

Minutes of the
NIU Board of Trustees
Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation
Committee Meeting
August 25, 2016

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chair Cheryl Murer in the Board of Trustees Room, 315 Altgeld Hall. Recording Secretary Cathy Craddock conducted the roll call. Members present were Trustees Robert Boey, John Butler, Wheeler Coleman, Robert Marshall, Tim Struthers, Marc Strauss, Matthew Holmes and Cheryl Murer. Also present were NIU President Doug Baker, Interim Vice President for Research Gerald C. Blazey, Parliamentarian Jerry Blakemore, Director of Federal Relations Dr. Anna Quider, and Assistant Vice President for Sponsored Programs Administration Dara Little.

VERIFICATION OF QUORUM AND APPROPRIATE NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Board parliamentarian Jerry Blakemore indicated the appropriate notification of the meeting has been provided pursuant to the Illinois Open Meetings Act. Mr. Blakemore also advised that a quorum was present.

MEETING AGENDA APPROVAL

Chair Murer asked for a motion to approve the meeting agenda. Trustee Marc Strauss moved and Trustee Robert Marshall seconded. The motion was approved.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Murer asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the May 19, 2016 meeting. Trustee Marc Strauss moved and Trustee Wheeler Coleman seconded. The motion passed.

CHAIR'S COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Murer introduced, welcomed Faculty Senate President Dr. Greg Long and Cathy Doederlein, UAC representative. Dr. Long remarked, during this committee meeting one of the topics has to do with research and our progress and work in that. I would just like to emphasize two points. One is the opportunity to lead research and create artistry as one of the most exciting parts of our work. It provides an opportunity to collaborate with students and other colleagues and it's also one of the most visible and highly evaluated parts of what we do in our role as professors. The second thing though that I would like to mention is that our contracts run August through May and so when we're in our typical academic year, a lot of attention is focused on service and teaching and that many of us spend significant portions of our three months when we're "not working" actually working very hard to pursue our research and get our writing in and so forth and so I would just say anything that we can do to facilitate and support faculty research during the academic year would also be appreciated because we work nine month contracts but I know very few of us who don't work 12 months a year to be sure that we get our research and artistry done Thank you.

Chair Murer thanked Dr. Long for his comments and continued, we certainly appreciate all the work that our faculty does and that's not just an empty commentary. The faculty is the heartbeat of this university and certainly from this chair research is critical for us to maintain the identity of Northern Illinois University as a research institution and I think Dr. Blazey is going to make some comments in that regard. We need to all remember that it's easier in good times to focus on research. It's imperative in bad times to focus on research. So thank you for your comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Board parliamentarian indicated that there were no requests for public comment.

UNIVERSITY RECOMMENDATIONS/REPORTS

Information Item 7.a. – State Legislative Update

Chair Murer began the meeting by saying, our agenda begins with a legislative report from Springfield and Washington. We have both of our liaisons here so I think we'll start with the state legislative update from Mr. Mann.

Mike Mann thanked Chair Murer and continued, I'll keep my remarks short today since there are other presentations planned. As most of you know on June 30th the General Assembly passed what I would refer to as a short term spending measure for FY17. There was great urgency even though on the 29th there was little hope for much progress, but on June 30th things changed rapidly. There was a desire by legislative leaders and the administration to get some sort of spending measure in place to ensure the basic continuity of state operations as well as the opening of K-12 schools in the fall. If you would take a quick look at your materials, Figure 1 on page nine of my report, you will see that the fiscal year is referred to as a six month budget because the appropriation that we have received for FY17 is meant to approximate half a year's appropriation. In Figure 1 you'll notice that the budget bill that was passed includes \$48.3 million for operating expenses. It includes \$15.5 million for the Stevens Hall renovation project and it also included funding for our Spring 2016 MAP awards for our students, which we had been covering while awaiting state funding. Just in summary, Figure 1 is kind of a 'good news' slide on this page. So we were fairly pleased that something happened. If you're looking for a not so good news slide, scan down the page to Figure 2, which again is a short little summary that reflects what has happened the last couple of years with our state appropriation. Our last full year appropriation in 2015 was \$91.1 million. We started that year with \$93 million and took about a two and a quarter percent reduction about three quarters of the way through the year. For FY16 you can see by the chart we received \$26.4 million, which is a 29% budget. This is a different way of saying we took a 71% budget cut in FY2016. The FY2017 six month budget we received is \$48.3 million. It is a 53% budget when using the \$91.1 million as the base. When you add those two figures together for the 18 month period, it approximates about 82% of that \$91.1 million figure. Unfortunately, unless you look at the figures and realize that it's for an 18 month period, it's a devastating blow and we will be working hard in the coming year to get a more complete budget for 2017 and believe it or not, we actually have meetings with IBHE in October to talk about FY18 budget development.

