

Minutes of the  
NIU Board of Trustees  
**ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, STUDENT AFFAIRS  
AND PERSONNEL COMMITTEE**  
November 12, 2009

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order by Chair John Butler at 8:35 a.m. in the Board of Trustees Room, 315 Altgeld Hall. Recording Secretary Sharon Banks-Wilkins conducted a roll call of Trustees. Members present were Trustees Robert Boey, Cherilyn Murer, Barbara Giorgi Vella, Student Trustee Matthew Venaas, Committee Chair John Butler and BOT Chair Marc Strauss. Not present was Trustee Myron Siegel. Also present were Committee Liaison Provost Raymond Alden, III and Board Parliamentarian Kenneth Davidson. With a quorum present, the meeting proceeded.

**VERIFICATION OF APPROPRIATE NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING**

Confirmation of Open Meetings Act public notice compliance was provided by Board Parliamentarian Ken Davidson.

**MEETING AGENDA APPROVAL**

Trustee Murer made a motion to approve the meeting agenda as amended. Trustee Boey seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

**REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chair Butler asked that a correction be made to a statement attributed to him in the minutes of the August 27 meeting. It says that I am more comfortable when there is an absence of tough questions, disagreements and active sorting out of misunderstandings, he said. It should read, "I tend to be more comfortable when discussions involve tough questions, disagreement, and the active sorting out of misunderstandings, than when there is an absence of these behaviors." It was moved by Trustee Vella and seconded by Student Trustee Venaas to approve the minutes of the August 27, 2009 Board Meeting as amended. The motion was approved.

**CHAIR'S COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

On today's agenda under University Reports, the Chair said, we have one action item and four information items. Our action item is a request for endorsement of the decision to grant tenure for two administrative appointments in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Information items include an outline on the university's attainment of the Carnegie Foundation Classification on Engagement, an overview of the Office of Sponsored Projects, an overview of Technology Transfer Office services, and an update on Phase II of the Strategic Plan

Chair Butler recognized University Advisory Committee representative Ferald Bryan. Professor Bryan stated that the other UAC representative to this committee, Professor Stephen, was unable to attend. But I am here to observe and eventually prepare a report, Dr. Bryan said, and certainly I will ask questions if I have any.

In my capacity as chair of this committee, Chair Butler said, it is a distinct pleasure to receive Professor Bryan's comments. Some of you know that Dr. Bryan is both a former professor of mine, was a member of my master's degree committee and is a former colleague.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

The Chair asked Board Parliamentarian Kenneth Davidson if any members of the public had registered a written request to address the Board in accordance with state law and Board of Trustees Bylaws. Mr. Davidson noted that no timely requests had been received to address this meeting.

**UNIVERSITY REPORTS**

**Agenda Item 7.a. – Appointments with Rank and Tenure**

The Board may remember that often we appoint administrative hires either with rank and tenure as part of the initial offer, Provost Alden said, or with a rank offered and a short track to tenure after an initial trial period. Today, we have one of each of those situations. Dr. Barrie Bode has been appointed as the new Chair of Biological Sciences. He is coming to us from St. Louis University. Dr. Bode received his Ph.D. in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology from the University of Florida, and did postdoctoral work at the Health Sciences Division of Monsanto. His first faculty position was at Massachusetts General and Harvard Medical School, a distinguished career. The Provost recognized Dr. Bode. Our second appointee is Dr. James Collins. He has been appointed to serve as the Director for the Center of Southeast Asian Studies, which you all know is a very distinguished center that has long been supported by excellence grants from the Department of Education and Department of State. Dr. Collins received both his Ph.D. and his master’s degree from the University of Chicago. He served in a similar position at the University of Hawaii and actually has worked in the Southeast Asia area for a number of years. The Provost recognized Dr. Collins. The university requests that the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee endorse the decision to grant tenure to these individuals, both of whom are being appointed at the rank of full professor. Chair Butler asked for a motion to approve the appointment of Dr. Barrie Bode as Chair of Biological Sciences with the rank of full professor and the appointment of Dr. James Collins as Director for the Center of Southeast Asian Studies with the rank of full professor. Trustee Strauss so moved, seconded by Trustee Murer. A roll call vote of the Trustees was as follows:

Trustee Boey	Yes	Trustee Murer	Yes
Trustee Vella	Yes	Student Trustee Venaas	Abstain
Chair Butler	Yes	BOT Chair Strauss	Yes

The motion was approved.

