**Creativity, Discovery, and Innovation Focus Group**

**Thursday, May 19**

**9 Participants:**

**What do the terms creativity, discovery and innovation mean to you?**

* It means novelty: new ways of doing things, new behaviors, new technologies
* Cross pollination is my key word. Getting different departments together and building bridges. When you get people together you come up with new thoughts and innovations. I do my best work when I am working with a diverse set of minds. When we work with people, or groups, outside of our normal areas we can come up with more creative solutions
* To make new materials which will have new applications.
* Discovery for me points towards research and using our research to develop processes that are creative and innovative.
* A diverse team that works on solving a problem. Getting diverse thoughts and backgrounds will create a better product which has a wider application.
* Agree, when you work together as a team this creates a better product.
* First thing that comes to mind comes back to research. Using terms ‘creativity, discovery, and innovation’ is important because sometimes the term ‘research’ is too narrow. I appreciate when research is connected to ‘creativity, discovery and innovation,’ because just using the term ‘research’ can be very limited and limits us in terms of what can be done, or what is valued. This can limit creative or innovative processes.

**What does ‘novelty’ mean when we are thinking of CDI and what does collaboration look like?**

* In my field of Chemistry, collaboration is in making new nanomaterials. These can be given to medical schools who can take them and test. They then collaborate with health providers and patients. Collaboration means having a real-world impact from our classrooms to our labs and finally to our community partners.
* Agree. It should be translational because significant problems demand a multidisciplinary approach. It must take partnerships, but it must be translational and impact the communities that we live in. This means that the research needs to be applied and reach the communities that we are serving. We need to make that impact.
* My work is in the policy arena so finding those gaps in research that helps lead to better outcomes. For me I have not seen a lot of internal collaboration at UND, so it is people across the country that I have been collaborating with. Working state to state to see how we can help each other in our work.
* My undergraduate degree was chemistry and then joined the Air Force. I ended up in Minot working in production control. I then got an MBA. When I retired from the Air Force, I went to work for the health department. I then went back to school, and it broadened my view and helped give more a wider perspective on things.
	+ This is exactly the kind of thing that we want our students to get at UND – develop the skills and competencies to address problems and understand the value of lifelong education and global perspectives.
* Novelty, from my perspective, it is related to new products, and new technologies (by new, I mean not used before). These should be more efficient, less costly. We have to be able to achieve things that were not achievable in the past. We need to improve the techniques and also the materials. New understanding for research. Discovering new systems and materials.
* For collaboration, we would benefit from different people, perspectives and those with different backgrounds. Different ideas and opinions can complement or be different, but the product or results will be better if we just try to conceive something individually.

**What are the existing vehicles for collaboration at UND, and what are some of the obstacles to effective collaboration?**

* As a graduate student, both our research papers and some of our projects are teamwork orientated. From my experience this is the only vehicle for collaboration that I have seen.
* The vehicles, from my experience, have been individual faculty that have reached out. I have not experienced a lot of set, institutional vehicles for this at UND. An obstacle that I have found is that we are rather siloed. There are a lot of similar things happening, but unless a faculty member reaches out to other faculty members then we remained siloed.
* One challenge at UND is understanding what true collaboration is and where to go with it. If I find people that think just like me and I work with them I can check that ‘collaboration box.’ But, what does real collaboration look like and how do we move things into the novel/new area. Often it means people that disagree with us or have different approaches need to be involved in the collaborative process. I don’t see this happening a lot from my perspective. In terms of silos, if UND wants collaboration then where does it show up in our policies or incentives? How does the institution show this is something it values? The structures that exist right now do not promote collaboration.
* For the vehicles I would say the main vehicle is the faculty or staff that show the initiative. We do discuss and communicate with others, and we try to break the silos, but it is not easy. We want to share, but we need to communicate better. How to do this and in what context? How can we express the need for collaboration, and what part of our projects we need to collaborate on? People need to be encouraged/ incentivized to collaborate. To do that we need to know how to measure collaboration.
* I agree regarding the very limited definition of productivity in research and scholarship. Also, all tracks of faculty should be given opportunity for scholarship, not just tenure track faculty
* Conflict and difference negotiation training might be a good addition. A new culture would need to be nurtured. In “Daring Greatly” by Brene Brown she talks about ways to create safe sharing and innovation strategies and prerequisites.
* One method of collaboration may be offering equivalent classes in different departments, for example a research class that qualifies for the requirements of multiple departments-students from different programs would be alongside each other and more likely to “cross-pollinate” and generate novel solutions to stated problems. Asking the community what needs are being seen and having community-university collaboration (for example, Counseling student developing a caregivers of children with special health needs support group program in response to a need identified/requested by a local occupational therapy clinic).
* Another novelty may include developing new programs to assess needs in the state. For example, there are not enough psychiatrists in the state. One solution may be to create collaboration between social work, counseling, clinical psychology, medical sciences, nursing, law and create a post-graduate psychopharmacology program and advocating for relevant ND laws.
* Communication. It can be an asset or an obstacle. To communicate you have to get out from behind your desk. Find out how people are doing and what they are doing. Have to do this to get people to work as a team.
* A reoccurring team is that departments want more autonomy but also more avenues to make clear to the institution, alumni, community what our work looks like and why we do what we do.
* I agree with the necessity of leadership being involved and supportive of faculty creativity, innovation, and discovery.
* Where do we see faculty rewarded for doing these things? If these are important (and I 100% agree they are) where do we see these rewarded? These things should be with the faculty who do the work with collaborating in teaching, pedagogy, etc. We need to start with rewarding this innovative work for faculty.
* I agree. Our college wants to be innovative, but with budget restrictions we can only do so much. We are stretched thin when it comes to teaching and keeping up with the research. My clinical and research work has become a ‘hobby’ due to my teaching load. This has been frustrating. Non tenured faculty don’t have the protections of tenured fcaulty, so we reduce the incentives to collaboration and innovation because we are not protected in our research. We cannot be protected without tenure.
* When UND created it PhD in scientific computing, and they had to collaborate with people from different fields to get your degree. You can now get a straight PhD in computer science which has removed the incentive for collaboration. An unfortunate turn of events in the computer science department.
* Second what is being said on the structural incentives -and trust- both need to be there and built between the institution and the staff. I love the idea of collaborative options for advanced degrees!
* There is an increasing reliance on non-tenure track faculty that have higher teaching loads while still having the expectation that they maintain service and research. Doing a 3/3 or 4/4 load this is hard to do when you still have expectation to have the research or service built into the contract.
* When I worked for the health department, I realized that hospitals are not run by doctors, but by administrators that are business folks.
* Not always the best things for patient outcomes when you have nurses/doctors not involved in the meetings. This can translate to what we are doing here at the school. Faculty governance and where does that factor into the decision making.