Chair Murer asked for questions from the board and recognized John Butler who asked, I wonder if either you, Dr. Phillips or Dr. Baker could comment on the decision to characterize this as an FY17 partial budget as opposed to characterize it as more for FY16, leaving open the argument that nothing has come for FY17.

Mike responded that there was more concern about K-12 in FY17 and IDOT projects, the threat of IDOT projects shutting down on July 1 and that it seemed to me in the Capitol there was more concern about FY17 than there was about higher education for FY16. The other comment that I would make is that due to higher education's concern about the significant cut we took in FY16, there was language added to this appropriation bill that allows us to use this FY17 money to cover FY16 expenses. I don't know if that's doing us a favor or not, but that's my observation.

Vice President Al Phillips added that one of the challenges is that even though we received a partial, or a stop-gap, budget for FY16 and FY17, the money doesn't actually show up until FY17. Of the \$48.3 million we will not receive all of that until the end of December. I think to this point we've received about \$8 million of it. It's coming in, but even though it could be used against fiscal year 2016 bills, we actually still don't have the money, but we're paying the oldest bills first. So essentially it is going against obligations for FY16 but we won't actually have the funding until it shows up and we're not going to receive it all until the end of the calendar year.

Chair Murer asked Mr. Mann if, when the budget was prepared, was the money distributed on an equally proportional ratio with the other public institutions?

Mr. Mann replied, you will remember maybe that in April or May I came before the committee and relayed my frustration with a draft allocation that only provided us with \$28 million, which represented a very small percentage of our previous year's appropriation while other institutions that were deemed to be in more urgent need for financial support received a much higher percentage in this draft budget. We worked hard with legislative staff and others to let them know how unfair that type of allocation would be. With this \$48.3 million we received, on a percentage basis that puts us on equal footing with all the other institutions, which we were very happy to see. Prior to June 29 we were looking at \$28 million. On June 29 I was looking at zero dollars and then on June 30 \$48 million popped up and money for Stevens and for MAP and we felt pretty good about that rapid development. If you look at Table 1 in my report, it will actually show how we were treated relative to the other institutions and if it's difficult to read sideways I apologize. But you'll notice that while the combined funding for us for the FY16 stop gap and the FY17 short term budget resulted in an 18% reduction for us, which is the 82% budget equal to an 18% reduction. Most other schools are also at 18%. There are three institutions that fared better, again Chicago State, Eastern and Western had a 10% reduction or a 90% funding level. I believe I told the committee back in April that rather than a 90 and an 82% scenario, we were looking at a 90% and a 25% scenario so we came up to the 82% level. And again I'm sorry if I'm using that 82% term, but 82% is for 18 months, not one year.

Information Item 7.b. – Federal Legislative Report

Chair Murer introduced Anna Quider, who began by thanking Chair Murer and the Board. She continued, today I'd like to give you an update on our federal engagement for the NIU fiscal year that has passed, as well as some insights into what we are planning for next year. NIU, through the Office of Federal Relations, participates in a national coalition called The Science Coalition. The first number I lead with shows 268,000 views nationally of The Science Coalition materials featuring NIU. This is a group of about 65 universities, two-thirds of which are APLU institutions. We all came together and hired a public relations firm to help the universities get out the message that we need strong federal investment in science and technology, as well as basic research.

