

# DRIVING DISCOVERY AND INNOVATION WORK GROUP (DDIWG) REPORT

## Executive Summary

As a national public research university, and a member institution of the prestigious Association of American Universities (AAU), the University of Kansas is a community of scholars driven by the need to discover and innovate. Research and creative activity of all kinds is in our DNA. We fulfill that obligation in different ways, to different degrees, across a variety of disciplines. The charge given to the DDIWG underscores this imperative: “Enhance KU scholarship broadly with a special emphasis on areas of present and emerging strength to benefit society.”

The urgency of this charge is reflected in all previous KU strategic planning efforts. It is also reflected in the changing expectations of our stakeholders and the challenges we face in the current economic climate. Indeed, the extent to which KU meets this charge has a direct bearing on the success of other efforts designed to enhance KU’s educational environment, elevate doctoral education, foster community engagement, and promote the retention and graduation of students.

The DDIWG took its charge seriously. In the course of five meetings over a span of three months, its members participated in lively and informed discussions on a wide range of topics. Some of those discussions developed into proposals for strategic initiatives. Others formed the basis for a broader and deeper personal understanding of these issues that will continue far into the future.

The immediate tangible outcome of the DDIWG is a set of nine activities grouped under three strategic actions: Document Excellence with Enhanced Research Accountability, Increase Research Activities and Innovation, and Pursue Strategic Initiatives. The nine recommended activities are:

- Obtain comparative tools for evaluating department rankings nationally on varied measures.
- Initiate a university-wide web-based faculty activity reporting system.
- Establish a formal external review policy for all academic and research units.
- Develop and implement a university-wide post-tenure review policy, and address the need for formalized mentoring of long-term associate professors.
- Institute a formal policy that allows for post-tenure research, teaching, and service reallocations of time.
- Introduce more differential rewards/awards university-wide.
- Recruit faculty at all ranks to enhance the research portfolio of KU.
- Pursue bold strategic initiatives that position KU as a national leader.
- Utilize joint appointments in support of strategic priorities.

The adoption of these recommendations will make a substantive contribution to achieving the DDIWG charge, while enhancing KU’s reputation among the nation’s premier research universities.

## Strategic Action Plan: Narrative and Templates

The charge from the Steering Committee to the DDIWG was: “Enhance KU scholarship broadly with a special emphasis on areas of present and emerging strength to benefit society.” Two types of actions are encompassed in this charge. First, ways to enhance KU scholarship broadly must be identified through, for example, policy changes aimed at enhancing the culture and impact of scholarship throughout the institution. Second, special emphasis must be placed on important areas of present and emerging strengths.

As the overall strategic planning effort moved forward, the second part of this charge evolved into assessing the current strengths and opportunities available at KU in order to develop three to five broad KU strategic initiatives. The vision behind this exercise was that these initiatives would provide KU with national and international visibility as a leader in the selected areas of emphasis. The intention for these initiatives was communicated to the KU community at large by Provost Jeff Vitter in November 2010. Planning for the exact mechanism by which initiatives would be identified and selected continued through the end of December. On January 12, Provost Vitter invited the KU community to submit proposals for strategic initiatives, with a deadline of February 28. The DDIWG was designated to conduct the initial merit review of these proposals. Consequently, this report will focus only on the first part of the DDIWG charge: to “enhance KU scholarship broadly.”

The work of the DDIWG grew out of earlier efforts to strengthen KU scholarship, most directly building on the findings and recommendations of the Chancellor’s Research Engagement Task Force. In the fall of 2009, Chancellor Bernadette Gray-Little charged this task force “1) to identify appropriate measures of research engagement, and 2) to suggest specific approaches to promote, increase, sustain, and recognize all types of research engagement by the faculty.” In March 2010, this task force made three recommendations to Chancellor Gray-Little: 1) to create a comprehensive, university-wide system for measuring research activity by KU faculty that takes into account discipline-specific metrics; 2) to implement actions at the school or college level that promote, increase, and recognize research engagement, including identifying and eliminating barriers and increasing incentives; and 3) to enhance and utilize university resources to achieve and sustain high levels of research engagement, including but not limited to providing pilot research funds, improved infrastructure, graduate and undergraduate research fellowships, and additional university-wide research awards. Implementation of these recommendations commenced in April 2010. Actions to date include:

