

**ORED Strategic Planning Process Meeting**  
**SSRC**  
**September 4, 2007**

- I. As an Institution
  - A. Attract and graduate more doctorates
  - B. Attract more post-docs
  - C. Achieve high graduate rates – less attrition at departmental level  
Can we compete one-on-one with a U of F? Their student body population is high. Can we revise these measures based on per-capita or per 1,000?
  - D. There is a disconnect between technology/mentoring more students vs. time/financial support for research.
  - E. More overhead back to departments/units/Pi's.
  - F. Fund faculty – initiated research more fully, completely.
  - G. Do not “tax” research centers – Do not penalize research and funding success.
  - H. Focus/nurture PhD granting departments – increase stipend to graduate students, make competitive with other peer institutions.
  - I. Sponsored Programs has improved, but need more improvement.
  - J. Sponsored programs should view themselves as a service and support to researchers, they are not gate-keepers.
  - J.2 Sponsored programs need to become proficient at electronic submissions and forms. Often times, sponsored programs, not the PI, must submit documents and forms.
  - K. IRB process needs to be more timely, stream-lined.
  - L. For IRB, institute appeals process or a “worthy relationship” that balances approval of research with regulatory compliance.
  - M. MSU needs a quantitative core – a unit of bio-statisticians to provide technical assistance on grant proposals and grants.
  - N. MSU needs competitive pay to retain quality faculty.
  - O. Bring to bear the considerable intellectual resources of the university to improve the “quality of life” in Starkville.
  - P. More supportive environment for your research faculty – protected from high class loads, committee assignments, service responsibilities, stronger faculty support from senior faculty, etc.
  - Q. More “high-tech” classrooms. Change class schedules to M/W or T/Thur. only. Make class periods equal and drop Friday classes.
  
- II. From our Unit (SSRC)
  - Assets in Place
    - A. We look after our students very well (Assistantships, research associates, post-docs).
    - B. The SSRC is a draw to active researchers.
    - C. Developed and responsive research infrastructure in place.
    - D. The SSRC offers and opportunity for trailing spousal hires – provided that they are research viable candidates.

- E. The SSRC provides both developmental and bridge funding. This provides research continuity and eliminates staff/student turn over.
- F. The SSRC is entrepreneurial and relies primarily on competitive grants.
- G. Strong and balanced leadership. Creates a nurturing environment.

From our Unit (SSRC)

Barriers to Overcome

- A. Taxes on research funds. This is a huge disincentive and a disruption. (25 accounts).
- B. Lack of in-house statistician support for sophisticated proposals (NIH, NSF, etc.)
- C. Lack of access to electronic journals (especially health journals)
- D. More efforts to integrate research faculty into the university community – to eventually build collaborations on research.
- E. Recognition on campus of research accomplishments.
- F. Facilitate cross institution collaborations.
- G. Academic department members do not understand the concept of “soft money.” Why we do not volunteer for non-funded activities such as