

**Research Council Minutes**  
**Tuesday, December 12, 2017**  
**3:30pm – 5:00pm**  
**President’s Conference Room**

VOTING:

Reijo Pera, Renee

Arlitsch, Kenning

Beamish, Rollin

Bekkerman, Anton

Cloninger, Mary

Gee, Regina

June, Ron

Kinion Elizabeth

Peyton, Brent/Robin Gerlach

Ruff, William

Thorsen, Andreas

Walk, Seth

Wiedenheft, Blake

NON-VOTING:

Hoo, Karlene

Leist, Terry

VPSS rep: Mitchell, Jim

Mokwa, Bob

Schmidt, Leslie

Sheehan, Jerry/Jonathan Hilmer

Singel, David

---

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes: November 14, 2017

- Approved

III. Presentation on the CRAEA

- Wendy Stock presented CRAEA through the use of the attached PowerPoint

IV. Discussion of CRAEA

- Discussion was had with Wendy about various topics of the CRAEA with the suggestion of an external advisory board being added as the current advisory board seems a little too internal
- Wendy left the room
- More discussion occurred about types of funding being decided for a university with an unanimous concern and discontent about being told who could provide funding.
- Recommend to President Cruzado that the Center be approved.
  - The vote was unanimous with Anton Bekkerman abstaining due to his relationship with the CRAEA
- It was then decided a summary of the discussion would be appropriate which Leslie Schmidt would write

V. Summary

- Research Council held its December meeting on December 12<sup>th</sup> and the main agenda item included a presentation by Dr. Wendy Stock on the Center for Regulation and Applied Economic Analysis (CRAEA). The presentation included the mission of the CRAEA and the numerous accomplishments in the first year of funding from the Koch Foundation. The CRAEA has worked to establish interdisciplinary programs that include Research Fellows, both graduate and undergraduate student scholarships to various colleges, an annual conference and a Visiting Scholars Program. The required annual progress was submitted to the Koch Foundation and the year two funding has been received.

After hearing the presentation, Research Council members had a discussion about whether the Council and/or the university wanted to put parameters around the sources of extramural funding and what the potential implications for academic freedom might mean. The group feels strongly that it is not appropriate to modify or restrict potential funding sources/opportunities for faculty members to pursue their areas of study and knowledge. The current internal review processes in place are meeting the needs of the institution.

The Research Council members also discussed how centers are established and managed on campus. Renee lead a discussion about how the BOR approval process works and the advantages, purpose and intent of starting a center. A subcommittee was put in place last year to conduct a review of existing research centers and the results of this review are available. The Research Council plans to develop policies/procedures for establishment, review and sunseting of current and future research centers.

Prior to putting forth a motion to approve/disapprove the CRAEA center status request to the BOR, the Research Council had two specific suggestions for Wendy Stock:

- To establish an external advisory committee
- Preference for open data whenever possible

One person was concerned that the current structure and work of the CRAEA is too narrow to function as a true center, the perception was that the majority of funding was only being distributed within one department. However others felt that the CRAEA is functioning as a center and when the vote was cast, the Research Council approved the request to move the CRAEA forward for BOR review/approval.

- Jonathan Hilmer clarified his position by following up with:
  - I would like to clarify my comments regarding the appropriateness of CRAEA as a Center. It is my opinion that a Center should serve functions beyond the distribution of funds. In the example of CRAEA, it is an appropriate and necessary role as a Center to provide a competitive and merit-based distribution of their funds, especially in this case considering the magnitude and origin. However, they should strive to support the research mission in other ways as well. Example could include supporting new interdisciplinary research projects, hosting regular events such as seminars, and improving awareness of the Center's work both within and beyond the MSU community. The departmental boundary is not a specific benchmark with respect to these activities, but I feel that inter-departmental research is a good indicator that a Center is helping to promote unique and synergistic research which would not occur in the absence of that Center.

I am not sure if the provided materials are part of the mission statement of CRAEA, but it was welcome to see this statement: "CRAEA explicitly encourages research by interdisciplinary teams in order to facilitate collaboration and communication between researchers with different intellectual training and perspectives." I support the inclusion of such objectives as part of their official mission, and adhering to those objectives will hopefully increase the interdisciplinary projects, which I count as 4 out of 44 total: Sturman, Kerin, and Shehryar; Dinerstein and Stock; Ippolito, Maxwell, and Bekkerman; and Penoyer, Sturman, Kerin, and Shehryar.

The Visiting Scholars Program, Conference Program, and Workshop Program are all excellent efforts that highlight how CRAEA would be a useful Center. I suggest that these could be further improved by more frequent Center activities, such as seminar series or other meetings. I support the creation of CRAEA, and recommend that they consider these minor changes.

On the topic of CRAEA approval, I support comments made during the meeting that we should include a brief explanation of our “yes” vote. I recommend highlighting that creation of CRAEA will produce a rigorous oversight structure, which would be an additional safeguard against any biased financial influence. Likewise, adopting an open data preference for the entire Center (including actual support for the mechanisms of open data workflows) will help assuage public concerns.

**Next Meeting January 9, 2017, 3:30pm,  
President’s Conference Room**

**Amended Summary of Research Council’s December 12<sup>th</sup> Meeting:**

Research Council held its December meeting on December 12<sup>th</sup> and the main agenda item included a presentation by Dr. Wendy Stock on the Center for Regulation and Applied Economic Analysis (CRAEA). The presentation included the mission of the CRAEA and the numerous accomplishments in the first year of funding from the Koch Foundation. The CRAEA has worked to establish interdisciplinary programs that include Research Fellows, both graduate and undergraduate student scholarships to various colleges, an annual conference and a Visiting Scholars Program. The required annual progress was submitted to the Koch Foundation and the year two funding has been received.

