

# Research, Entrepreneurship and Innovation Committee Meeting-20260219\_124519-Meeting Recording

February 19, 2026, 5:45PM

1h 11m 45s

 **Philip Rubin** 0:02

OK, uh, Jim, why don't you take A roll call?

 **Rockwood, Jan** 0:06

Excellent. Thank you everyone. Today is February 19th, 2026. This is the Board of Trustees meeting for the Research Entrepreneurship and Innovation Committee member. To start off, it is now 102 in the afternoon and for roll call we have Doctor Philip Rubin.

 **Philip Rubin** 0:27

Uh, here.

 **Rockwood, Jan** 0:29

Thank you, Mark Boxer.  
Sean Dunn.  
Thank you, Richard Vogel.

 **Dunn, Sean** 0:39

Here.

 **Rich Vogel** 0:41

Here.

 **Rockwood, Jan** 0:43

Tim Shannon.  
Konstantine Drakonakis.

 **Konstantine Drakonakis** 0:53

Here.



**Rockwood, Jan** 0:54

Thank you.

Constantine And then we've got a University Senate representative, Professor Horea Ilies.



**Ilies, Horea** 1:05

Yeah.



**Rockwood, Jan** 1:05

Thank you, Professor Dr. Rubin. We do have quorum.



**Philip Rubin** 1:10

That's great. Do we have any public participation in the meeting today?



**Rockwood, Jan** 1:16

No, we do not.



**Philip Rubin** 1:19

So I'd like to get a motion and a second to approve the minutes from the December 10th, 2025 meeting.



**Rich Vogel** 1:29

So move Vogel.



**Philip Rubin** 1:30

Rich Vogel moves any second.



**Ilies, Horea** 1:32

Second Dunn.



**Philip Rubin** 1:34

Is there any discussion of the of the minutes? Any corrections? Any changes? Hearing none all in favor, say aye.

**RV Rich Vogel** 1:47  
I.

 **Rockwood, Jan** 1:48  
Hi.

**PR Philip Rubin** 1:48

All right. Anyone opposed?

Anyone abstaining? The motion is carried. That's wonderful. So welcome everybody. It's great to see you. This is going to be in a committee about research, entrepreneurship and innovation. This is going to be a meeting about innovation today, and that's our focus. I'm.

Lighted that so many people have attended. We do have at least three presentations, so we have a lot to do in a short amount of time. So I'm going to just move right into it. And so we're going to start.

By hearing from Lindsay Dr. Lindsay Di Stefano, who's the from the Office of the Vice President for Research, and she's the interim.

Vice President for Research and Innovation and Entrepreneurship, and she's going to provide a research update. Lindsay, thank you.

**DL DiStefano, Lindsay** 2:49

Yes, thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. I had to double check what time it was. Some exciting news before I kind of jump into this is yesterday if you I had the pleasure of attending.

A meeting sponsored by the Department of Energy on the new Genesis mission, which if you have not heard about yet, please definitely take a look at it. Basically, the Department of Energy's goal is to develop an A I platform that with rigor, you know, high quality.

Validated that can be utilized to start with to address what they've identified are 26 lighthouse challenges initially. But the goal will be that, you know, additional challenges and much of science can be.

Can be done using this A I platform in the future. So they are really going to be promoting teams that are have components of academic institutions, industry partners, philanthropic efforts as well as the national labs so.

**IH** Ilies, Horea 3:51

Mhm.

**DL** DiStefano, Lindsay 4:00

They're seeing, you know, the goal is to really capitalize on the capacity and some of the technology and expertise within the national labs and then the domain scientists coming from universities. So I have pages and pages of notes that I'm about to throw into AI to get a nice summary sort of generated that I'm happy to share along, but. If you haven't seen it, take a look Genesis mission of Department of Energy. So with that some overall, I just given the volatility of the past, I guess what we're at 13 months within the recent federal research landscape, want to make sure that we're sort of keeping you all in the loop of.

