Strategic Plan Research Profile Subcommittee: 1-25-16, 4:00-5:25 pm

Members Present: Beate Schmittmann, Kan Wang, Amy Andreotti, Lora-Leigh Chryystal, Nathan Davis, Harrison Inefuku, Michael Kimber, Wolfgang Kliemann, Cathy Kling, Brooke Langlitz, Balaji Narasimhan, Adam Schwartz, Qijing Zhang

Absent: Julia Badenhope and Misty Spencer

Beate developed a template of the research profile subcommittee report (which included all the subgroup reports) and sent to committee members on Friday. She asked the committee to review this document prior to today’s meeting, but noted that this was a first attempt and open for discussion.

The three remaining subgroups reviewed their reports.

1) Increase external research funding and research expenditures (Narasimhan, Kling, Langlitz, Zhang). Balaji noted that this subgroup’s membership changed with Langlitz replacing Leiden. He reviewed the group’s report (see draft template report with objectives, tactics, and metrics). Below are additional discussion points:
   - Publishing in high impact journals and how it differs among disciplines.
   - How to capture high impact research that is not driven by research expenditures.
   - The role of honorary awards and what they mean to the university community.
   - Difficulty with metrics and tracking grants.

2) Build and maintain a personnel and physical infrastructure designed to enhance research (Kliemann, Wang, Davis). Wolfgang reviewed his group’s report (see draft template with goals, tactics, and metrics). Additional discussion points are noted below:
   - Find a way to formalize agreements with organizations such as NADC, etc. for more collaborative research and equipment sharing.
   - Issues raised about funding to keep instrumentation intact – raise private funds, use fee-for-service, etc.
   - Add wording about partnerships.
   - Change “scientist” to “researcher”
   - Still need to include information about arts and humanities.

3) “Other” group - need to determine appropriate title for this category (Inefuku, Davis, Badenhope). This group focused on increasing the visibility and impact of research with high impact publications, faculty awards, and other indicators of faculty productivity. Harrison reviewed this group’s report (see draft template with objectives, tactics, and metrics). Additional discussion points:
   - Discussed whether undergraduates should attend and present at regular conferences rather than specifically undergraduate conferences or publications.
   - Mentioned FRI (Freshman Research Initiative) which introduces freshman undergraduates to authentic research.
This section included support and promotion of undergraduate research, but suggested moving this under the category on attracting and retaining excellent graduate students. This category could focus more on impact and diversity.

**Action items:**

Beate will update the report and send another draft to everyone and asked that each group then review their sections again. This is still a work in progress.

Earlier, Julia Badenhope asked to share this document with the Faculty Senate Research Planning and Policy Committee. Since this process is to solicit input, it was agreed that the next draft that Beate prepares can be shared with this committee noting that it is still a working document.

The next meeting is Thursday, February 11 at 3 pm in 302 Catt Hall.