

[Meeting topics: Policy on Principal Investigator Eligibility on Sponsored Projects, Education in the Responsible Conduct of Sponsored Research and Grants Management Policy, Intellectual Property Policy, Course Loads Under Semesters.]

## MINUTES

### SENATE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (SCFA)

Thursday, March 4, 1999

3:00-5:00 p.m.

229 Nolte Center

- Present:** Kent Bales (Chair), Josef Altholz, Avner Ben-Ner, Carole Bland, Robert Fahnhorst, Andrea Hinding, Janet Holdsworth, Cleon Melsa, Marcia Pankake, Anne Pick, Richard Purple, Geoffrey Sirc
- Regrets:** Gary Balas, Gerry Baldrige, Carol Carrier, Carol Chomsky, John Fossum, Roland Guyotte, James Perry
- Absent:** Caroline Turner, Thomas Walsh
- Guests:** Leonard Kuhi (Chair, Research Committee)
- Others:** C. Robert Morris

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.

#### **1. Policy on Principal Investigator Eligibility on Sponsored Projects**

Professor Bales welcomed Professor Kuhi, chair of the Senate Research Committee, to present the policy on Principal Investigator (PI) Eligibility on Sponsored Projects. Professor Kuhi said he had taken the suggestions made at SCFA's January 21 meeting to the Research Committee and believes all have been incorporated into the draft presently before the committee. One involved moving the section outlining who may serve as a PI to the beginning of the document. Another change involved clearly identifying that faculty who hold regular faculty appointments are automatically eligible to serve as a PI. Term and non-regular faculty, and other academic employees (such as P&A) may serve as principal or co-investigators on research grants and contracts and other sponsored projects upon approval by the department head and/or the dean of the unit in which the individual is employed, according to policies established by the unit. This is meant to include consultation with the faculty and P&A following procedures established by the unit.

Professor Purple raised a question about the grievance process in Section IV(4), and suggested that the Judicial Committee may be the more appropriate body to hear grievances by faculty. Others agreed. Another person raised the Academic Misconduct Policy and inquired whether it should be referenced in that section as well. Professor Kuhi will review the Policy and revise the section accordingly, and then circulate the language to SCFA for a vote.

A final question was raised about PI training which does not seem to be consistent across colleges. Professor Kuhi stated that that is one reason the policy is necessary. Training should be provided on a regular basis for those who serve as PIs.

**The policy was then approved contingent on the modification of Section IV(4) as indicated above.**

## **2. Education in the Responsible Conduct of Sponsored Research and Grants Management Policy.**

Professor Kuhi next presented the policy on Education in the Responsible Conduct of Sponsored Research and Grants Management that was also discussed by SCFA on January 21. He said it had been minimally revised.

**SCFA suggested three small editorial corrections, and then approved the policy with no further discussion.**

## **3. Intellectual Property Policy**

Professor Altholz updated the committee on the Intellectual Property Policy Working Group. He is very pleased with the direction the committee is going. Vice President Maziar has been very cooperative and has not imposed anything on the Working Group. She has spoken with a number of Regents, keeping them abreast of the committee's work.

Professor Chomsky has prepared text for committee discussion. Professor Altholz believes the Working Group will have a draft policy ready in another month or so and that it will be possible to route it through the appropriate committees and to the Faculty Senate before the end of the academic year. He feels confident that a policy will be developed that faculty will find satisfactory.

## **4. Course Loads Under Semesters**

Professor Bales introduced the discussion on course loads under semesters. It has been called to SCFA's attention that there is great variance among colleges on how semester course loads are being determined and the committee has been asked to review the situation.

Several members who were unable to attend the meeting submitted their comments in advance. They included:

- Professor Perry urged SCFA to address this substantive issue, suggesting that SCFA consider preparing a statement for Faculty Senate approval.
- Professor Chomsky offered a perspective from someone who has been working on a semester basis. She agrees that losing the "light quarter" will translate into more difficulties for faculty research. She noted that changes in contact hours must be taken into account as well as change based upon the number of courses taught in any effort to equalize workload across departments. (E.g. 10 courses may mean something different depending on whether the "standard" course is 3 or 4 credits, or where (as in the Law School), one course each year is usually a 2-credit seminar.
- Professor Fossum provided the Carlson School workload policy for the committee's consideration.

Professor Bales also distributed comments received from faculty in CLA who indicated that the teaching loads are expected to increase under semesters, not be workload neutral as should be the case. He also reported the basic argument of a letter from Dean Rosenstone to CLA's Council of Chairs. It itemizes savings in time provided by the new semester format, savings not taken into account by critics of the teaching-load policy.

Professor Purple echoed the "workload neutral" principle and argued that the onus to comply should be placed on the departments. There are multiple ways to calculate teaching loads and to suggest one formula will work for the entire University is not realistic. It is realistic, however, to mandate that departments and colleges comply with the workload neutral stipulation.

Several cited examples and anecdotes from their colleges that confirmed the difficulty in developing a central policy. All agreed with Professor Purple's assessment that the committee should stand firm that whatever formula a unit uses to convert teaching loads from quarters to semesters, it must be workload neutral, and faculty should be involved in making that determination.

Not all colleges have been heard from and it would be helpful for SCFA to know if other units are experiencing similar conversion problems. Also, it appears not all units have a workload policy.

This raised the issue of a semester conversion oversight committee. Is someone monitoring the semester conversion process? If so, the teaching load and other issues could be handled by that group. Professor Bales will speak with Professor Laura Koch, Associate Director for the Semester Conversion Project, about these issues before the March 18 meeting.

If there is not a mechanism in place by the semester conversion group to address these issues, Professor Bales will prepare a draft letter on this issue for SCFA's consideration.

One member asked that SCFA add for discussion at a future meeting increasing faculty workloads and the resulting effect on quality.

-- Martha Kvanbeck