- The implementation of a university-wide faculty activity reporting system ( under way);
- The development and subsequent submission on August 1, 2010 of annual research activity plans by all academic deans on the Lawrence campus and all academic chairs at KUMC; and
- The initiation of new research awards that recognize the “impact” of early and mid-career faculty, and recognition for faculty who are awarded large research grants.

The recommended strategic actions of the DDIWG encompass these outcomes and build beyond them across three general focus areas: Document Excellence with Enhanced Research Accountability (four recommended activities), Increase Research Activities and Innovation (three recommended activities),

and Pursue Strategic Initiatives (two recommended activities). The premises that form the foundation for the proposed actions and activities include the following:

- KU is fundamentally a RESEARCH university.
- Research is an inclusive concept that encompasses a broad range of scholarly and creative activities.
- The majority of full-time, tenure- line KU faculty are expected to devote 40% of their effort to research, scholarship, and creative activity; 40% to teaching; and 20% to service. (Some departments in specialized schools may have different allocations of research, teaching, and service.)
- KU has many areas of strength in research, but evidence also exists of substantial unevenness in terms of the quality and impact of research, scholarship, and creative activity.
- The ultimate goal of KU scholarship is to benefit society in a wide range of ways.

### **Document Excellence with Enhanced Research Accountability**

Based on our charge and these premises, the DDIWG adopted two strategic activities recommended by the previous Research Engagement Task Force. These are Activity 1: Obtain comparative tools for evaluating department rankings nationally on varied measures, and Activity 2: Initiate a university-wide web-based faculty activity reporting system. Both activities are aimed at enhancing research accountability and both efforts are presently under way. Therefore, this discussion will focus on the rationale and intent for the seven new activity recommendations generated by the DDIWG. These recommendations emerged from the deliberations of the work group in December and January.

#### Activity 3: Establish a formal external review policy for all academic and research units.

All KU designated research centers and many schools and departments are already subject to some type of external review. In some cases these are necessary to maintain disciplinary certification. In other cases they are due to a specific policy already in place in a school or the College. However, KU has no overall policy or standards for such reviews. The goal behind the creation and implementation of a university-wide policy is to assist in elevating the performance of some departments and to provide the context for recognizing and rewarding units that are making substantial progress and maintaining high levels of performance. Acquisition of comparative tools for evaluating disciplines against peers and for measuring research activity will make this process easier to implement on a university-wide basis.

#### Activity 4: Develop and implement a university-wide post-tenure review policy and address the need for formalized mentoring of long-term associate professors.

The achievement of promotion to associate professor with tenure is a significant accomplishment. The majority of KU faculty members who advance to this level continue to generate high-quality scholarship for decades thereafter. However, KU has a substantial number of full-time faculty members who do not achieve promotion to full professor within 10 years of obtaining tenure. Too often, these faculty

members remain at the associate rank the rest of their career, possibly due to lack of mentorship or to being burdened with heavy administrative responsibilities, among other reasons. A large proportion of these individuals continue to make important contributions to the teaching and service mission of the university during this time. However, KU is fundamentally a research university and thus must do everything reasonably possible to support continued active scholarship by all tenure-line faculty members throughout their careers. A well-conceived post-tenure review policy can provide many benefits to faculty members and departments and to the overall impact and success of the university. Many of our peer institutions have adopted post-tenure review policies in recent years. The DDIWG recommends the development and implementation of a university-wide policy that: 1) includes a focus on research, teaching, and service responsibilities; 2) initiates a required promotion review for all tenured associate professors after eight years in rank; and 3) addresses the need for mentoring of post-tenure faculty with the requirement of formalized mentoring for associate professors as needed to support their continued advancement as scholars.