**Agenda Item 7.b. – Carnegie Foundation Classification on Engagement**

This particular presentation was postponed because of time issues during the last two meetings, the Provost said, so we asked Dr. Kaplan, Vice President for Administration and Outreach, to give her presentation first at this meeting.

Let me begin by saying this is supposed to be a presentation on the initiatives that supported our application for the Carnegie elective classification as an engaged institution, Dr. Kaplan said. We worked on that application a year ago last summer, applied for the Carnegie classification in fall, and we got it in December. The application is rather lengthy and is on line for anybody who wants to read it. I thought it might be more useful to concentrate a little bit on engagement as a new way of thinking about university functions, how this thinking applies at NIU, and why understanding and supporting it and claiming it is particularly important at an institution like this.

The starting point for our discussion is the Carnegie Foundation’s inclusion of us on the list of engaged institutions around the country. There are now 195 institutions with that classification. Engagement as the Carnegie Foundation describes it is a collaboration between higher education institutions and their larger communities how ever the institution defines that community. For an urban institution, it would be a city; for a regional institution, a region; for a statewide institution, the state or perhaps even more. But the key concepts in any conversation about engagement are collaboration, mutual benefits, partnerships and reciprocity. The key goals in any kind of engagement activity are really opportunities for increased learning on both sides for all parties and improvements in the region served by the institution and in the institution itself.

The history of this conversation in higher education goes back about 15 years. It started with a partnership between the Kellogg Commission and NASULGC, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, now called APLU, Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities. The Kellogg Commission and NASULGC about 15 years ago came to the conclusion that the historic land-grant mission, which was heavily focused on agriculture probably did not apply as well as they would wish in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century or at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century simply because agriculture is a decreasing portion of American industry and business, and land-grant institutions do many things having to do with more than farms. So there was a rethinking of the land-grant mission, particularly in the context of all of the general attacks on higher education, the concern about the value of higher education in society. The result of that partnership was a series of monographs called "Returning to Our Roots." A third of those monographs was called "The Engaged Institution." That concept was picked up by the ASCU (Association of State Colleges and Universities) institutions. The ASCU institutions are most of the regional publics around the country. NIU has belonged to both NASULGC and ASCU for many years, but any concept that depends heavily on regional impact was of great interest to the regional institutions. In their terminology, they talked about stewards of place. They have tried to put together a guide for university faculty on how best to respond to the regions that they are supposed to be serving. The Carnegie group has been led very much by Arizona State, Michigan State, Penn State and Virginia Tech. It now includes a number of Mid-American Conference institutions as well. We now have moved into what I would call the second stage of the engagement conversation. So we have these national higher education associations trying to refine their thinking about engagement. APLU has a Council on Engagement and Outreach, which is working on a toolkit for what they call transformative regional engagement. They also have a Commission on Innovation Competitiveness and Economic Prosperity. That group has been working on metrics. Our institution participated a few weeks ago in a pilot assessment tool, and APLU has received NSF funding for a January workshop, also on metrics related to engagement. You can tell something has become important in higher education once they start counting it, and we are now moving into the counting phase. Those of you who have been around higher education for a long time understand that typically universities think of three major functions: teaching, research and public service. Engagement is not exactly a substitute for public service, although some people have thought that. Instead, the engagement discussion has tried to work toward a more holistic approach to university work in which interaction with external partners is integrated with the research and teaching missions of the people involved and brought back into some kind of impact on the curriculum.

This is not a new concept at NIU. We have not really talked about it in these terms, but there is a lot of engagement throughout the university's strategic plan. There is a lot of conversation in the strategic plan about partnerships, alliances and external impact. One of the major strategic planning initiatives has to do with strengthening and extending NIU's regional and global impact. And there is a lot of conversation in the strategic plan, and was throughout the strategic planning process, on the need to make significant investments in regional impact, some of those being outreach like expanding the university's off-campus credit programs and some of them being engagement, like completing NIUNet. You can reasonably ask what the difference is between outreach and engagement. Engagement requires a context of reciprocity, shared needs, mutual benefits for all parties involved. Whereas, outreach is simply an extension of university resources off the campus, not necessarily in pursuit of mutual benefits. All engagement, I think it is fair to say, is outreach, but not all outreach is necessarily engagement.

