

MTU RESEARCH ADVISORY COUNCIL

October 20, 2006

1:30-3:00PM

Alumni Lounge MUB

MINUTES – Revised and Approved 1-29-07

Item #4 Garnishment of Research Travel Reimbursements submitted by Terry McNinch was placed on hold until the next meeting due to Terry's absence.

BOC annual Report

The council reviewed the Annual Research Report for 2006. (See Handouts). Requests were made for additional reports reflecting distribution by size of the awards be provided along with historical comparisons, and Anita Quinn will work with Cathy Banfield to provide those to the council members.

The Technology and Economic Development portion of the report has a slide entitled "Percent Increase in Research Expenditures". The data for this slide comes from the National Science Foundation and always lags by two years, thus the slide reflects the 2004 ranking. Dave Reed stated that there is a website with extensive data if anyone is interested. A question was raised as to how the various disciplines on campus are coded and reported by Research Accounting, since these NSF statistics are ranked by discipline. An additional expenditure question was raised, "Have we done any comparisons showing FTE to Research Expenditures? Cathy Banfield will contact Julie Seppala regarding these questions.

External Funding Incentive Program

Council moved to agenda item 2, and Larry Sutter presented the External Funding Incentive Program (EFIP) Senate proposal 5-07. (See Handouts)

The intent of the EFIP is to enhance research, scholarship and instructional activity of faculty by increasing the level of external funding. A semi-annual incentive payment would be given to those general fund supported tenured and tenure-track faculty who secure funding for their academic year salary from external sources. This program does not replace the current "release time" that is granted currently. Anita Quinn stated that the University of Arkansas was audited a few years ago, for the same type of program, and at this point, there have been no findings. The program was presented to the Senate where several concerns were brought up by senate members. Larry stated that the EFIP program is not unethical, "double-dipping" or illegal. The EFIP pays part of the salary so that the general fund has to pay less. The scholarly activity is completed in full and in the 40/40/20 breakdown; the 40 percent of scholarly activity is funded by external sources, resulting in no extra effort by the faculty. Keeping in mind that you are paid for 100% of your effort not for working a forty-hour week (faculty are not considered hourly employees.

Dave Reed pointed out that this past summer we had 30 employees who requested fifteen weeks of compensation. EFIP would stand alone as a new way to operate, and would not replace nine month salaries. In order to qualify for this program the appropriate indirect cost rate must be charged and fully collected, and the budget must also be fully fringed.

There is proposal 5-07 on the senate website.

The minutes of the senate meeting can be found at:

<http://www.sas.it.mtu.edu/usenate/minute/07/442m.htm>

The proposal can be viewed at: <http://www.sas.it.mtu.edu/usenate/propose/07/05-07.htm>

The council agreed that the EFIP program is a very difficult idea to explain. Larry asked that the council members in favor of implementing the EFIP program contact their senate representative asking them to support this program.

Extra Compensation

Anita Quinn presented to the council “Interpretation of Policies Related to Faculty Extra Compensation”. (See Handouts). MTU Board of Control Policy 19.3.3 explicitly provides for faculty to be eligible for overload compensation during the academic year due to research work, while the federal government’s OMB Circular A-21 explicitly prohibits faculty compensation above the normal salary without it being specifically provided for in the agreement or explicitly approved in writing by the sponsoring agency. Anita stated that the Faculty handbook was recently updated see 5.1.1 Faculty Compensation Policy:

http://www.admin.mtu.edu/admin/prov/facbook/ch5/5chap-01.htm#P4_53

The point being that a situation that may arise and is short-term in duration needs prior approval by the sponsor. Faculty will not be turned down for extra comp as long as prior approval was obtained from the sponsoring agency. For Example, if a peer faculty member was unable to fulfill their teaching duties due to accident or illness, another faculty member would have to step-in and fulfill the teaching duties of their peer. Anita said that faculty extra compensation does not occur very often, but documentation of time is required (in over-load situations); soft dollar units do this as standard procedure.

Upon conclusion of the extra comp discussion, the floor was opened to the council. No additional questions were posed. The meeting was adjourned.