this cost isn't charged to the project, it accumulates in units and centrally, and is substantial. I recognize that parts of this involve maintaining tax compliance (in case a subject accumulates over \$600 in payments in a year, or is an employee) and is record-keeping, but it is high inefficient. How can this be made more efficient?"

* 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.

Workshops: In many fields NSF and other funding agencies award grants to hold workshops. Two particularly common awards are for doctoral symposia and PI meetings, both of which have the property of having the grant pay for travel, accommodations, meals, etc., for a large number of participants--in the case of doctoral symposia, from all over the world. Receiving these grants is a boon to the field and to the reputation of the PIs, departments, and university. Administering them is a nightmare. The goal should be to strike a balance between reimbursing expenses that legitimately vary a great deal and providing incentives (such as stipends or per diem payments) to encourage participants to self-manage other expenses. We seem to be incapable of that, and we seem to turn this process into one even more complex than subject payments, including often requiring setting up "personal service contracts" with each participant being reimbursed. Other universities seem to be more flexible; it has gotten to the point where as a department we've had to discourage senior faculty from getting these grants to keep staff time free. Perhaps a solution is finding the right outside vendor (travel contractor) that could bundle the work into a single transaction. Perhaps it is loosening up internally.

Professor Konstan told the Committee that he has an adjunct appointment in Epidemiology and works in the field of human-computer interaction and has worked with a number of people who do studies with human subjects. He keeps hearing that it is a "pain in the neck" to pay a large number of subjects a small amount of money. With respect to workshops, the second issue he raised, he reported that in his department, with the exception of junior faculty, they have told the faculty that the department does not want them to do any more workshops because of the headache of the paperwork. A big part of the problem is that University policies seem to prevent paying stipends to workshop participants, resulting in alternatives that require either detailed reimbursements or in some cases setting up participants as university vendors. Professor Konstan said he has a hard time believing the University must have these policies because he knows that other public Big Ten universities have dealt with workshop grants differently, including providing checks (stipends) at meetings so that students in attendance don't face bills to pay before reimbursement arrives. Is the University so caught up in the minutiae of compliance that it cannot make these processes easier? Cannot some of the people at this meeting find solutions?

Vice President Mulcahy said he joined Professor Konstan in his request. He reported that there recently was an audit report from one academic department that found that sponsored-project funds were commingled with personal funds. That sounds bad, but the only way a principal investigator (PI) could pay research subjects was to put the money in a personal account and then write checks to the participants. He looks at this from the standpoint of a potential legal problem for PIs as well as from the standpoint of trying to make the process simpler.

Professor Leppert inquired if this is a matter of compliance with University policies or with federal and state agencies. Professor Konstan said he was not sure. Universities do implement federal policies and some have done so differently from the way Minnesota has. The federal government requires institutions to have rules. He said he knows other institutions do things differently because he was a research subject at another institution and did not have to do paperwork to be paid. He has also served as a co-organizer of workshops at other public institutions, which handled the finances by covering some costs institutionally and providing a stipend to participants for the rest of their costs. The University does not interpret the rules as allowing it do that.

Mr. Volna first addressed the issue of paying research subjects, which he described as a "snarly" issue that his office examines every four or five years as the rules change. The rules in this case are those

of the IRS, which requires that the institution track every person to whom it makes payments and, if the amount any one person receives exceeds \$600 in one year, must send a Form 1099 to the IRS. This is a good risk question: Does the University want to decide not to track payments of less than \$600? On the research side, there are stringent rules about disclosing information about research subjects; how they track payments for these purposes cannot violate research privacy rules. Greater problems exist with work done overseas, such as how to get money to research subjects in Africa, where there may not be a bank where one can get cash. He agreed that it is time to revisit the policy. He reported that he is meeting in the near future with his counterparts from Big Ten schools and will ask how they handle research subject payments. He surmised they "will be all over the map."

