

## **University of Memphis Research Council (UMRC) Meeting Minutes November 8, 2018**

Members in Attendance: Abby Parrill Baker, Gayle Beck, Gary Bowlin, Colin Chapell, Remy Debes, John Evans, Ryan Fisher, Alfred Hall, Cody Havard, Stephanie Ivey, Wilfried Karmaus, Satish Kedia, Santosh Kumar, Katherine Lambert-Pennington, Chuck Langston, Erno Lindner, Annapoorna Mary, Jim Murphy, Kim Oller, Max Paquette, Brandt Pence, Latrice Pichon, Sarah Potter, Chrysanthé Preza, Kevin Sanders, Sajjan Shiva, Tom Sutter, Brian Waldron, Hongmei Zhang

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Jasbir Dhaliwal at 3:35 p.m.

Dr. Dhaliwal thanked everyone for agreeing to serve on the Research Council and articulated the rationale for forming the group as follows:

- To provide a forum that helps researchers talk to one another and make connections across disciplinary areas;
- To share the good things happening and help advocate for research on campus both across campus and in the community;
- To help get everyone on the same page and behind the goal to achieve Tier 1 Carnegie ranking by getting each unit to highlight and emphasize research; and
- To provide a two-way flow of information and shared governance structure between campus researchers and central research administration.

Dr. Dhaliwal then directed members to review materials in the meeting folder, including the Agenda, Roster, Draft By-Laws for the Council, 1-page summary of Research Vision Committee Recommendations; and handouts with 45 slides explaining the Carnegie 1 ranking criteria.

Dr. Dhaliwal explained that there are two major ranking systems for Universities: US News and World Report and Carnegie Classification. While both are driven by specific evaluation of objective metrics, a large component of the US News rankings rests on perceptions of University Presidents across the nation who are asked to rank/rate Universities as part of the process. Carnegie also has a subjective component, although not as large a factor as US News rankings. The bottom line is that we need to work hard to elevate the perception of what we are doing, and we need the help of the council to do that. We are also preparing our first-ever Research Magazine that will be sent to University Presidents all over the country in January, in time to influence their ratings.

To understand the Carnegie Classifications, Council members were directed to the PPT slide handouts. Carnegie's 'Basic Classification' system has 3 Tiers: Tier 1 is for about 150 Highest Research Universities; Tier 2 for High Research activity; and Tier 3 for Moderate Research Activity – mostly characterized by predominantly undergraduate or other limited research institutions. In Tennessee, Vanderbilt and UT Knoxville are the only two Tier 1 schools – 1 each in east and middle Tennessee. We are the only major research University in the western portion of the state, and we are currently at Tier 2 and knocking on the door of Tier 1. A major focus of our efforts recently has been to identify other universities who have recently moved up in the rankings to find out how they did it, and the University of North Texas has emerged as a model we are looking at.

At this point Dr. Dhaliwal asked everyone for help to clarify that \$100 million is NOT synonymous with achieving Carnegie 1. There are, in fact, multiple components to the goal, and \$100 million alone will not get us there.

On page 4 of the slides on the lower right, Slide #16, shows the key measures and principal components analysis features of the Basic Research Classification model. The analysis is based on both overall size (aggregate) and per capita factors, so we have to optimize and not focus on only one element.

The next slide (top left of page 5) has a scatter plot that shows how the universities fall using both aggregate and per capita factors, so please look at that. Then, beginning on the bottom on page 5, slide 20, and continuing to page 6, you can see the overall median values and then where U of M ranks with respect to those median values.

Due to time constraints, Dr. Dhaliwal stated that he will not review all slides, but asked that Council members look at the University of North Texas comparisons as well and feel free to also talk with Abby Parrill, who has done a lot of work on this for the Research Vision Committee, or with members of the Division's team who helped pull together these slides (Stephanie and Dakota).