Listed here are a number of projects, most of which we described in the engagement application. These are pretty clear illustrations of the engagement concept. I will run through them quickly simply to remind you of the ways in which they count as an engagement. We launched the Center for P-20 engagement, which has to do with partnerships, with educational agencies around the state and schools in the region. Our first partnership school at Malta is an integration of the fine arts and technology across all subject areas. The benefits there have been clearly mutual. Student performance has risen. NIU students benefit from their emersion in an innovative school environment. We are doing the same thing with the new DeKalb High School. We have about 60 faculty and high school teachers engaged on five planning committees. The focus there is going to be on raising student achievement until 80 percent of the juniors meet state standards compared to the current 52 percent. The most recent engagement kind of project that the university has announced is probably the Community Cares Clinic. That is a partnership with the Kish Health System, National Bank and Trust, a number of major donors and Sycamore physicians, all of whom worked together for a couple of years to address the need for affordable medical care for uninsured or indigent patients in DeKalb. At the same time, this provides a clinical site for our faculty and

a training site for our students. So, again, you see the sort of shared problem, mutual benefits, the context of reciprocity, the perfect engagement project. NIUNet, which you have been hearing about for two or three years, exists because of partnerships with municipalities throughout the region. They have worked with us in order to lay fiber and, as a result, the towns that have been involved and that are on NIUNet have access to high-speed broadband communication at much better prices than they otherwise would, and our remote sites are connected to the campus. The same approach will be used with Illinois Rural HealthNet. In this case, we will be partnering not just with communities, but with healthcare facilities in those communities. The end result will be about 85 rural health providers who will have access to new technologies, specialists and professional development opportunities. And, again, NIU students who are preparing for careers in the health professions will have access to clinical experiences in telemedicine.

You are all aware of our most recent partnership with Harper College. The university has similar partnerships with eight to ten other community colleges in the region. Each of those partnerships involves faculty from both Northern and the community college working together to figure out how best to meet the needs of place-bound students. Each of those partnerships tells the university a little bit more about the workforce and economic development needs of our region, and then each of them builds relationships which we can use in other kinds of partnerships for other kinds of things. This has been the basis for what we now call the PASCAL process in which we are looking at NIU's relationships with two-year institutions in the region in the context of a comparison of the ways in which two- and four-year institutions and other regions around the world work together for the economic and workforce development of the regions they serve. Many of the other regions we are working with are in the European Union. The European Union is increasingly emphasizing publicly funded higher education, and the European Union Treaty, which will be ratified in January, explicitly calls for national investment in engagement activities. The European nations are looking to the U.S. as a model for the whole engagement concept, which is kind of ironic, because in the U.S. the people who are involved in the engagement concept are working hard to convince their institutions that this is a good thing to be doing.

Finally, we have some notable engagement activities in Rockford. One is the ROCK program, which teams engineering faculty with commercial component fabricators in the Rockford area to find creative uses for advanced manufacturing technologies. On the not-for-profit side, faculty and staff in Outreach, ITS, Health and Human Sciences, and the College of Business have worked for a couple of years with the City of Rockford, Winnebago County, the Rock River Valley United Way and Rockford Social Service Agencies to develop software packages that allow multiple service providers to participate in community case management for homeless persons.

Where are we as an institution? The Carnegie Foundation Engagement designation comes in two parts – one for partnerships and the other for curricular engagement. Although we applied for both designations, the designation we received was only in partnerships. We have to go back to the Carnegie Foundation to get the curricular engagement part of the designation. We have been working over the last year on some of the issues that relate to engaged learning. This week there was an article in *U.S.A. Today* on engaged learning and on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). NIU students participated in the 2009 engagement survey, and the results are on the NSSE website. Let me give you a sample of the ways in which NIU students are already involved in engaged learning. I am not going to talk about each of these, but I want you to know that we are out there, on the case. So, why is that important? All of the evidence we have suggests that opportunities for engagement on the part of students improves retention. It helps students figure out what they want to do, what they do best. It provides them with opportunities to experience post-university life. As an institution, over the last year or so to further the engagement concept on campus, we sent two of our deans, Bradley Bond and Lemuel Watson, to the National Engagement Academy at Virginia Tech. We launched in a very visible way, the P-20 Center for Engagement. We have made highly visible the appointment of Assistant Vice President Rena Cotsones in Rockford with a specific assignment related to engagement. We are, almost universitywide, working on a central database to collect, monitor and provide access to engagement activities. We just participated in the APLU assessment tool pilot and will be reapplying for the Carnegie classification in engaged learning. The overriding question here is why bother, why promote engagement, why talk this way? It is fair to say that engagement opportunities are appealing to students – they get them involved, they keep them involved. At the university level, engagement activities make a very strong case for the university's

claim for public support. At NIU, our potential as an engaged institution just because of where we are and how we have been behaving over the last 10 or 20 years is just about unlimited.

