

Research Council Minutes

December 8, 2016

Memorial Union – Peace Garden Room

Call to order at 3:30 PM

Attendance – Michael Strand, Svetlana Kilina, Kalpana Katti, Kevin McPhee, Chanchai Tangpong, Bernhardt Saini-Eidukat, Mike Strand, Todd Lewis, Mark Strand, Molly Secor-Turner, Christy McGeorge, Xiangfa Wu, Eduardo Faundez, Kelly Rusch, Jolynne Tschetter, Sheri Anderson

Minutes were approved for the November 17, 2016, meeting without changes.

Announcements

Vice President Rusch commented on the RCA internal funding opportunities announced last week. These opportunities cover a variety of areas. Most proposals received so far have been for research support services.

To clarify one of the areas, the undergraduate research awards are for work that is tied to a faculty member. Students can write the application, but it must be submitted by the faculty member with whom they are doing the project.

Vice President Rusch commented on Nexus ND, as there was an executive steering committee meeting held yesterday, December 7, on the program. This effort is being led by Chancellor Hagerott, with the goal of developing research and education opportunities in three focus areas: cybersecurity, unmanned aerial systems (UAS), and high performance computing (HPC). NDSU is leading the cybersecurity and high performance computing areas of the program. UND is leading the UAS area.

VP Rusch discussed the recent resignation of the NDSU CCAST Director, Martin Ossowski. She is starting to work on the job description.

Old business

a. Draft Policy 110.1

This policy will be discussed at the January 2017 meeting.

b. CORE Facilities

The *Criteria for Core Facilities* was distributed and discussed. Part of this document (1st page) has also been reviewed by the Dean's Council.

VPR Rusch brought up a point made by M. Secor-Turner at the last meeting concerning campus resources. There are many needs on campus for supporting the growth of research infrastructure and there is limited funding for everything. Core facilities is one area. It will be important to keep this in mind as this group works through the core facilities structure.

A question was raised as to the meaning of 'activity' when used to determine if a facility would be classified as a departmental, college or institutional core facility. It is important that 'activity' be defined

to insure that the same criteria is used across all core facilities. Activity can mean a number of things, as reflected in Item 3 (a-n) of the annual review information.

Council members discussed the section on *Annual Review of Institutional Core Facilities*.

C. Tangpong and Mark Strand discussed external benchmarking. The point was made that over time cost centers can become inefficient and there should be some way to benchmark. A comment was made that these equipment investments should generate additional revenue. There needs to be a balance internally, so as not making it too expensive for faculty to use, but where centers are paying their costs. It was recognized that core facilities typically are not self-sustaining.

Michael Strand suggested adding non-data related information to the annual reports, as the narrative is important too. Additional comments from B. Saini-Eidukat and K. Katti included adding outreach, use by other institutions and industry collaboration metrics.

Council members discussed the *Eligibility Criteria and Application and Review Process*.

VPR Rusch pointed out Item #3 (serve greater than 30 faculty per facility per year). This number is open to discussion. S. Kilina indicated that some equipment can only be used by certain people. Perhaps could use ratio?

Two other possible criteria to take into account when screening applications for Institutional Core Facility status were suggested: 1) Is the status being sought by the lab facility or is the status being sought for the lab by the institution and 2) Is there a role for the strategic plan and/or grand challenges to be used as a metric for institutional core lab status?

Item #8 (have dedicated staff with requisite expertise) is difficult. The costs of the center rise with having the expertise on staff.

The annual reports from the core labs were distributed and discussed. There were questions about the data provided. VPR Rusch indicated that at the time these reports were requested, the criteria under discussion today had not been established. Input was provided to VPR Rusch on the four current Core Facilities [and whether they meet the definition of an Institutional Core facility – 2 do, 1 does not and 1 was split leaning towards does not meet the criteria]

Going forward, the Research Council will review the annual reports for each of the respective Core Facilities.

If a facility becomes an institutional core facility, oversight is at the institutional level and reports to RCA. The Research Council will be important to in looking at what makes sense from institutional perspective for core facilities structure.

Upkeep of websites was discussed. Suggestion was to add an updated website requirement to the annual report.

No new business.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.