

Senate Research Committee (SRC)
November 11, 2019
Minutes of the Meeting

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 represent the views of, nor are they binding on the senate, the administration, or the Board of Regents.

[**In these minutes:** Corporate Engagement Workgroup (CEW) Overview; SRC Contact for MN-GEMS; Comprehensive Policy Review: Charging of Facilities and Administrative/Indirect Costs to Sponsored Projects; Comprehensive Policy Review: Protected Health Information, President's Office re Overview of System-wide Strategic Planning; Committee Discussion: System-wide Strategic Planning]

PRESENT: Julie Olson (chair), Chris Cramer, John Freeman, Sumanth Gopinath, Tasoulla Hadjiyanni, Daniel Heemstra, Lisa Johnston, Diana Karwan, Leslie Kennedy, Katsumi Matsumoto, Dianne Neumark Sztainer, Matthew Pappas, Nicole Pilman, David Roberts, Ali Salavati, Vaybhav Shaw, Susannah Smith, Kathleen Vohs, Sarah Walstrom Helgren, Pamela Webb, Phil Zelazo

ABSENT: Bill Arnold, Nelson Rhodus, Teresa Rose-Hellekant, Shashi Shekhar, Carston Wagner, Carol Carrier, Gregory Cuomo, Boyd Kumher, Tucker LeBien

GUESTS: Steve Corkery, associate vice president, University of Minnesota Foundation; Leza Besemann, senior marketing manager, Technology Commercialization; Meaghan Vandersanden, director, Corporate and Foundation Relations

OTHERS ATTENDING: Dan Gilchrist

Chair Julie Olson welcomed the committee and the members introduced themselves.

1. Corporate engagement workgroup (CEW) overview

Steve Corkery, associate vice president, University of Minnesota Foundation (UMF); Leza Besemann, senior marketing manager, Technology Commercialization; and, Meaghan Vandersanden, director, Corporate and Foundation Relations, introduced themselves as members of the Corporate and Foundations Relations (CFR) Team, and explained that the mission of the CFR team is to:

- increase financial investments to the entire UMN system from corporations and foundations;
- facilitate partnership engagement with companies relating to workforce, technology, outreach, and engagement;
- understand and align business priorities and needs with the University areas of excellence; and,
- manage internal campus relationships and serve as a central point of contact for strategic corporate partners.

Corkery told members that 25-30% of total annual UMF production comes from corporations and foundations.

The presenters shared that feedback from corporate partners has largely been that departments are often tripping over each other to compete for corporate funding, and that there is a lack of communication internally about which departments are pursuing which opportunities. Corkery noted that corporations want coordinated engagement with the University. To address this, the Corporate Engagement Workgroup (CEW) was established in 2014. Vandersanden told members that the vision of the CEW is to maximize mutual benefit by connecting University innovation and talent with the goals of University private or public sector partners. Specifically, the CEW provides the following resources:

- a centrally managed process to oversee and guide a more systematic approach to coordinating corporations that have interests across multiple units; and,
- a platform to drive collaboration between collegiate units and university stakeholders.

Vandersanden explained that the CEW Leadership Council meets every six weeks and currently has roughly 50 corporations in their portfolio.

Sumanth Gopinath asked if the University turns down partnerships with companies that have engaged in unethical practices. Corkery explained that there is University policy that addresses some of those issues, and he provided the example of renamings done in the wake of the Tom Petters ponzi scheme (donations from the Petters Group Worldwide were made to the UMF, and rooms and study spaces were named for the Petters Group Polaroid and the John T. Petters Foundation). Corkery explained that there are often clauses in the donation contracts that allow the institution to remove namings if there is nefarious business activity.

Committee members discussed opportunities for faculty to meet with corporate partners to raise awareness for research on campus. The presenters told members that if a department or college does not have a designated corporate engagement officer, then interested faculty can engage with the CFR team. Corkery also encouraged members that are interested in corporate engagement to let their departments know about their interest.

Members asked how the CFR team has been able to reduce the cross collegiate competition. Corkery opined that academics are not rewarded for collegiate enterprise, but for individual research, which presents a challenge. He explained that the CFR team is trying to work across the University so that externally, it appears that the institution has a strategy and can speak with one unified voice. He also explained that they can help individuals find the resources they need internally. All of this work, he noted, is strengthened by transparency at the UMF.