A few weeks ago, Dr. Erman presented a slide that showed our ranking on R&D expenditures in science and engineering. When someone asked what it would take for us to move up in that ranking, Dr. Erman said that a medical school would help because you have to have a way to get a lot of money in the sciences and spend it. If you ask the same question about what it would take for NIU to achieve national prominence as an engaged institution, it is a lot easier answer. It would take an expansion of what NIU does best. It would take promotion of what we are already doing. It would take continued leadership in national organizations. But those are not high-cost requirements, and we are very nearly there.

In reply to a query from Trustee Murer regarding the amount of funding received from the Carnegie Institute, Dr. Kaplan stated that the Carnegie Institute does not do funding.

When you talked about PASCAL, Trustee Murer said, you referenced two- and four-year comparison, two- and four-year institutions; but in Europe, so many of the programs, especially the accelerated programs, are three-year programs. What have you done in terms of that disparity? Within the framework of the PASCAL comparison, Dr. Kaplan said, the interest would be in how what they would call upper-level institutions are working with what we would call community colleges. This is really at the essence of the future, Trustee Murer said, and we need to do as much as we possibly can to enhance this type of program. The future of education is going to be in its globalization.

One point we do make and have made for many years here and made again in the strategic planning process this year, Dr. Kaplan said, is that being regional in this region also means being global because the region is one of the world's really great global areas.

Being a resident of this area, Trustee Boey said, I am constantly engaging in community discussions about what NIU does or does not do for the community. It seems that the social clubs like the Lions Club selling peanuts at cross-sections get more attention than we do. I know the things we are doing here, but they are so separated in time. For instance, we have P-20, the clinical partnership, and six months or two years later, we do something else. He asked if there is a way we can take all the good things we have done in the last five years and put them together in a pamphlet so the community can be more aware of our contributions to the community.

That is a challenge for all universities, Dr. Kaplan said. Telling your story is a critical part of getting people to believe it and act on it, and telling your story takes time and it takes resources. Very often, the people who are actually doing the work are too busy to bother to tell about it, and the people who are not doing the work are too busy to read about it. So, the communications aspect of this and any other university function is a real challenge. But, as you know, the university is in the process of reorganizing its communication efforts. To get the word out to the community is the challenge, Ms. Buettner said. I took notes on that because it is part of what we are trying to do over the next few months as we begin to rethink our organizational structure and our messaging.

In reply to a question from Trustee Vella, Dr. Kaplan stated that the partnership aspect of this venture varies project by project. We have several government projects behind NIUNet and Rural HealthNet at the municipal level. Rep. Pritchard was involved in the Community Cares project. We try to keep our government officials advised of everything we do in their district.

This is not how we approach every outreach project, Dr. Kaplan said. It is how we approach engagement projects, but it is not all outreach. Outreach is a division within the university. But many of these projects involve other colleges and departments. In the same way that research covers all of the university, so can engagement. When you ask what the Trustees can do, first and foremost is understanding the concept because it is a kind of new way of thinking about the university functions, and I hear in the way the Trustees talk that you understand the university's role in the region and the importance of taking advantage of the region we are in.

### **Agenda Item 7.c. – The Office of Sponsored Projects**

At our previous meeting, Dr. Alden said, the Chair inquired about some of the services provided to researchers as a follow-up to a research report presented by Dr. Erman. Dr. David Stone, Director of the Office of Sponsored Projects, will be presenting a brief presentation, and Dr. James Erman will present a brief presentation on the Technology Transfer Office

I want to give you two points so you have a feel for the role of the people who work in Sponsored Projects, Dr. Stone said. One is that Sponsored Projects demands acute attention to detail. If we make one mistake, a proposal can be rejected out of hand by the NSF or the NIH or any other fund. Attention to detail is absolutely critical. We literally cannot make one mistake or somebody's months long work comes back unreviewed. The other thing is we work under tremendous time pressure. Everything in the Office of Sponsored Projects has a deadline. Federal funders, even private foundations, if you are, literally, a minute late with a grant, it is rejected. We had the case two months ago of a \$4 million grant that was worked on by three deans and their staffs. The time stamp on that submission that was due in at 6:00 p.m. on a Friday was 5:59:56. If we had been four and a half seconds later, it would not have gone in, and that is every day in our office. It is a very demanding environment. But I have to say that our staff absolutely excels at it. They manage these competing demands of accuracy and timeliness in a tremendous way.