### **Increase Research Activities and Innovation**

Activity 1: Institute a formal policy that allows for post-tenure research, teaching, and service reallocations of time.

The 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service model for a full-time tenure-line KU faculty member is highly appropriate for the majority of faculty at any given time. However, in cases where, for whatever reason, a faculty member no longer maintains an active research program that readily consumes 40% of their full-time obligation as an employee, it may be appropriate to revise the model to reflect this. For example, a faculty member who no longer is active in research might move to an 80-20 teaching-service model. A faculty member serving as a department chair might for that time period have a reduced teaching commitment in recognition of their administrative role, and perhaps a reduced research role as well. A faculty member with three externally funded research grants might have an expanded research commitment and a reduced teaching commitment. Such modifications are already in use informally throughout the university. Implementing a formal policy to address these variations will ensure that all full-time KU faculty members contribute to the overall mission of the university in ways that allow for changes in interests and productivity throughout a lengthy academic career.

Activity 2: Introduce more differential rewards/awards university-wide.

This recommendation carries forward from the Research Engagement Task Force Report. It recognizes that outstanding scholarship and creative activity is the distinguishing characteristic (along with outstanding doctoral education) of any great research university. Thus, if we value it this highly, we should recognize it appropriately and frequently throughout the university (much as we recognize outstanding teaching broadly on an annual basis with the Kemper Awards).

### Activity 3: Recruit faculty at all ranks to enhance the research portfolio of KU.

When DDIWG members voted prioritization scores for all proposed strategic actions, this action received the highest priority score. This reflects the recognition that the more we can recruit proven teachers and scholars the less risk we take and the more we can be assured of achieving our fundamental mission as a research university. The importance of targeted recruitment is underscored by the highly competitive environment research universities inhabit, both nationally and increasingly on a global scale. This also emphasizes the importance of increasing the number and breadth of endowed professorships at KU.

## **Pursue Strategic Initiatives**

### Activity 1: Pursue bold strategic initiatives that position KU as a national leader.

The 2011 strategic initiatives RFP process resulted in the submission of 104 proposals. Considerable effort went into the development of these proposals, and a new, virtual, campuswide network of transdisciplinary relationships was just one of the positive outcomes. All of the 104 proposals have merit, but not all of them will advance in some form to the next level of the KU strategic planning process. Nonetheless, it is important that KU build upon this effort and, where appropriate, channel it in ways that lead to external grants, private funding, new academic programs, and other creative pursuits. This would make the proposals a seedbed for further scholarly work, based upon the original proposals or using them as the catalyst for entirely different projects. The RFP process empowered faculty to concentrate on abundance rather than scarcity; to think of grand challenges and how existing or attainable resources could be used to address them. That spirit of intellectual engagement and adventure must be encouraged and rewarded in an intentional and ongoing way. It mustn't lapse.

### Activity 2: Utilize joint appointments in support of strategic priorities.

KU currently employs joint appointments between departments to a very limited extent. Furthermore, the formal appointment process is cumbersome and problematic in numerous ways. These structural impediments fly in the face of the increasingly multidisciplinary world of innovation and knowledge generation, and serves to reinforce academic silos in ways that potentially limit the relevance and importance of both our teaching and research missions. We recommend that a university-wide policy for joint appointments be developed that does the following: 1) encourages joint appointments; 2) eliminates salary barriers to appointments between departments, between departments and research centers, and between schools; 3) provides guidelines for appropriate division of teaching and service duties; and 4) provides specific guidelines for merit increases and promotion of faculty and research scientists with joint appointments.

## DDIWG Strategic Action: Document Excellence with Enhanced Research Accountability

**Strategic Action:** Document Excellence with Enhanced Research Accountability

**Why (optional):** There is no single hallmark indicator for research accountability in this multifaceted era of complex global challenges. For KU to be competitive both nationally and internationally it is imperative that we assess the expertise of multiple disciplines encompassed by our talented faculty. We must do this systematically, thoroughly, and regularly using multiple indicators. In this way KU can identify the best roadmap to plan for future scholarship, using an expansive view that bridges emerging areas of science, technology, the humanities and social sciences, and the arts, and which leverages creativity to a higher degree.

