

## Creativity, Discovery, and Innovation: Meeting Notes – June 7, 2022

Agenda Item	Discussion	Questions/Responses
<b>Strategic Planning Updates</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met with the other workgroup Chairs and are starting to see some overlap of themes between the need for more targeted resources, infrastructure, and staff. Also, the capacity to incorporate experiential learning into what we are doing. Some requests for more support in academia and quality programming but also more specialized staff for grant funding.</li> <li>The Valuing and Supporting Employees (VASE) workgroup would like to come to one of our meetings because they have fewer faculty in that group and want to better capture the faculty employee experience for the work that they are doing for the strategic plan.</li> <li>Interesting conversations with the other workgroups. Everyone is glad that we are thinking cross collaboratively and expressed appreciation that this work is happening.</li> </ul>	
<b>Discussion with John Mihelich</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reviewed 'goal 4' of <i>OneUND</i> Strategic Plan: how we measure our progress and how it looks like we are advancing on our goals that were set. This goal has two main parts: (1) to enhance discovery and (2) to do so in a manner consistent with R1 classification (Carnegie status designation).</li> <li>We use a metric based off the HERD survey which looks at research expenditures. Our Goal for <i>OneUND</i> was to reach \$120 million by FY 22, and we just reported our numbers at \$140 million for FY21, so based off that metric we have exceeded our goal early.</li> <li>Two things that go into our research expenditure numbers: institutional research expenditures and externally funded expenditures. UND's externally funded expenditures have seen faster growth. Our largest contribution to the internal expenditures is reflected on page 2 of the faculty contracts (dollar amount associated with the percentage allocated to research activity). Other things would be graduate stipends, tuition waivers, etc. This comes out to around \$40 million, and the rest is what we are getting in external expenditures.</li> <li>The HERD survey is also a big part of the Carnegie measures.</li> <li>A strategy behind our research goal in <i>OneUND</i> was the Grand Challenges. While we recognize that all research is important, the funded research has the biggest impact on the HERD survey. Strategy was to support a breath of research across colleges but then focus on certain areas where UND can be nationally competitive, which is where we get the Grand Challenges. These were selected based off areas that UND had the greatest strengths in terms of research in the state and nation.</li> <li>The second part of Goal 4 was Carnegie specific- increasing PhD production, increasing post docs, etc. These are more geared toward enhancing our outcomes for Carnegie.</li> <li>Moving the needle takes time, partially because they only do the classification every three years.</li> <li>More recently, starting in 2019, we have been working on a national security strategy, to look at increasing DoD funded research. This could possibly be added as a 6<sup>th</sup> Grand Challenge, it is a huge area of opportunity for UND.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How far away are we for R1? What do we need to do in a manner that is sustainable/optimal if this was a goal? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are close. A bunch of universities are at that dividing line. If you look at those that are clustered around that line and how they differ from us: PhD production is key – we are dramatically lower. Estimated we needed around 60 more PhDs a year (3 years ago) which would mean we would need to have around 300 in the pipeline.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Can we compare a land grant university with a humanities university? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Don't think it is fair comparison. This Carnegie designation does not count JDs or MDs towards the designation, which is a large part of what UND does. Upwards of 40 % of our research expenditures comes from EERC, but they do not produce PhDs. So, a lot of what we do does not factor into the formula. Land grant institutions get lots of state funding and have PhDs that "count."</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revising the scholarly activities incentive model within MIRA has been a big help recently. This is one of the levers that can be internally adjusted within the MIRA model. Used to based exclusively on external contracts, but we have revised it to recognize the money colleges are contributing towards the internally funded work, such as found on faculty page 2 of their contracts. Intended to help compensate units for the F&amp;A rate that is too low. Is an attempt to help colleges make up for what is not covered.</li> <li>• So, the question for this group would be: do we want to enhance research? And if so, how do we measure this? Do we want to measure this in terms of R1, or do we want another kind of measure? We will always report to the HERD survey, but what measurements do we want to look at to determine if we are successful?</li> <li>• Focusing on enhancing research and focusing on Carnegie designation will lead you down two different paths of decision making. Ultimately the President needs to decide what route we will go down. We do need PhD students to do research and we continue to grow these based (in good portion) by funded research. You need to have the research and the faculty to support this.</li> <li>• Not many in state legislature know what R1 means. There are measures that we can draw out. We are closing the expenditure gap with NDSU. There is a comparison there. For those that care about research, we get a lot of support regarding the type of research we do. The larger battle is helping explain the value of a comprehensive research university and why that matters to the state of North Dakota. These are the bigger challenges then then R1/R2 conversation to our legislatures. Federal dollars that we bring in due to our research is money that would not have been in the state otherwise, and this has a real economic impact. We need to pick our metrics and help provide our stories that we get to tell. Pick what measures are important and help show the impact of these measures on the state.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Talk about being a really good R2 vs. a low ranking R1. What would be a competitive difference? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In my opinion, it doesn't matter other than we can tell people that we are R1. Large R1 schools do not compare themselves to the smaller R1 institutions- they are in two different worlds. Thinking that faculty will not choose us if we are not an R1 is not always true. Faculty care about the department they are going to more than R1 vs. R2 classification.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Focus on advancing knowledge and helping the state or advancing the academic field. We talk about educating our legislatures, it would be helpful to educate the alumni to help with this messaging is important. We have another audience to educate outside of the legislature.</li> </ul>
<b>Next Steps</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next meeting, we will either invite the Valuing and Supporting Employees (VASE) workgroup to have a discussion with us, or we will start to converge on the information collected</li> </ul>	

**In attendance** – Patrick Henry, Vamegh Rasouli, Amy Whitney, Ryan Adams, Mark Askelson, Becca Baumbach, Sandy Braathen, Sarah Heitkamp, Paul Korus, Beth Kurz, Soizik Laguette, Michael Mann, Scott Sandberg, Shawnda Schroeder, Robert Stupnisky, Chi Ming Tan, Stephanie Walker, Bailey Bubach, Anna Clark, Amanda Moske,

Next Meeting: June 21 at 9:00 am (Ina Mae Rude Boardroom or Zoom)