Professor Thomas commented on the audit charge of commingling funds that Dr. Mulcahy had noted: Because of the challenges of cutting a check for each participant in research, it is easier to pay them in cash. So she has had the money advanced to her personal account so she can pay research subjects. She keeps very careful records but it is disconcerting to have sponsored-project funds in her personal checking account. Vice Provost Carney commented that when she was paying research subjects, she would set up a separate personal checking account so that the funds were not commingled. (She simply paid the fees associated with the separate account from her own funds because it was not worth the trouble to try to be reimbursed for them.)

Professor Cohen said that he has served on panels for both NIH and NSF and both agencies treat panel members as one would wish to be treated: They do not require a lot of reimbursement forms but simply issue a check for participation. That is the way they operate and they are the ones giving out the grants; there must be some reason the University operates differently from the way the agency giving it the money does. His accountant has told him that payments to subjects are a very time-consuming process for her, and thus it would seem it costs the University a lot of money—and she is horrified that a department would discourage this because it is administratively difficult. She had read the issues on both topics as Professor Konstan posed them and reiterated that they are time-consuming for her as well, so it is not just a problem for faculty, it is for staff as well.

Dean LeBien said that in the AHC this issue comes up mostly in the School of Public Health, which uses large survey instruments. He said he has never done this kind of research and wondered what the view of the research subjects is. Do they see payments delayed? In cases of which he is aware, the turnaround time for reimbursement is about two days.

Professor Konstan said they had one research subject who threatened to come to campus and do something violent because of the delay in payment (it took about six weeks). Some units have found alternatives to cash, such as Amazon gift cards, but one worries there could be a recruitment bias with that kind of payment.

Professor Heimdahl said that NIH and NSF must have the same reporting requirements, must have a more streamlined process, and are dealing with larger amounts of money. What are the potential penalties if the University does not report subject payments? Will the IRS cart someone away? Mr. Volna said it would calculate the unpaid taxes and interest and assess the University for the amount. Professor Heimdahl observed that he receives a check without any withholding if he serves as a consultant; it is up to him to account to the IRS for his income. Mr. Volna said the University could decide to report only payments of \$600 or more that occur in one payment, but said that if someone is being paid \$450 per day for some number of days, the IRS will ask how it is tracking and reporting the

income, so the IRS can verify the taxes have been paid. The University must send a 1099, and if it does not, there are penalties both on the University and the recipient of the funds.

Dean Ponce de Leon said he assumed someone is tracking University research participants paid; do they know the number who reach \$600 per year? At \$10 per day, a subject would have to participate 60 times and at \$40 only 15 times to meet the criteria for reporting to the IRS. If it is only a very small percentage of participants ever reaching the \$600 criteria for reporting, then the University could request the IRS to provide advice on how to approach this requirement. When transactional costs are greater than the cost of paying the subjects, the practice needs to be reconsidered. Maybe the University could just agree with the IRS to pay a fix amount or a fine based on the percentage of participants reaching the \$600 criterion rather than tracking all these expenses individually and incurring in high transactional costs.

Vice President Mulcahy said, apropos of Mr. Volna's and Dean Ponce de Leon's comments, that at \$450 per day, the University knows it will be close to the IRS limit and should track the payments, but when the payment is \$15 or \$25 per day, then it is a matter of institutional risk—and one could conclude the risk is low.

Professor Bearinger observed that if one provides a gift card rather than cash payment, the reporting is the same. Mr. Volna agreed: The IRS treats most gift cards as cash that must be reported.

Professor Konstan said that for summer workshops he has attended, Google does not pay for travel from the airport to the hotel—they give one a \$100 VISA card because they know the expenses will not reach \$600. It could be University policy to allow a researcher not to track payments if he or she knows they will not reach \$600 for any one individual and to require them to track payments if they will reach that amount. There is a research implication in this issue: In many cases of online research, the PI wants to retain the anonymity of subjects but wants to or must compensate them. Small electronic payments could achieve both of these goals, as long as there is no need to track them in more detail.

Professor Bearinger noted that her research focuses on adolescents, whom they may pay \$10 or so, and she does not know their Social Security numbers.