After hearing the presentation, Research Council members had a discussion about whether the Council and/or the university wanted to put parameters around the sources of extramural funding and what the potential implications for academic freedom might mean. The group feels strongly that it is not appropriate to modify or restrict potential funding sources/opportunities for faculty members to pursue their areas of study and knowledge. The current internal review processes in place are meeting the needs of the institution. These include financial review, intellectual property rights, compliance, conflict of interest, right to publish, ownership of data, and institutional commitments.

The Research Council members also discussed how centers are established and managed on campus. The VPR lead a discussion about how the BOR approval process works and the advantages, purpose and intent of starting a center. A subcommittee was put in place last year to conduct a review of existing research centers and the results of this review are available. The Research Council plans to develop policies/procedures for establishment, review and sunseting of current and future research centers.

Prior to putting forth a motion to approve/disapprove the CRAEA center status request to the BOR, the Research Council had two specific suggestions for Dr. Wendy Stock:

- To establish an external advisory committee
- Preference for open data whenever possible

One person expressed that a Center should serve functions beyond the distribution of funds. In the example of CRAEA, it is an appropriate and necessary role as a Center to provide a competitive and merit-based distribution of its funds. However, a center should also strive to support the research mission in other ways as well. An example that was given included supporting new interdisciplinary research projects, hosting regular events such as seminars, and improving awareness of the center’s work both within and beyond the MSU community. The consensus of the group was consistent with this definition given above and felt that the CRAEA is functioning as a center and when the vote was cast, the Research Council unanimously endorsed the request to move the CRAEA forward for BOR review/approval.

**Initial Summary and Responses:**

Research Council held its December meeting on December 12<sup>th</sup> and the main agenda item included a presentation by Dr. Wendy Stock on the Center for Regulation and Applied Economic Analysis (CRAEA). The presentation included the mission of the CRAEA and the numerous accomplishments in the first year of funding from the Koch Foundation. The CRAEA has worked to establish interdisciplinary programs that include Research Fellows, both graduate and undergraduate student scholarships to various colleges, an annual conference and a Visiting Scholars Program. The required annual progress was submitted to the Koch Foundation and the year two funding has been received.

After hearing the presentation, Research Council members had a discussion about whether the Council and/or the university wanted to put parameters around the sources of extramural funding and what the potential implications for academic freedom might mean. The group feels strongly that it is not appropriate to modify or restrict potential funding sources/opportunities for faculty members to pursue their areas of study and knowledge. The current internal review processes in place are meeting the needs of the institution.

The Research Council members also discussed how centers are established and managed on campus. Renee lead a discussion about how the BOR approval process works and the advantages, purpose and intent of starting a center. A subcommittee was put in place last year to conduct a review of existing research centers and the results of this review are available. The Research Council plans to develop policies/procedures for establishment, review and sunseting of current and future research centers.

Prior to putting forth a motion to approve/disapprove the CRAEA center status request to the BOR, the Research Council had two specific suggestions for Wendy Stock:

- To establish an external advisory committee
- Preference for open data whenever possible

One person was concerned that the current structure and work of the CRAEA is too narrow to function as a true center, the perception was that the majority of funding was only being distributed within one department. However, others felt that the CRAEA is functioning as a center and when the vote was cast, the Research Council approved the request to move the CRAEA forward for BOR review/approval.

#### **Addendum Additions:**

The person above clarified his/her position by following up with:

- I would like to clarify my comments regarding the appropriateness of CRAEA as a Center. It is my opinion that a Center should serve functions beyond the distribution of funds. In the example of CRAEA, it is an appropriate and necessary role as a Center to provide a competitive and merit-based distribution of their funds, especially in this case considering the magnitude and origin. However, they should strive to support the research mission in other ways as well. Example could include supporting new interdisciplinary research projects, hosting regular events such as seminars, and improving awareness of the Center's work both within and beyond the MSU community. The departmental boundary is not a specific benchmark with respect to these activities, but I feel that inter-departmental research is a good indicator that a Center is helping to promote unique and synergistic research which would not occur in the absence of that Center.

I am not sure if the provided materials are part of the mission statement of CRAEA, but it was welcome to see this statement: "CRAEA explicitly encourages research by interdisciplinary teams in order to facilitate collaboration and communication between researchers with different intellectual training and perspectives." I support the inclusion of such objectives as part of their official mission, and adhering to those objectives will hopefully increase the interdisciplinary projects, which I count as 4 out of 44 total: Sturman, Kerin, and Shehryar; Dinerstein and Stock; Ippolito, Maxwell, and Bekkerman; and Penoyer, Sturman, Kerin, and Shehryar.

The Visiting Scholars Program, Conference Program, and Workshop Program are all excellent efforts that highlight how CRAEA would be a useful Center. I suggest that these could be further improved by more frequent Center activities, such as seminar series or other meetings. I support the creation of CRAEA, and recommend that they consider these minor changes.

On the topic of CRAEA approval, I support comments made during the meeting that we should include a brief explanation of our "yes" vote. I recommend highlighting that creation of CRAEA will produce a rigorous oversight structure, which would be an additional safeguard against any biased financial influence. Likewise, adopting an open data preference for the entire Center (including actual support for the mechanisms of open data workflows) will help assuage public concerns.