**Working Group:** DDI

**List of Units Responsible/Involved:** Office of Research and Graduate Studies, Office of the Provost, Office of Institutional Research and Planning, all academic deans

**List of Stakeholders Affected:** All faculty members and doctoral students; all associate professors

**Comments of Urgent Issues:** It is important that KU standardize existing piecemeal policies on post-tenure review and external review, in order to ensure equity and eliminate uncertainty about the application of these policies university-wide. It is also important that KU engage a larger proportion of its faculty in scholarly endeavors of all kinds.

Key Activities and Timeline						
Provide broad summaries of the key activities for this strategic action.						
	Contact	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Activity 1:  Obtain comparative tools for evaluating department rankings nationally on varied measures.	OIRP	Implement Academic Analytics and begin baseline studies of KU departments.	Evaluate Academic Analytic data for each department annually and begin reporting this data as part of the Chancellor's annual research activity report.	Use Academic Analytics to help drive department/school level research activity goals and to evaluate long-term impact of these efforts.	Use Academic Analytics to help drive department/school level research activity goals and to evaluate long-term impact of these efforts.	Use Academic Analytics to help drive department/school level research activity goals and to evaluate long-term impact of these efforts.

<p><b>Activity 2:</b></p> <p>Initiate a university-wide web-based faculty activity reporting system.</p>		<p>Contract with an external vendor to establish the system and implement, starting with the School of Music.</p>	<p>Implement the system throughout the entire university and begin using for annual reviews, tenure and promotion, and analyses of individual and department-level research activity. Use as a tool in combination with Academic Analytics to set individual department and school goals.</p>	<p>Employ system to monitor efforts to enhance research activity.</p>	<p>Employ system to monitor efforts to enhance research activity.</p>	<p>Employ system to monitor efforts to enhance research activity.</p>
<p><b>Activity 3:</b></p> <p>Establish a formal external review policy for all academic and research units.</p>	<p>Provost's Office</p>	<p>Review present systems in use by Deans; Create guidelines and measures for a university-wide system in collaboration with Deans and faculty.</p>	<p>Implement university-wide system.</p>	<p>Implement university-wide system.</p>	<p>Implement university-wide system.</p>	<p>Implement university-wide system.</p>
<p><b>Activity 4:</b></p> <p>Develop and implement a university-wide post-tenure review policy and address the need for formalized mentoring of long-term associate professors.</p>	<p>Provost's Office</p>	<p>Appoint a university committee to develop a university-wide post-tenure review policy.</p>	<p>Implement the policy, requiring mandatory review after eight years as an associate professor. Initiate mandatory mentoring by senior faculty members if promotion does not occur.</p>	<p>Institute follow-up reviews of associate professors at to-be-determined time intervals. Institute similar mandatory reviews at to-be-determined time intervals for full professors.</p>	<p>Refine and continue to implement the policy.</p>	<p>Refine and continue to implement the policy.</p>

**Relevant Outcomes:**

▪ Outcome #1:	Data-focused planning and accountability for discovery and innovation.
Metric 1-a:	Increased per capita submissions of scholarly manuscripts and other forms scholarly endeavor
Metric 1-b:	Increased per capita participation in external grant and fellowship applications
Metric 1-c:	Enhanced “evenness” in scholarly participation measures within departments
▪ Outcome #2	Increasingly transdisciplinary, synergistic, and collaborative scholarship
Metric 1-a:	Increased publication in high impact journals
Metric 1-b:	Increased per capita/normed citation rates
Metric 1-c:	Increased per capita/normed external funding
▪ Outcome #3:	An enhanced identity as an international research university
Metric 1-a:	Increased prestigious “awards” and memberships (e.g., national academies)
Metric 1-b:	Increase standing of departments relative to selected peers
Metric 1-c:	Increased proportion of associate professors achieving promotion to full within 10 years of initial promotion and tenure

## DDIWG Strategic Action: Increase Research Activities and Innovation

**Strategic Action:** Increase Research Activities and Innovation

**Why (optional):** For KU to be competitive both nationally and internationally it is imperative to take specific actions to promote, increase, sustain, and recognize research activity by its faculty and students. This can only be accomplished by encouraging an expansive view of scholarship, collaboration, and risk-taking by removing barriers and facilitating the exploration of new, creative ideas that address the major issues of today's society.

