Driving Discovery and Innovation Work Group  
Simons Research Laboratories Auditorium  
Saturday, November 20, 2010, 8:30-11 a.m.

Attendance
Steve Warren and Kristin Bowman-James, co-chairs; Kevin Boatright, staff; Bethany Christiansen, John Colombo, Tom Cravens, Adam Duerfeldt, Rob Fiorentino, Steve Goddard, Hartmut Jaeschke, Kris Krishtalka, Greg Loving, Deb Ludwig, Steven Maynard-Moody, Tom McDonald, Berl Oakley, Kevin Song, Paulette Spencer, Robert Rohrschneider, Paul Terranova, Lorie Vanchena and John Younger.

Agenda
The group reviewed some of the underlying premises of the strategic planning initiative as it concerns discovery and innovation. The necessity of developing “themes” was introduced. A presentation was made: “Perspectives on KU as a Research University.” An hour was devoted to two small-group discussions and reports.

Data Considered in Discussions
The presentation touched on selected key issues and the data behind each of them: measures of scholarship; research funding; publications and citations; permanent associate professors; other Indicators; and potential strategies for enhancing KU scholarship broadly.

Outcomes of Discussion
- Warren reviewed the instructions for generating and evaluating overarching themes. Examples of themes were discussed.
- Discussion of the presentation centered on associate professors and mandatory post-tenure review.
- Breakout groups were asked to discuss three questions: “What policies or strategies can and should be employed to enhance KU scholarship broadly?,” “What recommendations should we consider making to the steering committee?,” and “How can we build support among faculty, students, and other stakeholders for whatever changes are proposed?”
- The breakout groups reported a variety of suggestions centered on the first question, including: opportunities for mentoring all researchers in all aspects of scholarship; revising tenure to focus on probability of future research productivity; recruitment of faculty and students; joint appointments; measures of success; pro-active differential rewards; flexible terms of appointment; the relationship of graduate training to faculty research productivity; the administrative burden on grant-active researchers; transparency in allocation of indirect cost reimbursements (F&A); policies related to sharing between the Lawrence and Medical Center campuses; balancing of teaching loads.

Next Steps
The group’s next meeting is December 4. The agenda will continue the conversation, focusing on the breakout session take-home points and going on to the other two assignment questions. The group will also begin the discussion of themes. Some proposals will have already been received and these will be circulated in advance in order to assist the process. The subsequent meeting of the Work Group is scheduled for December 11 and will include a discussion of doctoral education.

Supporting Documents or Links
None