Mr. Volna said it is University policy that for small payment amounts, departments can be allowed to track them and his office would not need to know about them unless they reach \$600 for any one person. On the problem of putting money in personal accounts to pay subjects, that is new to him and he will put together a group to investigate the problem. He noted that there is great diversity in the University and his office may not know about the problems that arise. Vice President Mulcahy said that with respect to the use of personal accounts to distribute funds, the budget office said that they have no mechanism to allow such payments.

There is a question about how to move cash to PIs so they can do what they need to do, Mr. Volna agreed. The risk varies; with a local project that pays subjects on the spot, having cash is safe. Overseas is more difficult because one must meet bank regulations and having a lot of cash could be a problem. There are many regulations imposed on the University that people chafe at but that his office does not have the ability to sidestep, and the federal government keeps adding more regulations. Vice President Mulcahy said he agreed there are reasons that the regulations can be complicated, but if a faculty member puts federal funds in his or her personal account, he worries about the risk to that person and the possibility someone could make a mistake. The University should find a way to manage this—

"this is crazy," he said, when he was told that commingling funds was the way a PI had to pay research subjects.

Professor Bearinger said she wished to know how the Committee could best contribute to a solution to the problems. Perhaps there is a need for FAQs on various options for paying research subjects consistent with federal and University policy. Perhaps the staff on the business side are being told to impose restrictions that are not required. People need to know what the best options are.

Professor Konstan related that when he served as the University's faculty representative to the Federal Demonstration Partnership, he learned of what was seen as the immaturity of the system in Japan: The PI received a personal check for research, put it in his or her account, and spent the money over the course of the grant. He said he would not suggest that money be deposited in personal accounts, but it should be possible to set up structures to do things more simply when the situation is simple.

Professor Cohen said that when applying for a grant to NSF, he is asked for a fixed dollar amount for participant costs (stipends/subsistence); however, he can never provide an accurate dollar amount if he is then required to reimburse actual expenses. NSF does not authorize universities to change funds allocated to participant cost to another line within the budget without their approval. This means that if one gives a workshop one is almost automatically required to spend the time to contact the NSF after the workshop to reconcile the budget once the actual expenses are known. This is a large burden, as one cannot plan and carry out a workshop without going back to the agency to re-budget following the event. This would be solved with a fixed dollar payment that could be budgeted exactly.

Professor Bearinger thanked Professor Konstan and Mr. Volna for joining the meeting and she hoped Mr. Volna had the opportunity to learn what other schools are doing. Mr. Volna thanked the Committee and said he would work with Ms. Waldemar in the Office of the Vice President for Research and then consult with faculty and staff on doing a better job of developing procedures based on a revised tolerance for risk. Professor Bearinger indicated that the Committee would like to have Mr. Volna return to the Committee next semester to provide an update following further work on the issues.

2. Update on Operational Excellence vis-à-vis Research

Vice President Mulcahy next spoke to the Committee about operational excellence (OpEx) as it applies to research. OpEx is one of President Kaler's primary initiatives since taking office: Improve efficiency, reduce burdens, reduce costs, and promote excellence. Dr. Mulcahy recalled that he has talked with the Committee in the past about risk recalibration and defining the University's appetite for risk and observed that more often than not, when there is a range of options in implementing policy, the University seemed to choose the most onerous. Over time, it became a much more conservative culture, more risk averse, and treated all risks as the same no matter the size.

Fortunately, the University community agreed to re-examine its approach to risk. His office had a risk-recalibration initiative; he asked all units to look at whether something must be done at all and, when it did, at whether the burden was proportionate to the risk. It was while that was occurring that President Kaler assumed office and pledged to cut administrative costs. He learned of the initiative in the Office of the Vice President for Research and asked all of the vice presidents to do the same.

Not everything was identified as risk recalibration, Dr. Mulcahy said; there were other changes as well. The OpEx group identified about 250 opportunities around the University, and the administrative group working with the president organized and prioritized the list and began implementing changes. The OpEx group meets weekly to review what is being done.