2. SRC Contact for MN-GEMS

Pamela Webb provided committee members with an update on the MN-GEMS project, reminding members that an RFP was created to collect bids for a grant management database in the 2017-18 academic year. She explained that three-hour product demonstrations are currently being conducted with the vendors that bid on the RFP, which would narrow the vendors down to

a finalist list. Those finalists, she said, will be invited to campus to provide a more comprehensive demonstration of their products. Webb told members that she expects the finalists to be identified before the end of the semester.

Webb explained that a committee is forming to attend the on campus demonstrations, and requested nominations for an SRC member to participate on the committee. She explained that the time commitment would likely be two to three days.

Olson told members to email nominations to her, and she would pass them along to Webb.

Webb told members that the committee hopes to record the demonstrations so that other faculty members can review them. Sumanth Gopinath recommended that Webb reach out to the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) to notify faculty leadership and the faculty broadly about the demonstrations and future changes. Committee members also discussed other groups that should be informed, including the P&A Senate and the UMN Postdoctoral Association.

Webb told members that full implementation of the new system would likely take about two years, and will begin in Spring 2020. She said that a decision has not been made about whether to convert all of the old data from the existing system, which would likely affect the timeline as well.

3. Comprehensive Policy Review: Charging of Facilities and Administrative/Indirect Costs to Sponsored Projects

Webb then introduced members to the [Charging of Facilities and Administrative/Indirect Costs to Sponsored Projects](#) policy and explained that she is seeking feedback from members. She explained that there were no comments on policy related issues during the last comprehensive review, and so far, there have been no comments during the current review period. The data, she explained, is telling her that there is not currently a need for a change in policy. Webb asked for any feedback by December 1, 2019.

4. Comprehensive Policy Review: Protected Health Information

Olson told members that the [Protected Health Information](#) is also due for a comprehensive review, and asked members to review the policy and provide comments or suggestions to the senate office, who would then route them to the policy owner.

Bobbie Erichsen, senate associate, explained to committee members that the University Senate Office and the University Policy Program Office drafted and published a new process for [governance consultation during comprehensive policy reviews](#) to ensure that University senate committees could offer feedback to policy owners at the beginning of comprehensive review processes. The new process dictates that the University Policy Program Office will notify the University Senate Office when policies are coming up for comprehensive review and upon receiving this notification, University Senate Office staff will facilitate a committee review of the current version of the policy and provide the committee's feedback to the policy owner/contact early in the comprehensive review process. Erichsen informed members that the Protected Health Information policy is in the beginning stages of a comprehensive review, and the policy

owner is therefore requesting input from the SRC. Olson told members to have feedback submitted to the University Senate Office by December 1, 2019.

5. System-wide Strategic Plan

Bill Haldeman, senior assistant to the president, joined the committee to present slides titled [Overview of Systemwide Strategic Planning: Phase 3](#), which outline the phases for implementing the Systemwide Strategic Plan. He also presented President Gabel's commitments for the Systemwide Strategic Plan, which include:

- Student Success
- Discovery, Innovation and Impact
- MNtersections (Health, Food, and Environment)
- Community and Belonging
- Fiscal Stewardship

Haldeman explained that as part of phase 3 of the planning process, the President's Office has engaged staff, faculty and students in the Twin Cities and across other system campuses to help develop the five commitments. He explained that there will likely be three to five goals under each of the five commitments and there will be leadership identified and governance groups appointed to support each commitment.

Based on questions from SRC members, Haldeman provided the following details:

- The President's Office has consulted on how the Grand Challenges may fit into the Systemwide Strategic Plan, but did not offer specifics.
- He could not speak to the magnitude of University investment for this plan because the plan is not finalized, however, he told members that the investments made as a result of the Systemwide Strategic Plan will substantially impact the mission of the University.
- Haldeman told members that the plan has been shared with Minnesota legislators for comment, and so far the feedback has been positive.
- The commitments were identified based on feedback that the president has received from the broad University community in her time at the institution.

5. Committee Discussion: System-wide Strategic Planning

Following Haldeman's presentation, committee members discussed what feedback they should provide to President Gabel at the December 9 SRC meeting. Members agreed that research goals could be listed under all of the five commitments. Members agreed to include feedback to the president on a google form that outlines the five commitments.

With no further business, Olson adjourned the meeting.

Bobbie Erichsen
University Senate Office