**Working Group:** DDI

**List of Units Responsible/Involved:** Office of Research and Graduate Studies, Office of the Provost, Office of the Chancellor, all academic Deans

**List of Stakeholders Affected:** All faculty and students

**Comments of Urgent Issues:** Rigid notions about the appropriate mix of teaching, research, and service, or the hiring of new faculty at the lowest rank only, are no longer adequate. KU needs greater flexibility in this regard, and must implement ways to prompt and honor behavior that leads to discovery and innovation.

Key Activities and Timeline						
Provide broad summaries of the key activities for this strategic action.						
	Contact	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
<b>Activity 1:</b>  Institute a formal policy that allows for post-tenure research, teaching and service reallocations of time.	Provost's Office, <i>ad hoc</i> committee appointed by Provost to include members from Faculty Senate and administration	Survey departments to obtain baseline data on currently allowed policies, including deviations from 40:40:20 research, teaching and service policy.	Create a comprehensive university-wide policy for more flexible allocation of time post tenure.	Implement and monitor the impact of the policy.	Implement and monitor the impact of the policy.	Implement and monitor the impact of the policy.
<b>Activity 2:</b>  Introduce more differential rewards/awards university-wide.	Chancellor's Office; Provost's Office; Deans; RGS; KU Endowment	Institute award/reward program. Continue to award Leading Light, new faculty Impact awards, et al.	Add research incentives, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Research Enhancement Rewards:</b> return a percentage of state salary</li> </ul>	Continue these programs and seek additional opportunities for special recognition.	Continue these programs and seek additional opportunities for special recognition.	Continue these programs and seek additional opportunities for special recognition.

			<p>released back to faculty receiving a grant that provides 25% of their academic year salary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Research Leaves for Associate Professors:</b> create a policy that provides for a one-semester leave or a period of reduced teaching for faculty at the associate professor level at some time during the first five years after promotion.</li> <li>• <b>Multidisciplinary Research Award:</b> provide an award to a group of faculty recognizing multidisciplinary research initiatives that receive external funding</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Activity 3:</b></p> <p>Recruit faculty at all ranks to enhance the research portfolio of KU.</p>	<p>Provost's Office, Deans, RGS</p>	<p>Charge Deans, in consultation with the Provost, to plan a new policy for distribution of a percentage of the university resources both to the Provost and to the Deans to be used to build core strengths.</p>	<p>Identify core research strengths and uniqueness within KU and map a five-year plan for faculty hires and other allocation of resources.</p>	<p>Implement plan and a yearly assessment of the plan with attention to path changes based on new opportunities.</p>	<p>Implement plan and a yearly assessment of the plan with attention to path changes based on new opportunities.</p>	<p>Implement plan and a yearly assessment of the plan with attention to path changes based on new opportunities.</p>