Working with The Science Coalition, NIU has participated in a number of media campaigns, primarily on social media, but also Dr. Blazey has participated in a Senior Research Office media roundtable. If you add up across all of the platforms and tools, NIU's content has been viewed 268,000 times across the United States through The Science Coalition platform. I've engaged 120 NIU and NIU-affiliated students in federal relations. This includes meetings with members of congress, includes tours of federal facilities and those types of activities in Washington, D.C. We have submitted 19 federal fiscal year 2017 appropriations requests. That is more than we did last year and that's letting our congressional offices know what our funding priorities are for this year. We've engaged 11 NIU leaders and faculty in visits to Washington, D.C., who met with members of congress and visited six different federal agencies. President Baker most recently came to the Department of Education with me. NIU gave the Champion of Science Award to Congressman Bill Foster for his work on the national level highlighting the importance of science and technology for our nation's future and our higher education enterprise. Provost Freeman was able to attend the ceremony where the award was given to Congressman Foster. I've picked a number of photos that show the broad range of federal activity that we have done this year. We show in the upper left slide vice president Blazey participating in a media roundtable at the National Press Club with nine other senior research officers from around the country. Seven of the institutions that participated were APLU institutions. The event was covered by the *Wall Street Journal* as well as science publications such as *Nature*. In the upper right, we have Provost Freeman giving the award to Congressman Foster. In the bottom right we have an NIU student in the College of Health and Human Sciences meeting with Senator Kirk. In the bottom left we have Congressman Hultgren meeting with Dean McCord, as well as one of our physics faculty members and a development officer to discuss NIU priorities. And finally, centrally, we have NIU and Argonne joint faculty member Dr. Mike Papka participating in a Capitol Hill reception where he's showing some of his NSF sponsored research devices to a congressional staffer. Here is a video just to give you a little snippet of the type of materials that we're producing through The Science Coalition so you can see really what's been going out nationally about NIU. The Office of Federal Relations worked with our communications division to film NIU faculty

and students answering the question “Why should science matter to our presidential candidates?” And these snippets were put together into various video products that have been pushed out nationally. These are non-partisan, so these are just why science should matter – because it cures cancer or helps American global competitiveness. These are in the own words of NIU faculty and students. About 20 faculty and student participated in this project. I think this was a great collaboration within NIU and also a good national visibility piece for us. Looking ahead to our year of federal engagement we have some exciting things in the hopper. We are looking into co-hosting with University Advancement a Capitol Hill reception this would involve inviting NIU alumni to a reception with our congressional delegation. Our plan is to also bring NIU researchers with posters and demonstrations of their research, so it would be a wonderful marrying of our alumni community as well as our congressional delegation and we would also be able to invite federal program officers to attend. The timeline that we’re looking at for this event will be either the spring or the fall of 2017. Athletics department advocacy has been ramping up through our division, the MAC. The MAC has been convening all of the federal relations officers from its member institutions and NIU is poised to take a leadership role in helping the MAC to engage at the federal level. Our plan is for advocacy to focus not only on athletics issues that are of interest to all of the MAC universities, but also for the broader issues that affect us as institutions. The Office of Federal Relations is working with Intercollegiate Athletics to invite members of congress to our upcoming football game at Cellular Field in November. We think would be a great opportunity to engage our congressional delegation in our athletics program and interact with some of our students in that type of work. Finally, NIU has a number of its program prioritization and other assessment programs going on at the moment, and federal relations remains committed to providing high-quality service to whatever the federal priorities are for the university going forward. We’re keeping an eye on what happens so that we can make sure that we are fully integrated into the university’s priorities.

Just a real quick update on some of the issues that are currently happening at the national level; the fiscal year 2017 will be starting October 1st. Congress has not finished its appropriations business for the year yet. What usually happens in recent times is congress does not finish its appropriations work until December, so they pass a continuing resolution and then in December they will finish the complete appropriations work. This is the scenario that we are pushing for at the federal level and will be most likely to yield the best outcomes for NIU’s priorities. Some members of congress are pushing for a continuing resolution that goes until March of 2017. This would give the new congress time to develop and push its appropriations agenda as well as that of the new administration. For NIU we think that it would be best if appropriations were to wrap up in December as expected. There are a couple of pieces of legislation that could move by the end of this congressional session which would be favorable for NIU. One is the National Defense Authorization Act, which authorizes the Department of Defense and which is currently including a manufacturing university proposal. This would be a brand new grant program that would allow NIU to compete for up to \$5 million in funding to establish ourselves as a national manufacturing university. Finally I would be remiss if I did not mention the presidential election that is going on. I think as you all know it is a tumultuous year in presidential election politics, an unusual year, and what I’ve highlighted for you here on the screen are the stated, published on their website, policy position statements from the republican ticket, and well as the democratic ticket. They are statements that include NIU priorities. It’s really hard to say where we’re going to come out with each of the presidential candidates because this is a literally, not only a day-by-day, but an hour-by-hour evolving situation. All I can say is I encourage all of us to vote if we are able as American citizens. Finally, thank you very much for your time. I’d be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Murer thanked Dr. Quider and continued, I recall a very lengthy discussion that we had in the past two years about research money not necessarily coming from congress and appropriations, but the area of concentration needed to be on agencies. Could you just spend a few minutes talking about your work with the agencies and the opportunities that you think we have and how realistic are they and what kind of turnaround?