With respect to research, Associate Vice President Webb and Ms. Waldemar identified 59 initiatives to re-examine risk in his office, Dr. Mulcahy related; by July of this year, 45 of the 59 had been addressed and are done. Some of them are not completed because they are more difficult and cross vice-presidential domains, but they are working on them. Dr. Mulcahy provided a few examples:

-- One that he is most proud of, the University reduced the frequency of effort reporting from three times per year to two. He tried to move the requirement to once per year, which is what the federal government requires, but the decision was to not expose the University to more risk than reporting twice per year. The change makes it easier to handle summer appointments.

-- They are providing incentives for good behavior. The Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee inspected labs X times per year. Many faculty members had very good records and no violations, so IACUC decided that if someone has a good record over time, it would reduce the number of times it conducted lab inspections.

-- IACUC also tried to find ways to work with PIs to not increase their risk and each unit came up with a series of changes.

-- The Biosafety Committee reviewed its entire protocol and eliminated much.

-- They have eliminated the requirement that those who work with controlled substances must register with the State Pharmacy Board (which didn't want the registration anyway). Some believed it unwise to go in that direction, but in his view, Dr. Mulcahy said, if someone is determined to abuse controlled substances, requiring reporting to the State Pharmacy Board won't prevent it.

-- They are also rolling out e-Protocol, which does not deal with risk but helps reduce burden—but it also alerts researchers when there are training requirements, so it speaks indirectly to risk as well.

Professor Cohen said that his vision for e-Protocol is that it will grow to consume existing protocols and requirements that faculty must deal with because the basic assumption in e-Protocol is that it should be simple to fill out forms. Vice President Mulcahy commented that it is ironic that with only 43 days left in office, he is finally seeing an electronic system to populate forms. When he came to the University eight years ago, he said it needed such a system; now, eight years later, it is almost there. He agreed with Professor Cohen that it will be possible to seamlessly expand the use of e-Protocol.

They are trying to reduce the burden on faculty and staff, especially when there is no risk, Dr. Mulcahy concluded. The culture change has started and it must be kept going. He suggested to the Faculty Consultative Committee that if it considers what to do next, it should ask what would have the biggest impact. Professor Bearinger said that was her question: The 59 initiatives in Dr. Mulcahy's office were not the result of faculty suggestions. They were not, Dr. Mulcahy said, they came from staff and aimed at reducing staff time. They were trying to do a prototype for the University and wanted to prove that something could be done. Now they need broad faculty feedback on what to do.

Professor Bearinger said there needs to be a more systematic approach to the collection of faculty views, although the minutes of this meeting may elicit some responses. Dr. Mulcahy said that their punch list is not informed by faculty consultation but they knew which issues were of most concern to the faculty. They did not receive many suggestions from this Committee. He reiterated that the University must keep moving and expressed the hope that the change in leadership in his office would not change the emphasis.

When the president communicates with the Board of Regents and the public about OpEx, does he want to get to the point of saying that he wants to cut the amount of money being spent on people or does he want to eliminate burdens so their time can be put to better use, Dean LeBien inquired. "Both," Dr. Mulcahy replied. There is a list of what has been done and many of the items are reductions in administrative burden, not specific cost savings. When the president talks about cutting administrative costs, that is explicit and means there will be fewer dollars. But he also wants to cut the time and energy faculty and staff spend on administrative tasks.

Professor Leppert pointed out that during the search process, in a meeting with Regents Professors, Dr. Kaler was asked to comment on the size of the University's central administration. He responded that it was too large. He was then asked what his experience was in addressing the problem; Dr. Kaler said he had used a consulting company, Bain, at Stony Brook to help achieve significant administrative cuts. Vice President Mulcahy reported that President Kaler had talked about that experience when he came to the University, and looked at Bain reports from institutions similar to the University; he found there were common themes. The president decided not to use Bain at Minnesota because he reviewed the report of a task force co-chaired by Vice President O'Brien and Associate Vice President Bock and found that its recommendations were very similar to those that come up in Bain reports. So the University has used the task force recommendations as a foundation for its efforts without bringing in a consultant. Professor Leppert said that when the president was asked about Bain, he said they were expensive but that they helped achieve significant offsetting gains overall; the president also said that the goal was to reallocate money saved from administrative restructuring back into academic programs. It isn't clear that can be accomplished during a period of retrenchment. Vice President Mulcahy said he believes it remains the goal to redeploy money to academic programs even if there is also retrenchment taking place.