**Relevant Outcomes:**

▪ Outcome #1:	Wider dissemination of knowledge and visibility
Metric 1-a:	Higher quality product in research, teaching and service areas by shifting workload responsibilities according to faculty strengths.
Metric 1-b:	Increased awareness by community of role research plays at KU
Metric 1-c:	Increased per capita submissions of scholarly manuscripts and other forms scholarly endeavor
▪ Outcome #2	Increasingly transdisciplinary, synergistic, and collaborative scholarship
Metric 1-a:	Increased per capita participation in external grant and fellowship applications
Metric 1-b:	Impact of Multidisciplinary Research Award and Leading Light Award on scholarship
Metric 1-c:	Extent to which 40:40:20 modifications increase scholarly activity
▪ Outcome #3:	An enhanced identity as an international research university
Metric 1-a:	Innovation, strategic risk-taking, and long-term thinking
Metric 1-b:	Increased publication in high impact journals
Metric 1-c:	Increased per capita/normed citation rates
Metric 1-d:	Increased per capita/normed external funding
Metric 1-e:	Increased prestigious “awards” and memberships (e.g. national academies)
Metric 1-f:	Increase standing of departments relative to selected peers
Metric 1-g:	Increased proportion of associate professors achieving promotion to full professor within 10 years of initial promotion and tenure

## DDIWG Strategic Action: Pursue Strategic Initiatives

**Strategic Action:** Pursue Strategic Initiatives

**Why (optional):** The 2011 strategic initiatives process resulted in 104 proposals. KU should capture this effort and channel it toward external grants, private funding, new academic programs, and other creative pursuits. The RFP process empowered faculty to think in terms of grand challenges and how existing or attainable resources could be used to address them. That spirit of intellectual engagement and adventure must be encouraged and rewarded.

**Working Group:** DDI

**List of Units Responsible/Involved:** Office of Research and Graduate Studies, Office of the Provost, Office of Institutional Research and Planning, all academic deans, center directors

**List of Stakeholders Affected:** All KU faculty

**Comments of Urgent Issues:** The RFP process offers a template of what's possible when KU faculty feel emboldened to raise their sights, form multidisciplinary teams, and seek resources. Considerable effort went into the development of these proposals. KU has the opportunity now to harness that momentum and use it productively.

Key Activities and Timeline						
Provide broad summaries of the key activities for this strategic action.						
	Contact	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Activity 1:  Pursue bold strategic initiatives that position KU as a national leader.	Provost's Office, Deans, RGS, KU Endowment	Establish a fair mechanism for reallocating existing base resources into a segregated KU fund administered centrally. Seek private gifts to match this amount 1 to 1. Develop an RFP process that invites faculty and others to submit ideas for new strategic hires, new academic programs and centers, or infrastructure.	Announce the open-ended RFP with a three-month deadline. Detailed proposals must address an important problem, be interdisciplinary, be sustainable, be future-oriented, and involve an element of academic "risk." Evaluate the proposals on a competitive basis and use the segregated fund to launch 3-5 bold new initiatives.	Evaluate the process and the outcomes. Reiterate the "bottom-up" approach. Emphasize niche areas of excellence, vs. filling gaps in the curriculum. Repeat the first-year RFP process and launch an additional 3-5 bold new initiatives.	Evaluate the process and the outcomes. Repeat the first-year RFP process and launch an additional 3-5 bold new initiatives. In addition, seek proposals for new, three-person cluster hires in areas of emerging strength. Fund one cluster, composed of faculty at the associate professor rank or higher.	Evaluate the process and the outcomes. Repeat the first-year RFP process and launch an additional 3-5 bold new initiatives. In addition, fund one additional three-person cluster hire in an area of emerging strength.

<p><b>Activity 2:</b></p> <p>Utilize joint appointments in support of strategic priorities.</p>	<p>Provost's Office, Deans, Department Chairs</p>	<p>Identify existing policies and practices that encourage or inhibit successful joint appointments, e.g., salaries, annual evaluations, etc. Identify opportunities where an increased level of joint appointments will advance the areas of highest strategic priority.</p>	<p>Formulate and implement policies that encourage successful joint appointments, especially the appropriate division of teaching and service duties, and guidelines for merit increases and promotion of faculty and research scientists.</p>	<p>Monitor the success of this initiative, both quantitatively and qualitatively.</p>	<p>Monitor the success of this initiative, both quantitatively and qualitatively.</p>	<p>Monitor the success of this initiative, both quantitatively and qualitatively.</p>
---	---	---	--	---	---	---