Of what's happening. And so Jan, you can progress to the next slide.

Yeah. So we're a little over, we're a little over 1/2 of the year, right at this point for FY26. And so this table just to Orient, you know, it's got the stores and regional campuses as the first, you know, 8 rows, then UConn Health and then the last.

8 rows are the combined, right? So our overall institution, which those numbers are what's reported to like the NSF herd data, you know, and our sort of overall rankings data. And so every month we get sort of this output and now taking a look at it, you know, we haven't broken out proposals, new awards.

Active awards to give you just an understanding of, you know, the volume that you know our research enterprise is managing and then the indirect cost. So again those are the costs that are being reimbursed to the university and then the expenditures. So actual, you know how we're spending this money, so.

We've been monitoring this closely obviously for the past, you know, year more than ever and now we definitely can see some, you know, trends that you know our proposals especially in stores are a little bit lower than than they have been FY25.

Please note that started off really strong. So you know that's always an important factor to consider. But you know that that proposal number going, you know it's 493.7 compared to FY24 at this time was only 509, but the number of proposals right is down 70. That's you know.

OVPR is kind of like, we need to dig into that a little bit more. But the, you know, sort of more concerning thing that's starting to really show up is the new award number. It seems to be, you know, a lot lower. So that is something we are watching and I'll

show you.

And the next slide in a second where we think that this might be coming from and what we're working to do about it. Expenditures are still stable and good, which drives, you know, further indirect cost reimbursement. You know, those numbers are still coming in well. Those always lag a year or two behind the new awards.

So as we see our new awards dropping, we are going to anticipate that in FY27FY28, you know the indirect cost recovery to the university that's going to start to decline. UConn Health still remains pretty strong, which is great if you think about.

Sort of what the federal priorities are around the health and biomedical sciences. We we are awesome, right? Our strength areas matching well with the federal priorities in the areas of rare disease, neurodegenerative disease. So that's all of the work in Parkinson's aging neurology.

The cardiovascular diseases and then the promotion of health, right, the promotion of Wellness. You know, these are huge strength areas for UConn already and UConn Health that we need to continue to dig into. So if you can go to the next slide, Jan.

So what we're seeing in a lot of the federal agencies, especially within NSF and NIH, we all know that their staff were dramatically reduced over the past year. And so for that reason as well as probably some other reasons it the agencies are choosing.

Choosing to award fewer new awards, but for larger dollars. So NIH, for example, they used to only get, you know, sort of distribute the funding one year at a time.

We're starting to see in some mechanisms that they're actually putting the full award out there and so it looks like.

You know to you know Outlookers that they are spending down their money, but they're doing it in a very different way. So what this is, is it shows this is UConn and UConn Health combined, OK. And the FY26 data is only through January. The other years are the full years.

So when we look at NIH, for example, the red column here, so this is what we've received already from NIH. And if you see like this is 2023, you know we're a little, we're right around half of what we had in 2023. So we're not necessarily.

Lower, but we this is still an area of concern for us because what we know is happening at NIH and our research administration colleagues and this is across the institutions across the country, you know they're reporting that they're seeing sort of influxes of awards from proposals.

That came in and sort of end of 2024. So there's definitely this backlog. And so those are the things we're looking at. NSF is a big concern right now. So NSF is always, you

know, we generally are not competing as well with NSF as NIH.

But NSF funding, just overall in some universities, some of our peers and even aspirants have reported over the past three months a basic stall. We're not seeing a complete stall. We have seen a couple new awards, but not on pace of what we would expect.

We're hearing rumors, including one of our faculty members just came back from a couple of years serving as a program officer within NSF, that they're looking to cut some of their signature programs, including NSF career awards. So these are things that, you know, we are trying rapidly to work with our delegation.