Anna Quider responded that the current work we’re doing with federal agencies is for the visibility-raising for Northern Illinois University and our researchers. At the end of the day, to be effective in securing federal agency research funding, our researchers need to write grants that are selected to be in the top

ten or twenty percent of the funding bodies that they're applying to. The way I can best support that is ensuring that our faculty members are connecting with the program officers to hear about exactly what is looked for in the grant applications they'll be submitting, and also making sure that our faculty are aware of grant opportunities that are arising and the priorities for the different federal agencies. What I've been doing in that regard is working with Sponsored Programs Administration, which Dara Little will be speaking about next, to ensure that the research development specialists are aware of federal priorities as they are developing from the agencies. I am also working to bring faculty members to Washington D.C. to meet with federal agency officials. Unfortunately the budget situation has been quite constraining in the number of faculty that we've been able to bring to Washington D.C., but a clear outcome from one of our engagements with a federal agency is engineering Professor Federico Sciammarella has spent time with me in Washington visiting with various Department of Defense offices, as well as the National Institute for Standard and Technology, NIST. As an outcome of one of his meetings in Washington D.C., NIU actually co-hosted with Northwestern a NIST workshop at Northwestern on the research topic that Dr. Sciammarella is pursuing, 3D printing of metals. That was directly because Dr. Sciammarella met with NIST through a meeting organized by the Office of Federal Relations. Those types of meetings are critical because that is where the priorities are set for the next round of funding calls. The best way to be competitive for your funding is to help write the call that's going to be coming out. I'm trying to be very responsive, which ultimately leads me to perhaps be a little conservative in bringing folks out to D.C.

Chair Murer commented, one of the things I'd like to discuss with Dr. Blazey and Provost Freeman as we talk about research and the commitment to research I'd like to, through this committee, have more substantive conversation in exactly the correlation between what research are we planning, what research are we doing, what agencies are we trying to find the funding? Let's talk more about what are the results and what level of funding is more prevalent these days and what level of co-sponsorship? Is that a direction? I haven't heard enough of this. Is the direction of the future more in co-sponsorship of projects so that we're with the perhaps larger institutions or do we take a lead in certain areas that we have greater strength than perhaps others? I think that as we develop our committee meetings I'd like more specificity about the relationship with the federal government as it relates to grants.

Dr. Blazey continued, I also share Anna's concern about getting ahead of program prioritization. We are certainly considering many options right now, extended discussions with the deans of each college, with Provost Freeman. One of the things we are looking at very closely as we consider future research, scholarship, artistry to directors, is how we can best leverage partnerships with federal agencies, particularly the local laboratories, but it also extends to the agencies themselves in Washington. We're very cognizant of your concern, but again it's a little bit early to start discussing it with the board while we're going through this program prioritization process.

Chair Murer replied, I'll push a little harder as chairman of this committee. I am respectful of our processes. We've been going through prioritization for 18 months I think, but I also feel that time is of the essence. I would imagine that even though we're going through program prioritization there are some basic areas of expertise and recognition at NIU. We know we have strengths in certain areas. We know we've had grants in certain areas. We need to be more aggressive in determining where we are. I think it is important that the Board of Trustees knows about it through this committee because this really is at the essence of who we are and where we're going to go.

Provost Freeman also responded by saying, if I could say that I don't think we want to give the Board or anyone in the audience the impression that we've hit a pause button, because we're doing the university-wide presentations. I attended with Dr. Quider a wonderful set of presentations at the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology yesterday afternoon where our research-active faculty who have federal funding from some agencies or who are pursuing federal funding from others gave an overview of their research so Dr. Quider could figure out the best place to get them connected. Clearly all of our faculty who pursue research, scholarship and artistry are continuing to work in their laboratories and the field and to create works of art and to position themselves for future success. We released yesterday the process that will be used to guide faculty hiring and link faculty hires to our program prioritization process and I think one of the nice components of that is consultation across the colleges

with the provosts and the vice president for research and the leveraging of partnerships. I think you're correct, Madame Chair, that we need to continue to communicate to the trustees all of the wonderful things that are going on and how we're continuing to move forward and position ourselves and leverage federal relations along with all aspects of our academic mission.