Dr. Dhaliwal also made the group aware that Carnegie is changing the time cycle on its evaluation. It will now evaluate every 3 years instead of every 5 years. In addition, we are expecting new criteria to be issued soon. They were supposed to be out at the end of October, but, instead, Carnegie issued a notice of anticipated changes while we await a final version. In this document, Carnegie identified one primary change that may positively impact U of M related to inclusion of professional doctoral degrees (e.g. EDD, Law) in a separate category. We award a large number of these types of degrees within our doctoral totals, so this may help us, but we won't know until they issue the final criteria.

This underscores the need for us to focus on more than just the expenditure total to achieve Tier 1 and the need to work on raising our profile overall.

Moving on, Dr. Dhaliwal asked the Council to look at the 1-page document on the Research Vision Committee's recommendations. The Research Vision Committee was commissioned in 2015 by Dr. Rudd to look at infrastructure, policies, and programs within the Research Division and to make recommendations. It was noted that several members of the University Research Council were part of that group. Dr. Dhaliwal noted that we are using the recommendations as our starting point for actions and that we have, in fact, already made some changes in response to the recommendations. Establishing this Council to share information is one example.

Next, the membership of the Council was discussed, with reference made to the draft by-laws. It was noted that although our team drafted the by-laws based on the model of the Graduate School Council, there will be a task force formed to review and finalize the document. In fact, several task forces will be formed to address issues related to policies and planning. We will ask each of you to serve on at least one task force to look at what other schools are doing and recommend changes to our policies. It is important that you are all involved in assessing what we do.

Dr. Dhaliwal also pledged to make future meetings more interactive and less about him addressing the Council.

At the conclusion of his remarks, Dr. Dhaliwal asked the Council for feedback, suggestions, and/or questions.

Brian Waldron asked how the number of research staff counted by Carnegie is defined. Following some discussion, it was determined that the University is reporting this as the number of post docs, although the criteria call for the number of post docs and/or PhD prepared, non-faculty, staff scientists. Dr. Dhaliwal asked that all Council members take the Carnegie presentation back to their Units and stated that we will be asking the Associate Deans for Research to work with us to initiate conversations about this, so we get everyone involved.

Chuck Langston identified the lack of a central calendar that shows where and when research events, doctoral dissertations, etc. are taking place as a weakness. No one knows what is going on, despite the increase in SPAM e-mails from administration. Dr. Dhaliwal asked the Council to be sure to notify our office about upcoming events, so we can publicize them in our monthly newsletter. He also pledged to talk with the Graduate School about coming up with a solution to publicize dissertation defenses or, at a minimum, to stand up a website where all graduate coordinators could post this information. Dr. Dhaliwal also asked that everyone be certain to notify us when there are research seminars or visits from world-class speakers, so we can get the word out on NPR or other venues to encourage campus and community attendance. This will help us meet our goal of changing public perception about us as a research university.

Someone asked (I apologize that I did not write down who asked) if we have a plan to get to Tier 1. Dr. Dhaliwal said that we are working on that and that one of the task forces we are forming will be asked to look at the Research Plan of the University of North Texas and other Universities to help us come up with good ideas.

Remy Debes asked for a more compact presentation and plan for Carnegie 1 that Council members could use in unit presentations. A more concise version would make the content more accessible to everyone and better help deliver the key points. Dr. Dhaliwal agreed and will work on providing that to Council members soon.

Alfred Hall asked if it is possible to move DOWN in the rankings during Carnegie evaluation. His point was that we need to plan for sustainability of Tier 1 status and not just for the initial classification. Dr. Dhaliwal agreed and cited the example of Mississippi State that developed a plan to get to Tier 1 and then another plan to maintain Tier 1 status.