The goal is also to reduce the burden on faculty and staff researchers, Professor Bearinger observed. Dr. Mulcahy agreed—burden and costs. He said that Vice President Pfitzenreuter is looking at how to define and standardize administrative costs so that the University can know when it has cut costs. The University is doing the right thing to try to understand "administration." The administrative burden that faculty must bear is still a concern, Professor Bearinger pointed out.

Professor Leppert observed that there have been instances where savings are achieved by moving administrative obligations out of an administrative office and into departments, thus shifting responsibilities rather than actually reducing total administrative workload. Will some of the savings that Dr. Mulcahy has talked about be achieved by moving burdens from Morrill Hall to the colleges?

Dr. Mulcahy agreed that that has happened but said the president does not want to see it happen again. He said there is a link between administrative costs and burdens but at the same time there are administrators in departments who do important things; if one carried the argument to an extreme,

departments could lose administrative staff support that helps faculty members do their jobs. The point is to analyze jobs to determine which are more critical and which are not. The current human resources system makes that difficult, so those looking at administrative costs must dive down into the system. To President Kaler's credit, he is not doing anything precipitous and he wants to do things right. Professor Bearinger commented that one needs a huge range of administrative skill sets because there are so many administrative burdens placed on researchers—but she was hired to do research, not read financial reports.

When people talk about the administration being bloated, Dr. Mulcahy said, they mostly do not mean at the department level. That is why defining "administration" is important, because it would be possible to cut certain "administration" that would lead to perverse effects.

Professor Cohen said one thing that is out of control is the authority units have to do things at any time without approval. They can send emails and devise forms they want that require signatures. That is why this Committee is important, Dr. Mulcahy responded; usually such actions are not taken with nefarious intent but the Committee needs to be aware of them. He and the members of his staff have spoken with the Committee about problems they are aware of but they could be helped if the Committee would inform them of concerns it has.

Vice President Mulcahy concluded by saying he has had the best job in the University.

3. Research Infrastructure Strategic Planning Process

Professor Bearinger asked Associate Vice President Lawrenz to review for the Committee the strategic planning process for research infrastructure.

Dr. Lawrenz distributed copies of a set of PowerPoint slides and began by explaining that the Office of the Vice President for Research has been trying to develop a strategic planning process for the research infrastructure. As background, she noted the objectives of the strategic planning process:

- Align the research infrastructure investments with the institution's goals and strategies.
- Implement and manage a well-coordinated, long-term infrastructure planning process.
- Leverage investments across colleges and coordinate campuses through shared resources.
- Forecast major needs and expenditures to increase competitiveness for funding.
- Provide University leaders with the information to enable major investment decisions in a timely and flexible manner.

They want a reasonable approach to determine what infrastructure the University should invest in. They consulted broadly on development of the process and are now at the point of creating a continuous update/improvement loop, based on the 2009-10 process.

The results to date have been these, Dr. Lawrenz reported:

- Operational definition of research infrastructure
- "Starter" inventory
- Web accessible Resource Directory

-- The I3 grant program awarded \$12M (Infrastructure Investment Initiative, a grant program within the University; units made proposals and there was a process to select projects to be funded with matching dollars from the college; this program is going forward)

They are now repeating and expanding the inventory and refining the definition of research infrastructure, Dr. Lawrenz told the Committee. The definition is this:

Research infrastructure includes major research services, capacities or equipment, and specialized support staff that constitute direct components of the research and scholarly efforts that further the University's mission of Research and Discovery and that provide for persistent interdisciplinary and disciplinary needs.