Chair Murer said, I appreciate those comments and also I want you and the public to understand that during these times of crisis the board is even more attentive to the present as opposed to only being concerned as to the process and into the future. Sharing with this board and this committee the practical aspects of where we are from a funding perspective will continue to be very important and we're talking about now how we're planning throughout this year, this academic year, in committees meetings that we will have through legislative and research. Thank you very much Dr. Quider.

Information Item 7.c. – Sponsored Programs Administration FY16 Report

Dara Little began her presentation by thanking the chair and the board and continued, in FY16 we had 135 faculty and staff secure 290 awards for a total of \$28 million. Physics almost doubled its research funding from FY15 to FY16. I think partially that was due to the build out of the accelerator or research cluster. Overall support in the math and physical sciences is up six percent as was research funding in health and human sciences. Public service you'll notice that was up in FY16, primarily due to additional funding that was received through our Regional Development Institute and the Illinois Interactive Report Card. Here is just a four year funding overview with a breakout by sponsor, which again is what we would expect to see federal and state sponsors making up the majority of our external funding portfolio.. You might be wondering particularly with all of the things going on with the state how that could have remained constant and that's really because most of the funding that we receive from the state is for fixed programs. I'm not going to say that they're not completely dependent on the state budget, but they're not overly dependent on that state budget so some of those programs are federal flow through, social service programs that are mandated through the court. Just with the federal funding climate and again the faculty that we have positioned for federal funding. That spike in FY14 was a large \$7 million state award that the university received through Outreach for the Illinois Shared Learning Environment. Fairly unchanged, it's what we would expect to see in Liberal Arts and Sciences and Outreach, the two largest areas that tend to receive the most external funding. This slide is a time series of external funding by the divisions and colleges that received over a million dollars in funding or more per year. Our College of Education in FY15 received a large million dollar contract for international teacher training and that's why they were up a few years ago. Engineering and Engineering Technology, the one thing that we're seeing is again some of their larger federal grants are winding down. The work that Federico Sciammarella was here to present a couple of meetings ago - that grant is ending. The expenditures provide a more constant measure of external funding support and reflect the sponsored funding activities that are actually occurring on campus at any given time. The next slide takes a quick look at the indirect cost recovery by sponsor. It reflects the general total, effective overhead rate return of about between 1-15%. That's when we had a lot of those HERRA awards that were being spent and so we had some peak spending periods during that time. The breakout by sponsor is completely what we would expect to see with the majority of overhead return coming from our federal sponsors. Federally funded research of course carries the highest return of overhead. Our effective rate on federally funded research is 32%. I think that's pretty good against our federally negotiated rate of 47%. The lowest return of overhead is on state awards or those received through non-profit and for non-research projects. Those projects carry about a 6% overhead return rate. We were just talking about grant submissions and getting out with the agencies and so I want to touch on the proposal activity and not just the money that we're bringing in but what are faculty doing and how many proposals are we submitting. You can see to the left is a graph that shows the value of the submissions from FY13 on up to FY16. That value has gone down, but I think what's most important is the trend line to the right shows the number of submissions against tenure/tenure track faculty headcount. I noticed in the last meeting Jerry mentioned that we have a decrease in faculty, and we have instability in the state. I do want to note that the tenure/tenure track headcount here is just for the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Engineering, HHS, and Education. The reason that I decided to look at proposals against those specific colleges and for tenure/tenure track is because if we want to stimulate research most of that external funding is going to come through our

academic colleges and certainly through our tenure/tenure track faculty. I will also add there was some discussion of program prioritization and that is something that we're hearing on the ground as well and not just the university but from faculty concerned of the state's instability and that they have been holding off on submitting proposals. So at least anecdotally that is something we're experiencing in Sponsored Programs.

I'm going shift gears here to talk about what we've been doing to help support external funding over. It takes many institutional units to support and facilitate faculty funding efforts. We all support external funding when we make the process of submitting and managing their awards as easy as possible and when we protect the institution from compliance issues so that the agencies are comfortable giving NIU funds and our faculty funds for their work. Some of the things that we have been doing in SPA keeping administrative burden, rising compliance, and challenging funding climate and limited local resources in mind, I'm pleased to say that we've been working with many other university units to try to enhance the infrastructure for external funding throughout that funding life cycle. With enhancing funding development, in the last year we have had two meetings with the NIU Foundation. We've brought our proposal development specialists and the foundation together to talk about how we might more holistically approach external funding, recognizing that some projects may be perfectly suited for a competitive grant proposal, while some projects are just more suited for a sponsorship or a donation, but also understanding how we can leverage each other's strengths to support our faculty needs. One concept is cost sharing. When we need cost sharing for a project, is it possible to work through the Foundation to obtain a gift for that? Our research development specialists have a lot of ideas about how to work with the gift officers and we certainly look forward to those meetings, but we have had two over the past year.

