Committee co-Chair Sachin Shetty began the meeting welcoming members, briefly reviewed last week’s meeting, and discussed the topics for the meeting. The plan is to identify smaller working groups to divide up the work and do further deep dives into topics to come up with pointed and specific strategies.

Dr. Shetty posed the first question, “What does it mean to be an R1 institution?” The committee’s conversation included the following points of discussion.

- The topic of what does improving non-faculty research was asked
  - At a prior institution one member discussed how a group was created to help visiting faculty, research scientist, non-tenure track, and post docs feel like they were part of the research enterprise. This helped with culture change and reduced silo issues.
- VMASC works to identify and secure a broad range of contract vehicles which helps address gaps between projects. This can help create viable pathways for non-faculty researchers.
- The current tenure process is not a great fit for VMASC researchers as much of their work is classified or closely held and cannot be published. This leads to a struggle in being promoted.
- VMASC looks to create promotion pathways for staff who may not have Ph. D’s but are contributing to research.
- This area was suggested as a topic for one of the working groups.
- Bryan Porter in the Graduate School had begun working on a group to improve the sense of belonging for post docs prior to the pandemic, believe he is looking to resume this effort.
- Ways to have staff continue working between projects should be explored which will help with retention; should consider pathways for non-Ph. D staff to get their degree at ODU; should consider funding support for this as well as exploring ways to have fringe costs covered as projects currently have to cover this element.
- The idea of gap coverage is an important piece that should be considered as part of the financial model.
- The IPA model currently utilized by VMASC was discussed as a good example of efforts to embed faculty with government sponsors for a finite period of time; these programs help faculty develop insights on how these entities operate and develop relationships with them.

The committee began a discussion the need to address the culture and the atmosphere of the university and its importance in being able to execute the ideas that will be developed.

- Many things like stipends, health care, etc. have been identified in the past, but in some cases they have not been able to be executed.
- There is an atmosphere of struggling to do the small things here on campus; an example of changing a dissertation form was shared which took two years to enact.
- We need to address the primary problem of the ability to make continual improvements along the way; we need to be able to identify issues and move on them.
- Being nimble and able execute is what it means to be an R1 and would be a vital ingredient to moving forward.
- This area was suggested as a topic for one of the working groups; it should be a part of the university’s fabric and will benefit everyone.
- We should set realistic goals that can have big impacts; the example of the health care initiative for graduate students was shared; the lack of health care was a big impediment to attracting
students; the university made a financial investment which positively impacted graduate recruitment by offering health care to graduate students; the committee should look for other changes that are not necessarily monetary but will make an improvement for solving issues

The committee began a discussion of workflow and processes that present challenges to faculty researchers.

- A need to streamline internal processes, workflows, talent management for all types of researchers are all important elements of an R1 school. We should be considering how to utilize digital technologies to make this happen.
- Administrative duties of faculty researchers present many challenges in managing time and accomplishing research projects.
- An organizational structure that would help the right things get done with the right people at the table should be considered; this would allow an improvement of governance and oversight of prioritization and follow through on things
- The committee should not only come up with items to improve, but also find a way to execute and work on them.

The committee discussed the importance of marketing the R1 status and what it means to the public as well as the state government.

The committee continued its discussion addressing the topic of students which addressed the below elements.

- How do we continue to enhance the quality of the students that ODU attracts? Can we improve or admission strategies to help us enhance the pipeline of students?
- The GEM Consortium was discussed as a valuable tool which has allowed the Graduate School to recruit high performing minority students to ODU
- It is a challenge to compete with other schools who have more resources available to support their recruitment of graduate students

Dr. Shetty provided a summary of the areas to be addressed:

- Execution of Strategies and Initiatives – perhaps the most important
- Financial support/Career Advancement/Education
- Process for faculty performance evaluation/Administrative Burden for Faculty
- Financial Support
- Improvements in governance, oversight, prioritization
- Investment in infrastructure
- Enhancing quality of students

The group also began to identify members of the three groups breaking down Systemic Change into two smaller groups.

Post R1 Culture/Systemic Change – Effective execution of strategies and initiatives

- Culture – Michel, Mecit, Phil, Shanan, Charles, Chunqi, Ryan
- Process – Eric, Doug, Liz, Adam, Tihomir, Masha
Goal for Funded Research – IPA, faculty support

  - Barry, Sachin

Goals for Arts & Humanities

  - Saikou, Heather, Nancy

The meeting concluded with Dr. Shetty saying that we will finalize the groups next week to allow people who were not at the meeting to join one. He will send a follow-up asking folks to select a group. The next steps will be a discussion of the budget, determine the charge of each group, and then have the groups began working in their respective areas to later report back to the full committee.