**How can the institution better support faculty, staff, and students in creativity, discovery, and innovation work?**

* I’ve been working on a project that has included 11 ND institutions. It is a big effort from UND, NDSU and other institutions and a great opportunity to collaborate with many faculty members. We need to do more of this, have more cross-institutional approaches as well.
* After I retired, I was on the school board. I had the opportunity to do strategic planning. Question was “what is our product- is it the student or the community” ultimately it is the student that we are turning out and how they will contribute to the community. We should think about how our students will do in the workforce, not just while they are in school.
* Let faculty do the teaching and the research and not the administrative work that is getting pushed on us. I don’t want to market, recruit, or focus on retention. Anything that takes away from my teaching and research, what which is what I am were hired to do, is not supportive. So much of the work that we do does not fall under these buckets. We have a lack of support staff. We need more staff that can help take this load off faculty.
* We are getting bogged down by bureaucracy.
* We need staff supports that help us with this research. I want to bring in research but I don’t have the administrative support to do work the system while also teaching and trying to keep up with the research side of things. We create too many unnecessary barriers. Too many forms, and forms to ask for forms…
* If UND wants to improve creativity, discovery, and innovation they need to create the conditions that allows that to happen. We need to make sure that our teams can do our jobs well. If this is important to UND it needs to be prioritized and we need to create the conditions for success in these areas.
* This resonates with the educational mission of the institution. One of the reasons that our faculty need time to work in their fields is because it trickles down into the classroom. This is the ideas regardless of discipline. If we are staying up to date in our discipline then this will trickle down to our students.

**Are there any final thoughts you would like to share with the Creativity, Discovery, and Innovation work group?**

* As far as who is served, this list could be endless. Communities can be affected (local, national, international). If given a supportive environment- create those right conditions- then we have an infinite possibility of what can be accomplished here.
* I would want to know who can make decisions in this area? When I think about higher education and creativity, discovery and innovation – it is faculty that is doing this. If faculty are doing it then they should make decisions around it. But are they and will they be able to going forward?
* Looking at how you measure success - sometimes it is not quantifiable. You know it when you see it. We have to look out for each other. If there is something affecting our performance in creativity, discovery and innovation you have to be able to respond to this. You must be able to make decisions on a daily basis. One measure of success is how the team is functioning together.
* UND can help with forming closer industry connections. We have limited connections with industry and I believe we can do more with this.
* One (soft) metric might be what new connections we have bridged and sustained in the next 5-10 years? Are we better connected with the region, government, arts communities, etc. Are we communicating and connecting better with those areas than we are now?
* I think having more awareness about big & small projects, the labs and their foci, and ways to connect or invite collaboration with each other on campus (e-letters? Webpage?) might also help promote creativity, discovery, and innovation.