And other stakeholders across the country to, you know, find out the validity of this and truly what's happening. And then Department of Ed is obviously, you know, definitely in sort of a disarray. Good news is Department of Defense continues to be funded well and we are definitely competing well within the Department of Defense. You can see our FY26.

Numbers are actually, you know, equal or better than some of our previous years in total. So that's a quick snapshot of where we are from a research standpoint. Happy to answer any questions.

**IH** **Ilies, Horea** 11:03  
And.

**PR** **Philip Rubin** 11:04

Thank you. So do we have any questions?

Hearing none, I'll make a couple comments. So a couple things on the Genesis mission, for those who have not heard of it. So this is something that came out of the White House. It's being led by the Department of the Energy Office of Science. The key person there is Gary O'gil, who used to head up research at IBM and also working in conjunction with Michael Krazios at OSTP. What's unique about this program and.

It kind of points at a direction that the funding may be going and why you're seeing a little bit of slowdown at the NSF, but that may change is the not just the AI aspect, but data sharing in a certain way that's unique and in particular.

For the first time, at least in my memory, is the enlisting all of the national laboratories, places like Los Alamos and others. And again, they'll will. They don't play. I used to be at OSTP. They don't play well with each other. They're all great.

But it's, you know, a different time and I think that there will be opportunities there and there are other opportunities. There will probably be an announcement soon also about a new director of the National Science Foundation.

And that person, who I know is also an acolyte and has worked as the Chief Operating Officer in the past. He worked at HHS, but also as the Chief Operating Officer for Peter Thiel, who's played a big role. Michael Kratsios, who was at OSTP, was his chief of staff.

And so you're kind of seeing an alignment with that that relates to AI, quantum data sharing and other things. And I think the idea for other areas is to make sure that work continues, remains innovative, but people are aware of.

Other things going on and how they can make sure that their work doesn't change but fits in with those plans and those things are possible. We can talk about that more in the future. Are there any other questions?

Hearing none. And in the Yes, go ahead. I'm sorry. Oh, I see. Hi, Konstantine. Yep.

**KD** **Konstantine Drakonakis** 13:31

Hey, Doctor Rubin. Yeah, hey, no, no problem. Yeah, I put my little hand up. I'm just wondering, is there any collaboration or at least coordination with the R1 universities around this project?

**DL** **DiStefano, Lindsay** 13:32

Konstantine.

**PR** **Philip Rubin** 13:47

Yeah.

**DL** **DiStefano, Lindsay** 13:47

Around Genesis.

**KD** **Konstantine Drakonakis** 13:49

Yeah.

**DL** **DiStefano, Lindsay** 13:50

Yeah. So the Department of Energy invited institutional leaders from all across the country from R1 universities to come to this meeting yesterday, as well as I I think I

want to say all national labs were represented by at least two or three people as well as industry partners. And so there was a, I think.

I think there were about 500 people in the room and it was, they did a really great job of we did a ton of brainstorming together. They, you know, came to the table saying that they wanted feedback and ideas and that's, you know, that's what was created. I mean, obviously we'll it may be seen exactly how they roll it out.

It sounded like most people felt like some initial funding announcements, RF PS would be released in early March. So obviously a very quick turnaround and the initial feedback was that there would likely be sort of stages of funding in this space that included sort of competitions.

Like not your traditional grant competition, but rather a competition to put a team together representative of all these types of partners and you know, do some sort of problem based competition to solve, you know, a short challenge and then receive some seed money and come to a workshop.

Job those types of strategies.

**KD** **Konstantine Drakonakis** 15:08

Yeah.

Got it. Thanks, Lindsay.

**DL** **DiStefano, Lindsay** 15:12

Mhm.

**PR** **Philip Rubin** 15:12

Yeah, and from the R ones, I mean some of the major concerns about this stem from the physics community, which traditionally the Office of Science and the Department of Energy is actually their main source of funding, not not NSF, though NSF is a secondary source.