From a policy perspective, the last time the university updated its internal distribution for overhead was in 1993 and so I had an opportunity to work with Dr. Blazey over the last year to update that distribution and to work with administration on that and so that new distribution will take effect this fiscal year, FY17. We believe that the new model will place more accountability on the use of recovered indirect or overhead funds and to insure that they're being used to support research and scholarship activities. A new component of that distribution is also returning a small share back to the faculty investigator to give them a little more flexibility for managing the research program so if they need seed funding or bridge funding to get them through, that they have that. We've also been working with the provost's office and with human resources to streamline the hiring process for post-doctoral scholars. These are highly technical positions but are absolutely critical for our research faculty and to build out our research programs. Internally behind the scenes we have been working to streamline our own business processes in Sponsored Programs. One of the things I mentioned last year when I gave this talk to the board was that we were looking to streamline our award notification process and to make sure that our faculty are getting their account numbers as quickly as possible when their awards come in so that they can start spending their money as quickly as possible. I'm really happy to report that since last October we've reduced our account set-up time by 50%. We now have put a policy in place that accounts are set up within ten days of award receipt. We're meeting that goal 85% of the time and where we're not meeting it is there's an explanation. All of the different initiatives that Sponsored Programs Administration has been working on over the last year have required the work of these different units. We need the work of human resources or procurement, and as Jerry has talked about, reducing research impediments. Sponsored Programs Administration was identified as a program for enhancement under program prioritization. We want to focus more on performance measurement and data analytics just to make sure that the changes that we're making are actually having their intended effect and to do more modeling to better understand where we need to be in terms of proposal submissions so that we can try to increase external funding.

Chair Murer commented on Ms. Little's presentation by stating, I want to commend Dr. Phillips and Dr. Freeman for addressing procedural issues. I thought the metrics of the turn-around time was excellent and I think that type of metrics is really important as well because there are things that we can manage ourselves and there are outside forces that we can't, but certainly anything that's internal and you did an

excellent job both of you in coordinating to address a 50% reduction in turn-around time. That was excellent.

Information Item 7.d. – Division Wide Initiatives

Dr. Blazey began his presentation saying, I was charged by Chair Murer to describe what our basic support is for the research enterprise here at NIU. I thank Professor Long for pointing out in his comments about how important this support is to help the university move forward. To remain competitive NIU has to distinguish itself through research and its reputation and that to retain and recruit students and faculty in the future we have to also be supporting the research, scholarship, and artistry. It's been demonstrated in the academic literature that having a strong research program actually helps you attract and retain both undergraduate and graduate students.

Over the past year, RIPS has taken a two-pronged approach to promoting research and innovation at relatively little cost other than the time of the individuals involved. We have been working with the provost's office and Administration and Finance to reduce the policy and procedural impediments to research. I'll give you a little more detail. The second prong is assuring direct support is available for faculty to maintain and most importantly initiate new scholarship and innovation.

A bit about removing impediments: we formed the Research and Innovation Advisory Council, which is populated by a spectrum of researchers, artists and scholars from across the campus. They agreed to take on specific jobs in the form of a task force and the first task I asked them to do was to identify the impediments to their scholarship and rank them. And here's their top five rankings; no return on F&A, or the indirect costs directly to the faculty. We are doing that now and I can assure you that that was a great morale booster for the research community. There was, as Dara mentioned, a high cost and long lead time for hiring post-docs. We have now agreed upon on a policy where that impediment is completely gone. We have completely streamlined the process. Third, was the difficulty confirming matching funds from the university for internal grant proposals. That's just internal to SPA and to my office and we will get that squared away quite quickly, including more formal mentoring with quality feedback on proposals or research plans. Dara mentioned that we're really beefing up our professional training program for our scholars and also a mentoring program is in place. And then number five on the list, difficulty to get a travel advance rather than reimbursement. This actually is an awkward impediment. You need to be respectful of controls and compliance, but you also need to enable the faculty to get out there into the field as quickly as they can and to assist their students. I know that there are options underway right now within finance to accommodate travel and we're in close communications with them as they develop their plans for us. So we've actually been quite successful. The list was 40 items long and we started at the top, so there's a lot of room for improvement. The other prong is the direct support and there are four programs within RIPS that make up the framework for supporting our faculty.