**Relevant Outcomes:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Outcome #1:</li> </ul>	<p>Innovation, Strategic Risk-Taking, and Long-Term Thinking</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Metric 1-a:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Increased level of funding from all sources targeted at highest strategic priorities</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Metric 1-b:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Increased number of higher quality degree programs resulting from mergers</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Metric 1-c:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Increased numbers of joint appointments in areas of highest strategic priority</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Outcome #2</li> </ul>	<p>Increasingly transdisciplinary, synergistic, and collaborative scholarship</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Metric 1-a:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Increased numbers of joint appointments</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Metric 1-b:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Increased level of research funding involving Lawrence, KUMC campuses</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Metric 1-c:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Increased number of higher quality degree programs resulting from mergers</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Outcome #3:</li> </ul>	<p>An Enhanced Identity as an International Research University</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Metric 1-a:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Increased level of funding from all sources targeted at highest strategic priorities</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Metric 1-b:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Increased number of higher quality degree programs resulting from mergers</p>

## Driving Discovery and Innovation: Descriptive Background

The DDIWG met as a whole on November 8 and 20, December 4, and January 18 and 22. The minutes of these five meetings provide a thorough depiction of the lively deliberative process that resulted in development of the DDIWG strategic actions and activities found elsewhere in this report.

The following individuals were invited to serve as members of the DDIWG:

- |                                   |                       |                          |                         |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Steve Warren, co-chair         | 8. John Colombo       | 17. Kris Krishtalka      | 25. Christian Schöneich |
| 2. Kristin Bowman-James, co-chair | 9. Tom Cravens        | 18. Stacy Leeds          | 26. Kevin Song          |
| 3. Kevin Boatright, staff         | 10. Adam Duerfeldt    | 19. Greg Loving          | 27. Paulette Spencer    |
| 4. Shrikant Anant                 | 11. Dietrich Earnhart | 20. Deb Ludwig           | 28. Paul Terranova      |
| 5. Chris Brown                    | 12. Rob Fiorentino    | 21. Steven Maynard-Moody | 29. Lorie Vanchena      |
| 6. Bethany Christiansen           | 13. Steve Goddard     | 22. Tom McDonald         | 30. Bob Walzel          |
| 7. Mark Cohen                     | 14. Susan Harris      | 23. Berl Oakley          | 31. Doug Wright         |
|                                   | 15. Hartmut Jaeschke  | 24. Robert Rohrschneider | 32. John Younger        |

Early on, or during the course of the project, Brown, Cohen, Duerfeldt, Earnhart and Wright were excused or declined to participate. Cravens, Goddard and Rohrschneider were added to the group following the initial meeting.

Originally, graduate education was potentially a subject for discussion by the DDIWG. Soon after the start of the process, it was decided that a separate work group on that topic was warranted. While the January 22 DDIWG meeting was devoted to doctoral education in the context of KU's research mission, the intent was primarily to provide useful feedback to Sara Rosen, dean of graduate studies, for the benefit of the Elevating Doctoral Education work group that she chaired.

Most of the DDIWG meetings involved PowerPoint presentations, small-group breakouts and reports, and occasional homework. Attendance was consistently excellent, as was the level of lively intellectual engagement by members in all of the discussions. Three of the meetings took place on Saturday mornings and were well-attended, another indication of member involvement.

The final set of DDIWG strategic actions reflects a ranking process that occurred during the first week of the spring semester. The intent of the ballot was to establish which of the proposals had the greatest support and were seen as high priorities for KU to pursue. It was also an opportunity for a proposal to be eliminated. This process was instrumental in guiding the subsequent development of the final strategic actions and activities.

The DDIWG's official charge essentially ended following the January 22 meeting. However, it was subsequently decided to utilize DDIWG members as the merit review panelists for the strategic initiatives process. Ultimately, 21 DDIWG members participated as reviewers, panel chairs, or staff. They were joined by another 18 individuals from other work groups as reviewers and panel chairs. This review process started March 10 and concluded on April 9. Again, the willingness of DDIWG members to extend their original commitment in this way was exemplary.