The mission of the Office of Sponsored Projects is to support faculty and staff efforts to seek and obtain external funding for research, creative artistry, public service and instruction. I will shorthand that in the rest of my presentation by saying "research," but we do roughly as much public service dollars as we do research dollars. So, though I am saying research, depending on who the faculty member is or what department they come from, it could be creative artistry, instruction or public service. It is certainly often engagement related, and engagement related money is something we are working on all the time. The second aspect of our mission is to insure that all Sponsored Projects submissions, grants and contracts adhere to all applicable university, sponsor, state, federal and foundation policies, guidelines and procedures. The third thing we do is assist the university in fostering a culture of research-lead teaching by engaging faculty proactively regarding the role of externally funded research or anything in their careers as teachers and scholars.

Roughly, we do about the same amount of research development time, proposal preparation and submission time, and award acceptance. Before an award is granted to the institution and moves to Grants Fiscal for an account to be set up, we have to insure that award is entirely in order. On an annual basis, the office does about 75 proposal preparations and submissions, processes about 350 awards, and negotiates approximately 100 contracts.

There are two broad models of offices of sponsored projects. One model functions at major research universities where the faculty generally have lighter teaching loads and lots of access to research active colleagues and mentors. The research offices at those institutions tend to function mainly as assembly lines where they do essentially budget and compliance reviews and electronic submission. Faculty resources at those institutions are usually web based search tools for finding funding announcements and explanations of office procedures and requirements. At smaller and mid-size institutions, offices of sponsored projects tend to be very small, centralized operations. They are almost always staffed by generalists who assist faculty with funding searches, general editing of proposal narratives, compliance review, budgets and submissions. NIU's Office of Sponsored Projects model is a bit different, and I want to talk about that in a number of steps. First is the structure. Unlike these other models, our office is fairly unique nationally, which we have learned by going to national meetings and talking to our colleagues. The idea behind our model is to meet the needs of faculty who have higher teaching loads than their peers at major institutions, who often have less exposure to and familiarity with the grant-getting process while they are in graduate school or in their postdoctoral. In most cases, they have less access to research active colleagues who can serve as advisors or mentors; therefore, we strive to provide services that strengthen the faculty's competitive positioning, promote efficiency of the process, create strategic advantage and reduce the amount of time faculty need to spend on the grant-getting process.

Structurally, our model is based on two principles: specialization and decentralization. To do this, the OSP model created the position of Research Development Specialist (RDS). RDS's are specialists in the

following senses. They are sufficiently well educated in the given area to which they are assigned to function at the level of a nonexpert reviewer. Every review panel has people who are experts in the thing they are reviewing and nonexperts. Whether it is NIH or NSF, there are people who do not have a detailed understanding of what they are reviewing that are called nonexpert reviewers. The goal in setting up the Research Development Specialist position was to get people who could read a proposal as though they were a nonexpert reviewer on a panel. That gives them enough knowledge of the science that their faculty are pursuing to give high-level feedback about the work as well as a very high level understanding of the proposal guidelines, so that when they are reading RFP's, they can read it as well as the faculty in terms of what fund they are looking for. They are also experts in all of the aspects of pre-award services and completely up to date on funding agency priorities and policies. All of our RDS's have master's degrees, and three of them are currently pursuing their doctorates. All have attended multiple national level training programs and regularly attend federal agency presentations on funding and policy changes. The OSP model is also decentralized in that the RDS's are physically located among the faculty with whom they work so that they can get to know them and their work in detail. They can get to know the culture of the departments they sit in, and they are available for informal discussions about research and about funding so that they are viewed as advocates by their faculty. That way, they are able to work closely together from well before the proposal is developed through the proposal development process and into submission.

Thanks to some generous support by our deans, we are able to deploy five Research Development Specialists across campus: one each in Liberal Arts and Sciences in the physical and mathematical sciences, Liberal Arts and Sciences in psychology and the social sciences, the College of Education, the College of Engineering, and the College of Health and Human Sciences. That constitutes about 90 percent of the grants we do. These people also work on things like the humanities or with Outreach or other entities on campus that want to submit grants.