And like every field that's out there, everybody tends to be a little conservative and traditional about, well, what's this? Why is something new going on? Again, I I've worked for three different presidents. And I will say that whenever a new administration comes in, even if it's in the same party, priorities change.

There's actually no news. I'm not saying nothing was new and novel over the last few years. Particularly people are very concerned about the precipitous drop in the funding rate at NSF and the change in staffing. But change in priorities is an actual

reality and I will commend the physics community.

Which is where I started. They know how to play this game very well in the in the long run. So even though they may raise some concerns, it's good to raise concerns. And yes, there's a lot of conversation going on.

In many ways, across many entities, it's it's very new. The one real positive for people who happen to have worked with him and Nome is I do think that Dario O'Gill plays a key role and he's really an innovator and has been for years. He's very open.

And willing to talk about stuff. That's the good news. The bad news, and I think it's going to impact the kind of slide we saw, is the change in staffing, you know, which happened for other reasons, isn't going to help across any place and when you start a new activity.

Even at energy, you know, it's going to be hard to get the things up to speed, but you know that'll come with time. Are there other questions?

**DL** **DiStefano, Lindsay** 17:12  
Thank you, Philip.

**PR** **Philip Rubin** 17:14  
Thank you. That was excellent. So next, I'm pleased that we're going to hear a presentation by Michelle Cote, the lead instructor of the Connecticut Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation, the School of Business.  
And the interim director of the Worth Institute, Michelle.

**CM** **Cote, Michelle** 17:34  
Thanks. Thanks so much, Doctor Rubin. Good afternoon, everyone. It's wonderful to see you all. I've had the privilege of working with and or meeting many of you individually over my last 10 years as a member of the faculty at the School of Business.

**PR** **Philip Rubin** 17:36  
Yep.

**CM** **Cote, Michelle** 17:51  
There I am attached to the Connecticut Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation, have led many, led the development and the instruction of many of our signature

programs, including Accelerate UConn, which is the NSF I Corps initiative that's been at UConn for 10 years, CCEI Summer Fellowship program.

And I was delighted to be asked in October to take over as interim director of the Worth Institute. That part of the work that I do at the university comprises about 50% of my time, and the rest of the 50% of my time is allocated to the School of Business Initiatives and Community.

Outreach, some of which include support of quantum work that I get to do with JIT as a part of the workforce development things that we do. And so the the role at Worth is really kind of defined by two large pillars.

And one of them is a review of the programming that's executed by the team at the Worth Institute. And the other is trying to develop better relationships amongst all of the innovation and entrepreneurship leaders that we have across the university that had been done by something that was called the Innovation.

And Entrepreneurship Consortium for a while about 10 years back, and prior to me taking on the role of interim director at Worth, Amy was kind enough to pull together an innovation and entrepreneurship task force across the university and since stepping into the role at.

Worth has asked me to lead that initiative. So what I want to do with my time with you this afternoon is to bring you up to speed on what we're doing with the Innovation and Entrepreneurship Task Force at the University and provide you with a little bit of preliminary findings, but most importantly to ask for your input on a couple of critical topics.

And hopefully we'll be able to find a way to to continue the dialogue past the 15 minutes that I have this afternoon. So with that, I will bring up a short set of slides that I've developed just to provide you with a little bit.

Of an overview of that work.

And let's see, here we go. You're probably seeing my messy desktop, so apologies on that. Now are you seeing the slides?



**Rockwood, Jan** 20:19

Now we're seeing your screen.



**Cote, Michelle** 20:21

Oh boy.

The permissions that I have don't allow me to grab a window. You always have my back, Jan. Thank you.



**Rockwood, Jan** 20:26

That's OK, I've got them fired up.  
What I'm here for, all right.



**Cote, Michelle** 20:32

All right, excellent. So this work has been convened. We were operating roughly between October and June, so the academic year. The overall charge when we go to the next slide is to conduct a review.

An assessment of the of the work that's being done in innovation and entrepreneurship and provide actionable recommendations to the OVPR and Office of the Provost. And so we're well underway in doing that.