Dr. Lawrenz noted the exclusions:

1. Building construction or major renovations, unless related to an infrastructure upgrade
2. Transactional systems and support personnel included in cost pools (e.g. EGMS and SPA)
3. IT Services unrelated to the support of specialized technology integral to research or scholarly effort
4. General, non-specialized library services and collections
5. Indirect, non-specialized support services (e.g. facilities/maintenance)
6. Infrastructure that primarily supports teaching, learning, clinical care, or outreach
7. Equipment or personnel supporting a small number of researchers or a single project

They would like suggestions and comments on the definitions and exclusions. The intent is to focus on infrastructure that directly supports research.

Professor Cohen asked about #7. Those items are still part of the research infrastructure of the University that makes this an excellent research university, he said. He would not argue they should be available to others, but there are two reasons to compose a definition. One is so that researchers know what is available to them; the other is to let the public know about the resources at the University, so the definition should not be limited to elements of the infrastructure that are only used widely.

Vice President Mulcahy said this is not intended to be a definition of the entire research infrastructure—it is defining what is eligible for inclusion in the strategic planning process. He agreed that perhaps the definition should be explicit about that and agreed with Professor Cohen that the University should advertise what its research infrastructure consists of; there will be much that is not eligible for funding in this process. Dr. Lawrenz added that she would like suggestions of the criteria for eligibility for funding. Dr. Mulcahy commented, also in response to Professor Cohen, that one could make the case that certain equipment that serves only a small number of researchers but that is very costly would also qualify for consideration for funding.

Will the definition serve future I3 initiatives, Dr. Haugstad asked? It serves a dual purpose, Dr. Lawrenz responded, which makes it more difficult. It is intended to identify what is available at the University and what might be fundable by central administration. Dr. Haugstad said that his office does receive questions about where something is at the University, in the case of items more likely to be in single-PI labs, and they direct people appropriately when possible. Dr. Lawrenz commented that perhaps Professor Cohen is correct, that there should be an overall inventory as well. That is also a way to let the public know about the infrastructure and charge for its use, Professor Cohen added; the inventory could

be helpful about what the University has to offer. Dr. Lawrenz agreed and said that a different set of criteria would be used for funding. Vice President Mulcahy suggesting thinking about this definition as establishing eligibility for funding, so that people can read it and know if something is in or out.

Dean LeBien asked, apropos of I3, if the definition is too stringent. That will depend on the funding available, Dr. Lawrenz said. Most think I3 was successful, Dean LeBien said; what would like to improve on? They want a continuous loop, Dr. Lawrenz said, and hope to have \$3-4 million per year to use in a process akin to the capital planning process so that people can plan in advance for renewable and new items in a way that is fair. Vice President Mulcahy said that the I3 proposals were the right size; what was wrong-sized was that they had twice as many good proposals as they had funding to support.

Dr. Haugstad asked if there has been any discussion of a corporate fund drive to support the next I3-like initiative. And possibly pledging to make the infrastructure externally accessible, to attract donations. Dr. Mulcahy said he believes the president is of the view that there should be a research infrastructure budget line and has committed some funding to it. He said the University needs to decide if it wishes to build that item into the biennial request and into requests for support from the private sector. It would likely help the appeal if the equipment could be publicly available. Dr. Mulcahy agreed that the suggestion fits with President Kaler's ideas about relationships with the private sector.

Professor Bearinger asked if the I3 proposals they received spanned the full range of research and scholarship at the University and interdisciplinary work. Dr. Lawrenz said they did; they received a wide range of proposals most of which came from more than one college and CLA was the college that had the largest number of funded proposals.'

Professor Bearinger noted the language in the definition "persistent interdisciplinary and disciplinary needs." Should funding go more to interdisciplinary activities? Dr. Lawrenz said there a great deal of equipment that only the people within a particular discipline will use. Dr. Mulcahy said that in the hierarchy of priorities, one can say that interdisciplinary work is a high priority for the University, but it must also have strong disciplines and some item of the research infrastructure could be a high priority for a discipline. He noted that one item of infrastructure funded by his office was replacement of the dance floor for Theater Arts and Dance, which is not an interdisciplinary activity.

Dr. Lawrenz invited comments on the process described in the slides.

Professor Bearinger thanked Dr. Lawrenz for the report and adjourned the meeting at 4:00.

-- Gary Engstrand