***Academic Services Committee***
***Monthly Meeting Minutes***
***February 10, 2011***


**Committee Members Present:** Amy D'Unger, Marlit Hayslett, Peter Hesketh, Moon Kim, Helena Mitchell, David White (Executive Committee Liaison)

**Committee Members Absent:** Nancey Green Leigh, Margaret Loper, Caitlin Manley (student representative)**\***
***\*Due to a change in jobs, Tyler Walters is no longer on the committee.***

The meeting was called to order at 9:31 AM by chair Helena Mitchell.

Dr. Stephen (Steve) Cross, Executive Vice-President for Research, was the invited speaker. All members introduced themselves and Helena shared the duties of the Academic Services Committee. Steve began by providing the history of his position, which is relatively new at Georgia Tech (though not entirely new, as there was an EVP for Research when Georgia Tech first became a Research I institute in the early 1980s). Dr. Cross said that it was a new model for him, as he was used to his role in the Provost's Office. His job is to support faculty and students in conducting research by providing leadership and resources. The new role is a reflection of President Peterson's desire to bring all research components of the Institute together (e.g., GTRI, the Enterprise Innovation Institute, research centers, GTRC, etc.). The new strategy will be revealed to the public in the spring and will be consistent with the plans of the new Provost.

Steve worked with Chet Warzynski and Bill Rouse in the formation of the Institute's Strategic Plan (SP). He stated that the SP should address the practical aspect of the GT education and also preserve cultural elements (the "experiential" component). Dr. Cross stated that he particularly liked the "What does Tech think?" portion of the vision statement in the Strategic Plan and views it as a metric for what the Institute can become. He cited a *New York Times* article on aging that looked to commentary from MIT and stated that Tech will be successful when we are the ones referenced as the experts, not MIT.

In the mission portion of the SP, Steve indicated that he particularly liked the goal of "advancing the human condition." The Board of Regents actually rejected the initial mission statement because they thought it sounded "too liberal arts," but President Peterson persuaded them that Georgia Tech must be engaged in the context of the larger world and that innovation, public services, and entrepreneurship go hand-in-hand. Steve said that one goal of the SP is to make Tech known as the "Innovation Institute," with innovation embedded across the curriculum. The Inventure Prize and the TIGER Program are two examples of this. An innovation taskforce is being assembled and will provided resources such as an Innovation Bootcamp for faculty members, an Innovation Fellows Program for a one year sabbatical to study innovation, and Innovation Zones for industry to encourage an embedded industry presence (e.g., Exxon, Conoco, Dial,

Southern Company, Philips, etc.).  There are also currently 20 wet labs and office space in the ES&T building for startup companies.  In addition to innovation, Tech should be viewed as a campus that is globally engaged and provides a friendly living and learning space for foreign students and researchers and must also be more proactive in creating a virtual campus world for prospective students, alums, and current students.  All of these goals will have a potential effect on the master plan for campus space.

Dr. Cross indicated that Governor Deal has made draconian cuts in the education budget, including cuts to the Georgia Research Association.  The GRA is currently working with the Department of Economic Development to determine strategic markets for Georgia.  At Georgia Tech, fiscal issues include funding for interdisciplinary research centers, physical infrastructure, lab space, office space, etc.  There are currently 18 major research centers on campus, and an additional 178 others centers, labs, or institutes (not including the 12 – 13 centers in GTRI).  It is unclear whether this is too many, or maybe not enough.  One thing that must be done is develop "theme areas" that will better allow Georgia Tech to market itself to industry, which is difficult to do with so many individual centers.  Currently, Communications and Marketing, GTRC, the Development Office, and the Enterprise Innovation Institute are working on identifying research support areas, diversifying research portfolios, and determining the best way to appeal to industry, which could also result in increased money from the state.  The Development Office and Communications and Marketing are putting together a Research Support team that will work across centers, thereby being able to engage with large corporations on behalf of all of Georgia Tech, reducing administrative work for centers and providing more resources for faculty.  Research support could also be instrumental in prototyping of larger projects, adding agility to the system, and facilitating an increased level of communication with actors outside of Tech.