Wanted to share the approach that we're taking in making that happen. So we've introduced the logic model that many of you are probably familiar with in terms of evaluating the way that programs work and their outcomes. The next slide kind of provides you with a refresher of that framework, but the place that.

What we started is not in the inputs or even the purpose of programs, but rather a focus on outcomes. And the reason that I decided that that was the the best place to start is really outcomes should be the things that are driving program design.

And there are a couple of slides at the in the appendix that show the difference between the purpose and an outcome of a program. But the purpose is what you're trying to achieve. The outcomes is how you know if it is actually happening or not. And so the first step that we took and there's sort of three parts of this work, the arc that we're doing together in the next slide.

Is we started in the fall and before the end of the semester asking subcommittees. So there are four different subcommittees of this group. And I should also mention that in addition to Amy and Lindsey and Jit, Amit Kumar and Daniel Weiner, who are a part of the task force, are also on this call. So please.

Please feel free to to chime in and and add some color here from your perspective.

But the three phases of of work are really to work through in subcommittees in mapping the purpose and outcomes of each of the different types of innovation and entrepreneurship activity that are occurring throughout the university.

And for us to be able to understand the depth and breadth of what we're already

doing, the second phase, which we're about to launch with the subcommittees, is going to be sharing out the outcomes that we're all working on and then moving into a.

A conversation around the constraints that we each feel as leaders of these initiatives to maximizing the impact and the outcomes that we're trying to achieve and identifying those as places where we want to make recommendations for how to overcome them. And then the third phase of this work is going to be compiling the recommendations.

Foundations that we that we bring to OVPR and to the Provost's office. So the next slide shows a little bit of the preliminary findings. And I wanted to pause here because it was really interesting when we got the subcommittees together, one of the first questions that came up.

Was well, what counts as innovation and entrepreneurship activity at the university and what doesn't? Does it mean revenue generating programs? Does it mean things that inspire innovation amongst people, but not necessarily the development of new ventures or the commercialization?

of technology or are we really just talking about new business formation and growth? What What are we, what's in bounds here? And so one of the things that we did with the results of the outcome mapping and and program mapping work that we've done in phase one is compile this matrix

Of different categories of innovation and entrepreneurship activity at the university. Some see this as a pipeline or a continuation towards one ultimate goal. But really I think what's important about this is it helps us to understand.

How we are organizing activity to inspire not only development of new commercial entities with either technology or ideas, that kind of thing, but also thinking about seeding skills in exploration, discovery, creativity, innovation.

And.

Problem solving as its own end point for those who are looking to not necessarily start, found, grow new ventures independently as a startup, but join the innovation economy in other ways through jobs in their first 10 to 15 years out of.

School. So just a quick review of of this. This is probably intuitive to many of you since you you work in this space, but it's important to sort of point out that there is a there's a distinct difference between programs that inspire exploration and discovery at the very, very beginning.

Of an innovation journey, those that take the momentum and energy that people

feel coming out of those and translate that into creativity and problem solving. Understanding once we know that we live in an imperfect world, what we can do to try to address market.

Fail.

Solve problems that we see that are posing significant challenges to society, and the next step in that process is innovation. So figuring out how to take a theoretical solution and turn it into something that actually.

Will solve the problem. So this is all of the work that we do around experimentation, prototyping, iteration of things and much of the technical discovery work that we do across the university and labs. That's sort of like the halfway point of of the the spectrum here, the next piece of it.

Is integrating how we support the incubation of technology that leads to scalable and sustainable solutions from those innovations and then builds in a business model through entrepreneurship and then.

After that initial business model is created, supports business sustainability and growth, the things that lead to those long tail numbers of outcomes around revenue, capital raise, jobs created, all of those different types of things. So I wanted to pause here to see if anybody.

Had comments or questions on this as a framework for all of the different types of innovation and entrepreneurship activity that take place at UConn.