We take this approach with all new faculty and all faculty who express an interest in working with us using this approach. First and foremost, we set a long-term research agenda identifying a major research goal or question that is the focus of their work and then work backwards from there to determine their next step and their short-term funding strategy. Often this means identifying a faculty mentor either on this campus or at some other institution who can help that faculty member. It means exploring the possibility of putting them into an existing research group on campus or, what happens very often when new faculty comes in, it allows us to form a research group around that person. In other cases, the RDS's will organize and staff learning communities for groups of faculty who are interested in supporting one another in their efforts to develop research funding. The goal is to get them funded with an appropriate sponsor, because once you are funded with a sponsor, you are twice as likely to get additional funding from that sponsor as you would be trying for the first time. Ten years ago at NSF, the chances of getting funded were one in three. The chances now are less than one in five. So our long-term strategy is to try to get people in with the funder and keep them with the funder because it increases their likelihood of remaining funded.

To support that, we do outreach. Once the RDS has a clear sense of the faculty's research agenda and next steps, we then provide that faculty member with information about only those grants that would be specifically appropriated for them. We do not send out broad announcements to the whole campus or whole faculties about funding announcements. We also provide information about funding agency white papers and dear colleague letters and strategic planning documents that help faculty understand what the sponsor is seeking to fund. The RDS's each maintain a website with very detailed information about funding possibilities, funding agency related news, policy changes, changes in funding priorities and other information that is useful to their faculties. We do presentations at faculty meetings fairly regularly to remind faculty about how to use our office and to talk to them about their interests in pursuing funding. We have periodic meetings with department chairs on how they would like to see us focus our efforts within their department, and we discuss possibilities at those meetings for larger things like undergraduate or graduate research, graduate student support projects or training grants. We also periodically meet with the deans to share information and to hear about college priorities.

Cross-disciplinary support – Every week, the RDS's and I meet to discuss progress on research development and submission activity. This is a venue that allows us to talk about what various faculty members are doing and to look for opportunities for cross-disciplinary connection. For example, we are in

the process of organizing a meeting on battery technology between a faculty member in engineering who is in discussions with General Motors, and faculty members in chemistry and physics who are doing related work on battery technology.

We also organize and staff major universitywide proposal preparation processes like the 2/14 grants, TQP, the Howard Hughes that we initiated, and some of the large ARRA stimulus proposals. Proposal preparation and submission – once the faculty member has decided to pursue a grant, the RDS meets with them to discuss the sponsor guidelines and be clear on what the sponsor is looking to fund. The RDS then works with the faculty member to build the budget. The RDS's and I often review the narrative portion of the grant and provide feedback. We give strategic suggestions about grant writing and how to better align their project with the funding agencies interested in priorities. Sometimes we suggest getting methodological or other assistance from other faculty, either here or elsewhere, and we continue working with the faculty member until the grant proposal is finalized. At that point, the whole submission is reviewed by the RDS for compliance with university and funding agency guidelines and routed for administrative approval. It is then reviewed again at the OSP central office and signed off on before it is submitted. Approximately 85 to 90 percent of what we submit is now electronic.

Resubmission – in cases where grants are rejected, we meet with faculty members to discuss the reviewer's comments and plan for resubmission. We provide strategic advice based on having reviewed many such reviewer comments and based on my experiences as a federal reviewer. We work with faculty in order to review and negotiate contracts for research, public service and some instructional projects that are paid for through contracts with the federal government, national ads, industry partners and others, including municipalities and hospitals. This process is designed to both streamline the contract process and insure that all contracts adhere to university policies as well as controlling federal and state laws. In this work, we liaise with University Legal Services, Grants Fiscal Administration, Human Resources and the Office of Compliance for things like IRB issues.

We generate weekly reports that go to the vice president, and to Public Affairs so that they are aware of both what we have submitted and when we receive awards. We do quarterly reports that go to the deans, the chairs and unit heads who have receive funding in that quarter. Data is provided to the program review process, and we do an annual report. We also do ad hoc reports as necessary for things like tenure reviews and for research and artistry grants.

