

3/30/22 – Research Strategic Growth Subcommittee Meeting

Via Zoom – Morris Foster, Daniel Campbell, Adam Rubenstein, Doug Streit, Phil Reed, Eric Weisel, Sachin Shetty, Licheng Sun, Barry Ezell, Ryan Klinger, Sophie Clayton, Charles Sukenik, Rodger Harvey, Liz Smith, Hongyi Wu, Masha Sosonkina, Michel Audette, Shanan Chappell-Moots, Nancy Klein, Mecit Cetin, Chunqi Jiang

VP Foster began the meeting with a discussion of the submission template that includes: goals, strategies to accomplish goals, and key performance indicators for each goal. He also discussed consideration of annual targets, our ideal result in five years, who is responsible for each item, budget needs, and coming up with approximately eight recommendations by the June 1st deadline.

He also shared that the Mission and Core Values report prepared by the Steering Committee is available on the Teams site. The Challenges and Opportunities report is also there and has specific information related to research that should be considered and built upon as our report is put together.

This was followed by a brief discussion of the Research Subgroup portion of the Challenges and Opportunities report.

The committee began a discussion about the high level and worthwhile goals being discussed, but were still concerned about seemingly smaller challenges that often add up to impact research and teaching.

- We can consider creation of a goal aimed at streamlining processes on campus
- A structured and deliberate approach and associated processes supporting research should be a part of our plan at the university level
- Processes are something that is cross cutting through all the committees and we should consider sharing responsibilities among groups

The question was raised about where do we place this area.

- VP Foster suggested bringing it to the steering committee and/or make it part of one of our subcommittees; consider making it a goal to streamline processes
- Co-chair Shetty noted that documenting this will ensure that the execution challenge is addressed

The committee discussed the creation, assignments, and considerations for the small working groups:

Post R1 culture/systemic change – effective execution

Culture – Charles (Lead), Michel, Mecit, Phil, Chunqi, Ryan, Sophie,

- *How you think about a problem; How to evolve our mindset on solving problems; Need a can-do attitude, will help find efficiencies with people going out of their way to fix an issue that may come across their desk*
- *The question was posed: How do we get everyone thinking like an R1 university?*
- *There needs to be a campus mentality of making things happen and getting things done and overcoming minor hold ups to build a culture that will allow research to be done effectively*

Process – Eric (Lead), Doug, Adam, Liz, Tihomir, Masha

- *How you deal with a problem*

Goals for funded research – Sachin (Lead), Barry, Licheng, Shanan, Rodger, Hongyi

Goals for arts and humanities – Nancy (Lead), Saikou, Heather

VP Foster posed the question about not meeting as a large group on 4/6 to allow the smaller groups time to meet and discuss ideas. It was decided to cancel the 4/6 full meeting and have the sub-groups share their preliminary ideas with the full group at the 4/13 meeting.

- Sub committees should consider the three areas that the President and university are investing in: Maritime, Data Science, and Health Care, as they put together their goals

The group discussed the possibility of coming to a consensus on the KPI's.

- VP Foster indicated that the KPI's should flow from each specific goal; we should start with the goals, strategies and then develop KPI's specific to them
- Subgroups will bring goals to the larger group which may see cross cutting goals that can be prioritized when brought to the Steering Committee

A question was posed asking if there was anything that could be learned from the last time we worked on a Strategic Plan effort.

- The last university plan was fairly generic; this time we are looking to develop a plan that is distinctive to ODU; the prior Research Strategic Plan is on the Teams site
- A Research & Entrepreneurship sub-committee had started working on a new plan prior to the pandemic

The committee resumed a discussion of processes and it was suggested the Process group will be challenged to understand what problems are occurring.

- The question was posed on how to collect information to inform those discussions and the Process group can think about this area
- A brief survey to faculty was suggested as an option
- We should consider establishing an overall process to improve processes; we should identify examples, but not pursue an exhaustive list
- Consider who could be the responsible party for fixing small problems
- Consider picking an 80% solution and pursue that option; challenges with contracting were offered as an example

The committee began a discussion about some challenges encountered when working with the Research Foundation.

- This is a good time to discuss these challenges as there will be a new Executive Director of the Research Foundation in the coming months.
- These items can be addressed by the Process sub-group

- We should consider how we can utilize digital assistance to address the interconnectivity of systems
- This is another area that can be addressed when considering Research Foundation challenges as many of their systems are home grown and do not connect with the university systems.
- Interconnectedness is a theme that is integral to our efforts; for example, a registry of available 3D printing locations on campus would be helpful

The challenges in hiring of technical and support staff in the current economy was discussed

- Consider adding hiring to the Process group's portfolio; look at pathways to advertise non-traditional type positions that we would like to get out to a larger group of candidates

The Faculty Expertise Guide was discussed next. The original person responsible for it has left the university. Doug Streit indicated he would investigate who in Academic Affairs was working with it now.

The group resumed a discussion of shared resources and brought up the question of how to address billing since eventually some services will have to be paid for when working between departments.

- This is another question that can be addressed by the Process group; possibly consider billing as a block of time, equipment, etc.
- Internal cost centers were proposed as a possible option; example of COSMIC was shared
- The need for a process that would apply to smaller pieces of equipment was also discussed; the example of VMASC developing agile software teams was shared; it can also be difficult to break out times of FTE
- Consider how do we make X resource available on a broader scale to be able to reimburse
- The difference in definition of an FTE between the Research Foundation and the Federal Gov't. was also discussed

VP Foster concluded the meeting saying that Daniel Campbell will work with the subgroup leads to set up meetings for them to work in advance of the next full group meeting on April 13th.