**PR** Philip Rubin 27:33

Any questions? Concerns. Yeah, Rich Vogel, you go ahead.

**RV** Rich Vogel 27:35

Michelle, if you thank, thank you. Nice to see you again, Michelle. It's it. It's been a while and this is wonderful. Thank you for for presenting it. I would just make a a plea for remembering and for finding and and growing, you know the.

**CM** Cote, Michelle 27:39

Good to see you.

**RV** Rich Vogel 27:55

Incredible students. We've got undergrads that have kind of the genetic code, you

know, the DNA for entrepreneurship. And you know, as we go through the framework, I think it's important that however we staff.

**CM** **Cote, Michelle** 28:01  
Mhm.

**RV** **Rich Vogel** 28:10  
The Worth Institute or or you know whatever hubs are at the university that that it is very accessible to to the students who want to sit down with you one-on-one and and kind of work a problem and work a business that hands-on side of this has. Produce just just some remarkable graduates and I I I would just ask that we don't lose that feet on the street in in in the students face kind of element of of of what the Worth Institute has been. It's it's just been remarkable for for a whole bunch of students.  
You know.

**CM** **Cote, Michelle** 28:51  
Awesome. I I appreciate that observation. And one of the things that's really interesting out of this process is that, you know, sometimes the assumption is that you can start here sort of in technology incubation and entrepreneurship and achieve those outcomes.  
And what's really, really important as we've been mapping this is that you have to start much earlier, to your point, Rich, in the journey and be available to students, provide them with experiential learning opportunities to practice creativity, problem solving, discovery, really help them to understand that as a foundational skill before we can expect.  
them to hop over here and be successful.

**RV** **Rich Vogel** 29:31  
Yep. And and the curriculum, I don't know what we've got for coursework, you know, in in early stage entrepreneurship, but some of the most remarkable stuff happens in those classes, so.

**CM** **Cote, Michelle** 29:41  
Yeah, absolutely. Awesome. So the other piece of the puzzle that I just wanted to

share with you is a preliminary heat map of some of the the numbers of programs that we've identified that fall into each of these categories. So Jen, if you can help me out by advancing to the next slide, we'll see.

The distribution here, and this is just very cursory. I've gotten so much of this information back from stakeholders in the last week or so, so we need to dive deep and do some more analysis. But it's interesting to see the distribution in terms of numbers of programs and where they're focused.

So you know there is a relative sort of large investment sort of here in this middle. It certainly suggests that maybe we need to think about more access to opportunities at the early stage of this pipeline and then when we're thinking about the things that allow our, our, our.

Startups and new ventures to grow, there may be some additional capacity that we need to be thinking about in terms of getting them to the next step. So this is just number of programs and I would invite a conversation on here, but the next slide shows some of the things that I think are key questions and next steps to be able to really unpack this a little bit more and so we need to understand.

Understand just not the number of programs, but how many students and faculty do each of these different initiatives reach? We need to understand how to think about framing some more significant outcomes for early stage exploration and creativity, much to Rich's point about, you know, the value of that and what that means for the. The university and then the the other, you know, key questions are what's it going to take to enhance the offerings that are critical and critical program categories? And then are we equipped to deliver the outcomes that are most important to the university and other critical stakeholders?

And so some of the the work that we're we're going to do is think about creating logical program pathways that help people participants move from one stage to the other and better sequence and handoffs. We're also going to be really diving deep into the constraints around increasing activity and the impact.

That activity in each of those different categories. But the thing that I wanted to ask of you during during this time today was a little bit of input and it's framed on this next slide. Jan is saying, you know, as practitioners of this work at the university.

We know the last one. We know the outcomes that are important to us, but thinking globally at the university, and this is from your perch, what do you believe are the most important outcomes of innovation and entrepreneurship activity that we should be?

Targeting as we move through this analysis process.