Lastly, I just want to talk about a couple of broader efforts that we are involved in. Dara Little, Assistant Director at the Office of Sponsored Projects, is the president-elect for the Society for Research Administration International, the largest professional society in the world for research administrators. Kellie Dyslin, one of our RDS's, is the chair of the SRA Education Committee NIH Peer Review. An enormous problem for smaller and midsize institutions is that the NIH changes its peer review rules. Smaller and midsize schools are going to be horribly disadvantaged through this process because we do not have or have very few of the study section members that major institutions have who will be able to report back to their faculty colleagues about how these changes are affecting the review process. The ASCU Task Force is very similar to the work Dr. Kaplan just talked about in engagement, and there is interest in getting offices of sponsored projects involved in engagement activities.

Trustee Murer inquired about what the university can do to exponentially grow its research monies in view of the present economy. Clearly, the major money is in large cooperative projects, Dr. Stone said, and those grants tend to average about \$120,000 a year. So even if we have strong research active faculty in all of our science departments, who are bringing in \$100,000 per project, it does not add up very quickly. Certainly, this was on the minds of the people who did the strategic planning process, looking to bring faculty together into groups that could begin to go after larger center grant possibilities, which are multimillion dollar programs. When the ROCK winds down and some of those faculty can begin to take advantage of all of the partnerships they developed in that process and have the time to start writing competitive research grants on the back of that, it might open up some possibilities for some large Department of Defense or Department of Energy projects that we have heretofore not had real access to. Exponential growth is difficult anywhere, even if you look at major research institutions who do that by poaching whole departments of epidemiology from other institutions. In answer to another query, Dr. Stone said that the RDS's are placed in the areas where most of the grants are being written. We



certainly work with all areas of the university, he said, even if we do not have a specialist yet in those areas.

In reply to a query from Trustee Strauss, on whether there are grants that do not go through the Office of Sponsored Projects, Dr. Stone stated that it is a rare occurrence. Every once in a while they discover that somebody has accidentally submitted a grant without going through the OSP office, because there is sometimes confusion about fellowships and grants and what people are allowed to apply for without the university's signature. We usually find out about them, he said, because usually the award comes to us, and then we have to work backwards and do the whole approval process.

In answer to a query from Trustee Boey, about how the decision is made on whether or not to submit a specific proposal, Dr. Stone said the RDS's are not empowered to make that kind of decision. What often happens, he said, if the RDS feels that the faculty member does not understand the guidelines or have something that would be funded, the RDS brings the faculty to me and we have a long conversation about whether this is really a fundable idea. Occasionally, faculty decide not to go forward, and occasionally they decide to go forward anyway and see what happens, if only just to learn the process, to get the reviews and to get reviewer comments back.

The reason I asked Dr. Stone to speak to us today was to introduce this process to any of the Trustees who were unaware of it, Chair Butler said. I knew about it because I worked with the Office of Sponsored Projects when I was a faculty member here. It is an incredible resource that we have for our faculty. I was surprised at the level of attention and detail they paid to the project I was working on. Though that very ambitious grant project was not funded, the impact of that intellectual interaction with the research development specialist was formative to some of the research that I went on to do as a result of it. This office is part of the intellectual life of the university on a very large scale.

#### **Agenda Item 7.d. – Technology Transfer Office Services**

After you have developed the intellectual property, Dr. Alden said, how do you deal with it and how is it protected and so forth? Dr. Erman will make a presentation on the Technology Transfer Office.

Chair Butler took the chair's prerogative and asked that the presented be as sensitive as possible to the time so that the meeting would not run overtime. Also, he stated that the Trustees had worked out an arrangement to save the strategic planning presentation for a special meeting after the first of the year.

The impetus for university technology transfer activities had its start in 1980 with the Bayh-Dole Act, Dr. Erman said. That federal law allowed universities to keep the ownership rights to any inventions generated in federally sponsored research. Since that time, there have been just over 200 universities that established some sort of Technology Transfer Office (TTO). In general, the experience has been that technology transfer license fees have provided a fairly minor portion toward the research revenue supporting most universities. A survey of major research universities showed it typically to be in the area of four to six percent. NIU is probably less than one percent. Half of the TTO's are not profitable because the costs associated with them are usually greater than the income generated from licensing fees.

