• A Learning Community for framing crosscutting themes through active participation of faculty from social sciences, humanities, life sciences, architecture, education, and engineering… (Mistree)

• We cannot discover CCT’s at present.

• The presentations and slides were not in a format that allowed for a good comparison and determination of commonalities

• Rather than recommend a final selection of one or more CC themes, have VPR invite people to develop teams (inter-disciplinary) who would work up themes over 6 months-1 year, and at the end of the period teams do presentations addressing stated criteria

• In general, there ought to be CCT’s- but we are not able to identify any well at this time. So- we should set up a call for groups to show examples of CCT’s at work. At the end of a fixed period, the groups present, and a choice can be made on the basis of actual experience.

• It seems that OU would like to be invited to join the A.A.U. 7 of 11 public schools in the (former) Big 12 are members: UT, A&M, ISU, COLO, KU, NEB, MO. Part of the Criteria for AAU invitation appears based on research funding. Roughly, Nebraska has approximately $192 million/year of research expenditures; Missouri has about $149 million/year. OU’s research expenditures are about $147 million/year. OU should set a goal of increasing research expenditures in $25-50 million/year. To do this, it is prudent to look for sources of new money and CCTs can be a vehicle.

• I am concerned that the meetings and discussions have been rather male-dominated (i.e. there were apprx 23 males and 5 females today). Most of the airtime was dominated by men.

• No themes can be determined by this non-representative body.

• Network science and engineering is quite broad and had some overlap with the following themes: social justice, (unclear), (unclear), Anthropology (philosophy), Informatics, (unclear)

• Curriculum should be designed to advance research themes

• Research theme should facilitate cultural change by explicit flexibility to faculty interests.

• USOs were selected in a formal process. OU has invested in these. The USOs have many of the properties sought in a cross-cutting theme. These “seedlings” should be integrated as leaders of Aspire 2020 (but not to the exclusion of new ideas).

• There are multiple themes that have the potential to reach across campus. They have different strengths, and require about 6 months to 1 year to develop, before it can be judged whether they are success-able or not

• Recommendation: VPR should invite potentially collaborative theme proposals to meet/organize in fall to prepare formal proposals for 2-3 research themes

• Recommendation: May and Heather should prepare report based on their interpretations- make it public- allow comments as addendum. Submit to VPR office

• Sustainability and Social Justice: but we’re not in position to recommend, suggest, or ‘select’ CCTs
• No theme today. Suggest process (periodic, transparent)
• No theme because there are no clear rules for how VPR will use recommendation
• No theme because there are no rules!! (when repeated, how much $, how VPR will selected)
• No themes because USO’s are not involved
• No theme today because few hard numbers ($, papers, collaborations) provided
• No theme today because cynicism from those not here
• No theme because it excludes people who have no presented themes
• No theme because process is not periodic and thus divides into winners and losers
• No theme because there is no budget and thus can’t evaluate if theme is reasonable
• No theme because- it must be done periodically with assessment
• Action Team #2 activities created many good ideas. Some of these ideas are well suited as campus wise cross-cutting research themes. These ideas, as well as other potential ideas, should be further explored, and a process developed to selects CCRTs.
• We should not be making selection!! Process needs to be from bottom up! Needs to continue and be transparent. (K. Milton)
• Sustainment and sustainability can be combined. Informatics could become a natural partner. Large-scale systematic approach is key. Shiva, Muralee, Farrokh, David, Sridher, KT: all have presented ideas/teams that have significant overlap. We can piggy-back on existing center of excellence.