Santosh Kumar stated that this information has been very helpful and that it is clear that we all need to do our part in our units to move to the goal. He noted that it is unlikely, however, that we will see much substantive change if we are all working with the status quo and ask if there is a plan to implement and invest in new strategies that will produce the change necessary to achieve Tier 1. Dr. Dhaliwal said that

we are working on a plan and that key pieces include how to increase our STEM PhD production. We have already implemented two new STEM doctoral fellowship programs in response. One leverages state diversity funds to support TN residents who are underrepresented in their STEM field and the first in their family to pursue a PhD, and the second is a supplemental fellowship designed to help you compete for top students that is supported with strategic investment dollars. We need you to go out and recruit students to take advantage of these programs. Another strategy that will be announced soon is a program to fund 10 Post Doc positions on campus beginning next year. We will place these individuals on 9 month contracts to give them incentives to also apply for grants to cover their summer salary and, in this way, also help improve our research expenditure numbers.

Dr. Dhaliwal also went on to make the point that everything we do will not benefit everyone and that each Council member needs to check their unit at the door when they come to these meetings. The goal cannot be to see how much money one can get for her/his unit. Instead, members need to look at programs and actions that can help advance the university towards its goals and, in so doing, raise the profile and provide benefit to all.

Dr. Dhaliwal pointed out that under SRI, indirect cost revenue goes to the units, and the Deans then determine how to allocate those resources. Our office no longer has these funds to invest, so we are looking for creative or alternate ways to generate investment dollars. For example, the University of Memphis Research Foundation is setting up a Research Park that will generate revenue for use to support research initiatives. Similar to the University of Tennessee's Cherokee Park, we will provide space for companies to locate in our research park and use the revenue to support campus research initiatives. We are considering a future policy that requires companies who license our technologies to locate in one of our Communitel research park locations.

Dr. Dhaliwal also shared that the STEM Building is #1 on the University's state building list for this year. THEC recently met and approved the plan. We are listed as #8 on the overall THEC list, and the group has historically received funding for up to nine projects. We are also the only project in west Tennessee, so we are optimistic that we will get this funded this year – that is \$36 million.

The University is also looking at ways to streamline and increase cost efficiency of its research operations. For example, we are considering consolidating our animal care operations into one locations.

Next – Directors of the primary units within the Division provided brief overviews.

Heather Winters, Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs highlighted the role of her team in helping faculty navigate all aspects of the sponsored project life cycle as the office the university has given the authority to submit and accept sponsored project proposals and awards. She briefly discussed Cayuse, the University's electronic research administration software with modules that provides faculty, students, and staff a tool to submit and track IRB documents, that provides capability for system-to-system direct submissions of federal proposals (through 424 module), and that (through SP module) provides a central and transparent means to route proposal documents for required authorizations and approvals and that provides a central cloud storage site for all proposal documents. Cayuse also allows

us to set up reports of interest to faculty and administrators, and we are working on building out that feature now. Heather stressed that Cayuse should not be a barrier to you. The office has daily office hours for anyone who needs help (3-4 p.m. in AD 315) and can sit with you 1:1 at other times as needed. She concluded by invited everyone to our upcoming Research open house on November 29<sup>th</sup> and told everyone to stay tuned for a monthly research administrators forum that will launch in February.

Dr. Dhaliwal added that we have been participating in a campus-wide task force to discuss the integration of the Office of Sponsored Programs and Grants Accounting and that we expect to see recommendations issued about that very soon.

Deborah Hernandez discussed the two foci of the Research Development Team: Building Capacity and Increasing Competitiveness. Research Development builds capacity by identifying and pursuing funds for infrastructure, helping faculty developing research partnerships, and conducting faculty development workshops. We increase competitiveness by providing targeted proposal development assistance, with an emphasis on large-scale or complex proposals, limited competitions, junior faculty proposals, and resubmissions. In the next few weeks look for distribution of the IDCR calculations, call for nominations for RISE and First Gen STEM doctoral fellowships, and announcement of proposal help near you – a weekly rotating location for proposal help.