We also have the Office of Innovation, which assists faculty with development and protection of intellectual property. The Office of Research Compliance, Integrity and Safety takes care of all the non-financial compliance aspects of research and scholarship. The financial aspects occur in SPA, but everything else is with the Office of Research Compliance. A fourth program that we formed in the last couple years or so, is the Office of Federal Relations, which you've heard about already. These four offices constitute an essentially obligatory framework for institutional scholarship and innovation; it ensures the faculty have the assistance they need and ensures we are respectful of regulatory and compliance requirements. We formed a fifth program in the last year. There were elements of this floating around, but now it's actually a recognized program with its own budget line to support faculty: Faculty Research and Development Support program. It has four components - the competitive programs, which is our intramural program to assist our researchers; our award programs; our external mentoring program; and finally our core facilities programs, which involve instrumentation and high performance computing.

We have some research centers that focus resources and personnel on specific topics, like faculty development, which is for things like start-up money for new initiatives and new faculty, and cost matching for all sorts of scholarly activities.

Over the past year, because of budget limitations, we've been focusing on professional development by updating and extending our PI Academy. We've been broadening the instrumentation program by starting up a program with a vendor who has a quite aggressive and attractive cost sharing program for instrumentation. As Dara pointed out the return on our investment has been excellent. In FY15 NIU received \$30 million in sponsored funding of which about \$4 million in indirect costs were recovered compared to an investment of something on the order of \$1.4 million during that period. Indirect costs allocated for operation of RIPS and reinvestment was allocated for research and scholarship. The increased investment in this program increases research again and indirect costs. By investing in research we actually not only increase our reputation that we get more indirect costs to support research and other activities in the university. An excellent example is the accelerator research concentration which Dara mentioned in her talk, which was initiated in 2014 with Fermilab. External funding attracted by the concentrations has generated more funding than currently invested in the center. At a cost of about one million dollars to date they've guaranteed about \$3 million in collaborative funding with Fermi Lab and \$2.7 million in external funding. It's a direct result of a deliberate investment we made in a concentration with a partner that we could leverage. Interestingly enough we now have arguably the largest academic accelerator program in the country. We have a number of areas of research and scholarship that can develop into strong concentrations like this and that's the discussion we're currently having with the deans. Looking forward, the task force recommendations strongly endorse expanding university scholarship and innovation. They were very specific for the Division of Research and Innovation Partnerships and recommended enhancement of the faculty development program of Sponsored Programs and of the Office of Innovation. In response to those recommendations we have presented a plan to the Executive Budget Committee and President Baker which features expansions of those programs including resources for additional research concentrations and expansion of SPA and Office of Innovation. With these proposals, the total RIPS budget would reach almost 2% of the total university budget. A few closing comments; we continue to provide the infrastructure for supporting research and innovation, that's our bottom line. As resources are available, we increase our direct support to faculty. Over the past we've made real progress reducing impediments, but as I said there's much more room for improvement. An expansion of key programs would significantly enhance the research enterprise and our ability to compete for students and faculty and to retain them. Thank you.

Chair Murer thanked Dr. Blazey for his leadership and commitment to research and innovation. Continuing, she stated, it also strikes me in listening this morning that what we have is a crew team and we have to make sure that all our oars are in the water at the same time going in the same direction. We had evidence of that I think from Dr. Long's comments representing the Faculty Senate. I think that we saw with the provost and finance that you're solving problems. Certainly the leadership from the president's office knows that this is important and I think also the fact that this Board of Trustees deemed it appropriate to make this a standing committee. I'll always be grateful for that because I think it really indicates from the Board level that research is really at the epicenter of what we do at this university and it helps propel us to the future. Thank you everyone and thank you for your comments.

OTHER MATTERS

No other matters were discussed.

NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting of the LARI Committee will be at 9:00 a.m. on November 17, 2016.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Murer made a motion to adjourn. Trustee John Butler so moved and Trustee Marc Strauss seconded. The motion was approved. Meeting adjourned at 10:13 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathy Craddock
Recording Secretary