I would like to give a brief history of technology transfer here at NIU. In 1983, right after the Bayh-Dole Act, the Illinois Board of Regents drafted a university Intellectual Property Policy, and in 1984, the responsibility for patenting and licensing was associated with the Dean of the Graduate School, Jerrold Zar. In 1985, the state provided funding to establish various technology commercialization centers around the state. Larry Sill was NIU's initial director, and in 1991, in the early years of the technology commercialization center, the state stopped that funding. So internal dollars were allocated to continue the offices, and the name was changed to Technology Commercialization Office. Ken Kirkland was the first external director. When Ken left, Xueshu Song, an engineering faculty, became interim director. Our second external director was Don Colbert, who was here for three years. Several searches were done for the position between 2001 and 2005, but we were unsuccessful in filling that position. Gail Mitchell, an assistant vice president for research, took over the office in 2005 until she retired. In 2007, there was another reorganization. The name changed to Technology Transfer Office and Rita Yusko was named manager in 2009.

The first invention disclosure by an NIU faculty member was in 1985, soon after the Intellectual Property Policy was developed, and the first patent was issued to NIU in 1988. Since that time, we have had approximately 87 invention disclosures. Twenty-nine patents have been assigned to NIU and eight licensing agreements have been signed over the last 20-plus years. If we start with the invention disclosures of a faculty or staff member who has an idea, believes they have a new invention, we will disclose that to the TTO. The TTO will then do an initial search to see if there is any prior art and determine whether the concept is novel, whether it is patented or its patentability. We generally make a patent application on about two-thirds of our disclosures. So out of the 90 or so, we have made around 60 applications for patents. About 50 percent of those applications result in the issuance of a patent. Once we have the patent, then we strive to try to license it. Of our 29 patents, we have had eight licensing agreements.

The number of invention disclosures per year since 1985 has increased. Since 2001, there has been increasing awareness of our faculty on the possibility of obtaining patents for their inventions, and we have seen this increase in activity. Along with the increasing disclosures, we are applying for more patents, and we have the same increase in our cost of patent filing. Prior to about 2007, our costs just for maintaining and applying for patents was in the area of \$40,000 to \$60,000. In the last two fiscal years, that cost has increased to over \$100,000.

The first of our 29 patents was issued in 1988. There was a peak in 1999 when six patents were issued. Fewer patents have been issued in the last few years. One reason is that the time between applying for a patent and the time that the patent office issues a patent has been increasing. In the early years, a patent would be issued within one to two years of your initial filing, whereas in more recent years, it has been taking five to six years. The lack of a TTO director between 2001 and 2005 also caused some of this decrease in the patents issued in the last few years. Our revenue stream from royalties over the last 11 years, has typically been between \$20,000 and \$40,000 per year, compared with typically \$12 to \$20 million a year we get from external grant funding. So the tech transfer activity is still very modest here at NIU, and within our level of patents, our royalties have lagged the application because of the time delay from the patent office in issuing the patents.

Trustee Murer indicated to Dr. Erman and Dr. Stone that in the future, along with the information being presented, she would like to see a comparative analysis with like universities, not only in Illinois, but comparatively in the United States, so that we get a better sense of where we stand. In regard to a slide that talked about the costs escalating in the pursuit of the patents, she also asked if there is anyway that the Law School could be of service in expediting the process and perhaps help mitigate some of the costs. Dean Rosato stated that the Law School was just acquiring a new faculty member who has expertise in patents, and would continue to explore that possibility. We are discussing with University Legal Services the possibility of hiring an in-house patent contract attorney, Dr. Erman said, so there will be ways to mitigate the external cost.

Dr. Erman introduced Ms. Yusko who, in reply to an earlier query from Trustee Murer, stated that there are now 15 to 20 patent applications pending approval.

#### **Agenda Item 7.e. – Strategic Planning Update**

I appreciate Chair Butler and Chair Strauss arranging to have a special workshop on the strategic planning update, Provost Alden said. When Chair Butler asked me to prepare an update on the strategic plan, it was a daunting task. We have literally hundreds of faculty, staff and students working on various aspects of the strategic plan, so information flooded into my office. The Board members have handouts, and almost every bullet has its own story. It felt like too much to try to cover it all in 45 minutes, so maybe if we have a workshop for the Board that specially focuses on the strategic planning updates, we could do it in three phases. Now we can tell you what we have done in Phase I, what we are doing in Phase II and what we plan for Phase III, which makes quite a compelling but very lengthy story. So, I appreciate the opportunity to have a bit more time to plan a focused special workshop for the Board.

**NEXT MEETING DATE**

The next meeting for the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee is scheduled for February 4, 2010.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Butler asked for a motion to adjourn. Trustee Boey so moved, seconded by Trustee Vella. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:02 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon M. Banks-Wilkins  
Recording Secretary