Beverly Jacobik provided an overview of Research Compliance. The two-person office manages Human Subjects and Animal Care review boards and is responsible for the University's required Financial Conflict of Interest and Export Control programs. Research Compliance is also responsible for managing the University's Research Integrity activities including its Research Misconduct process and Responsible Conduct of Research programming. This office is spearheading a University Compliance Council to involve faculty and administrators in its efforts, and it welcomes your involvement.

Cody Behles provided an overview of programming at the FedEx Institute of Technology, the applied technology arm of the University. FIT operates at the crossroads of industry and university interests on campus. It manages the work of five Research Clusters: Biologistics, CAST, DRONES, SmartCities, and Additive Manufacturing. The clusters are designed to get people talking and seed development of new research. There are currently more than 60 faculty involved in these clusters. FIT also hosts meetings, training, and competitions designed to bring the technology community to campus and to foster industry-university connections. Programming is on the FIT website and listed in the Division's monthly newsletter. FIT is also working on standing up CommuniTech – our research park. The grand opening will be on January 17<sup>th</sup> and will be in the old library on Central Avenue. We currently have about 10 companies who will be coming into that space.

Dr. Dhaliwal asked Council members to send companies anyone is partnering with to us, so we can talk about having them co-located on campus. In addition to the site of the old library and the site at the Defense Audit building on south campus, we own 3-4 houses on Patterson that will also be renovated for our use.

Hai Trieu, Director of the Office of Technology Transfer, highlighted his work in disclosures, patent filings, and technology evaluations. Most of his office's focus is on patents. He also provides grants to

help support research in areas that may produce commercializable technologies, with a small amount of activity in the area of copyrights. He also focuses on trying to license or market the technologies we own.

Dr. Dhaliwal introduced the six (6) task forces being formed and the staff conveners who will work with each task force: Council By-Laws (Cody Behles, Convener); Research Policies – Faculty Incentive Pay (Ty Flores, Convener); Research Policies – Intellectual Property (Hai Trieu, Convener); Research Policies – Research Misconduct (Beverly Jacobik, Convener); Research Policies – Sponsored Programs, Grants, Contracts & Agreements (Mary Earheart-Brown, Convener); Strategic Research Plan (Stephanie Thompson, Convener). At the end of the meeting, each Council member will be asked to sign up to serve on at least one task force. The job of the task forces will be to go out and look at what other universities are doing and then bring back recommendations for us to consider.

Dr. Dhaliwal concluded the meeting by providing a few other updates:

- We have a new partnership with the Urban Child Institute, and Mary Earheart-Brown will be issuing a call for proposals in the spring for our next funding cycle with them.
- We issued a call last month to establish Communities of Research Scholars (CoRS) designed to get interdisciplinary teams of faculty talking about possible research around a topic of shared interest. We received 24 proposals and funded 13 of them.
- Council members likely heard the announcement made earlier this fall that we will be pursuing setting up a medical school in Jackson. We are now talking about setting this up at our Millington campus and are working with a private equity firm to explore the viability of this alternate model. This would allow us to hire faculty on the medical school funding model in order to grow our faculty on our home campus while also supporting the new D.O. Medical School. Stay tuned for more information as these discussions unfold.

Hongmei Zhang asked if/how Council members can bring issues before the full Council for consideration. For example, she is working on a proposal for a statistical consulting center that may be of interest to the Council. Dr. Dhaliwal said that anyone who has an idea or issue they would like the Council to consider should send a 1-page proposal to him and then make a motion during a meeting to discuss it.

Remy Debes asked if there were plans to repeat the \$1 million in seed funding allocated with FY17 strategic investment funds and, if so, if the Council would have any role in that process. Dr. Dhaliwal responded that these funds were allocated under the old funding model and that these types of resources now reside in the college. This is why we are working to set up alternate revenue streams through UMRF Venture, CommuniTech and other mechanisms.

Dr. Dhaliwal told the group will have three, regularly scheduled meetings each year, with the potential for other called meetings if need arises. The next meeting will be in February, and we will be polling you for dates soon.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.