Discussion then turned to Dr. Cross's most recent initiative, the creation of IPaT (Institute for People and Technology), which is being directed by Dr. Beth Mynatt. According to a Georgia Tech news release, IPaT will "catalyze research activities, create new economic development opportunities, and address important societal problems. It will support various college research centers that collectively pursue transformations in healthcare, education, consumer media, and other complex human enterprises by integrating advances in human-centered computing, architectural and digital design, policy, and system science and engineering" (www.gatech.edu/newsroom/release.html?nid=64010). IPaT will invest in "test beds" for start up companies, like Wesley Woods does around issues of aging at Emory University.  Steve stated that the institute will be able to help with scalability and will focus on "grand challenges."  Issues of electronics and nanotechnology, materials sciences, national security, paper science and technology, energy and sustainability, biotech/biomed/bioengineering, and manufacturing and logistics will be of particular interest to the new institute.  IPat will bring together many centers on campus, representing every college at Georgia Tech.  Dr. Cross also noted that there will be changing rules on project budgeting that should result in more money being credited to the colleges and schools, as opposed to the larger institute, and that oversight and accountability should be made more clear.

The discussion then moved to the new focus on institutional practices and how Tech can best manage itself ethically and efficiently. President Peterson launched this in September with ten initiatives that Tech had already begun. The question of how to improve the administration related to research is an important one, and Dr. Cross stated that a better intranet with automated support is being introduced on a trial basis. There will be a new budget director and more discipline and organization in finances and managing overhead.

Peter then asked about intellectual property issues, particularly with the desire to better integrate and embed industry on campus. He pointed out that industries might actually be in competition with each other, therefore hesitant to potentially share space on campus with a competitor. Dr. Cross stated that appropriate firewalls would be put in place in the industry space so that multiple companies will be able to share the same facility. There may also be additional space for government entities such as NIST, Oak Ridge Laboratories, etc. He also acknowledged that companies may want exclusive rights to innovations, and that there was a current experiment with Exxon underway in which they pay a fee for exclusive rights for four years, pay the patent costs, and then retain non-exclusive rights after the four years have ended. These types of policies will be necessary in order to be "industry friendly." Working to be friendly to industry can also bring in state money. If the state government sees Georgia Tech engaged in work that can create jobs, it may contribute to infrastructure costs.

Helena stated that this seemed like an opportunity to bring research and academic faculty, or the applied and the theoretical, together. Dr. Cross stated that this may be true in some cases, but will require a larger cultural shift. There is room for both, so mutual respect must be fostered in order to best generate innovation. Helena stated that she hires academic faculty into her center (CACP) in order to build bridges and that tensions diminish if the faculty are working collaboratively on exciting problems.

Peter stated that he was very pleased to hear about the increasing importance of/focus on innovation and that there will be more help for startup companies. Dr. Cross gave the examples (generated from a December 8, 2010 meeting of Institute leadership) of the "Burdell Institute," a student-led project, including a dorm "filled with electrical and mechanical things," and the Ivan Allen Institute for Advanced Studies.

Discussion then turned to how the Academic Services Committee can help in all of these areas. Dr. Cross views the ASC as a "barometer" for reading research and academic faculty experiences, including their intellectual health and well-being, culture, and morale. In other words, ASC can be a "sanity check" in the midst of these large-scale changes—in other words, does what he is doing make sense?

The discussion with Dr. Cross was concluded at 10:24 AM and the committee turned to internal business after his departure. Committee members discussed how to best serve as a "barometer," and Amy suggested that the proposed "Campus Climate Survey" could be one source of data on morale and well-being. Peter emphasized the importance of communication between actors on campus, which turned to the absence

of the student representative.  Tyler Walters's departure for a new job at Virginia Tech was also discussed.

David suggested that Helena send a note to Chris D'Urbano, who is chairman of the Executive Board Nominations Committee, regarding the resignation from ASC of Tyler Walters (accepting a new position at Virginia Tech) and need for an interim member until the next time the position is open via campus wide elections.  David also suggested it would be a good time to also bring up the issue of an ASC student representative and if there is a way to promote the value of service in student venues.  Helena agreed to send an email to Chris.

The committee members were asked by Helena to reflect on today's meeting with Steve Cross and at the next meeting present what each member saw as a priority list of things to do that might assist him in his "sanity" check.  Also to think of a statement to the executive committee that might assist their efforts in implementing the SP, allowing for more agility in view of small budget cuts next year.  For example…provide questions to research faculty as part of a larger survey; barometer on cultural issues by finding out more what is percolating around campus; suggestions on equity of overhead return/flexibility in overhead rates for innovative or transformational research projects; student representatives on committees; etc.

The meeting was adjourned by chair Helena Mitchell.

Minutes Respectfully Submitted by,

Amy D'Unger
Secretary, Academic Services Committee