So Jen, I think you're ahead, but the appendix on here shows who's been involved in it and it has a couple of more definitions. But the key question, and we don't need the slide for this really, is what are the most important outcomes of innovation and entrepreneurship activity from your point of view? Is it revenue back to?

The university. Is it attraction of top talent? Is it prestige and awards? And what are examples of those? So that's what I would like to ask of all of you this afternoon.

**PR Philip Rubin** 33:05

So on that, are there any volunteers, any suggestions to address that fascinating question? It's a big topic.

**CM Cote, Michelle** 33:17

It is a big topic. I wanted to introduce it and I hope that we have follow up on this.

**PR Philip Rubin** 33:18

Of course. So we've we've got a hand up before we get to that. Of course, my answer would be all of the above. But in any case, Jit, go ahead.

**CM Cote, Michelle** 33:23

I.

**BA Banerjee, Abhijit** 33:30

Yeah, I think it is. It is all of the above. You cannot compartmentalize it and say that one is important than the other at a time when we have unprecedented funding situation.

And the university has to focus on alternative ways of bringing in revenue, bringing in dollars, monetization efforts. That is critical. Uh At the same time, that is also critical for getting the confidence of the faculty.

IT that they are able to raise money if they're in a startup. So certainly revenue is an important part, but what I think is critical here and doing an outside in perspective.

And Washington University in the last six years, I I think we do not do enough in the upstream events, which is training and and teaching of faculty and students. We do some, but I think.

We have 36,000 students, 34,000 students. I would expect that given their, given their

ideas that they have and and and.

Things they want to accomplish in the new world. We should have more and more of these entrepreneurial programs for students and and that should be a priority for the university, similarly with the faculty.

It is just not. It is just not OK a course on how to start a company, but I would probably go as far as to say.

Having them also do sort of a secondment at a startup for a few months so that they actually learn what it makes, you know, what it actually means rather than just the classroom. If they don't understand a cap table, it does not make sense.

If they are starting a company, right? And they can't understand us many of these things unless they are, they are immersed on it. So I think, I think it'd be important for us to start thinking more out-of-the-box. So I'll stop there.

**PR** Philip Rubin 35:54

Konstantine.

**KD** Konstantine Drakonakis 35:57

I I can't agree more with with Jit on that and I'll just put a finer point on it because he hit most of what I was going to say. But I think the long term investment here is to help obviously the students be very successful, so successful.

That they end up being a return on investment themselves like and I think looking at Yale and Josai and what they've done there in and around innovation is a great model. So we can, you know, help mentor and.

Support students to be successful entrepreneurs to the point where they then want to, you know, provide support to the university endowment, but also to specific programs. I think that's the longer-term vision that I'd like to see sort of put into the strategy.

**PR** Philip Rubin 36:49

Thank you, Lindsay.

**DL** DiStefano, Lindsay 36:53

Yes, Jed, I just want to echo support for what you just shared. And that was, you know, going back to the Genesis meeting yesterday, that was actually a big talking point of pushing undergraduate students, but especially graduate students, PhD level

students to do, you know, sort of six months at, you know, a start-up company, six months, you know, with another industry partner.

And you know, build it into, you know, sort of the redesigning what a PhD degree, you know, actually what what society needs it to be now and how we can change that so.

**PR Philip Rubin** 37:24

So I want to thank everybody. In the interest of time, we're going to have to move on, but I invite you to interact directly with Michelle, Lindsay and and others on this if you have suggestions. Also, if possible, if Lindsay and Michelle could share their presentations.

Give them to Jan if you're not able to for the committee. If you're not able to, that's fine too. Again, time is short for today's meeting, so if there's not anything else immediately pressing on that, I'd like to turn it over for our.

Next presentation by Mano San Agnosto, who's the director of the Innovation Partnership Building, and I assume he has journeyed here from his previous meeting, which was running long. And there he is.

Thank you.

**AE Anagnostou, Emmanouil** 38:19

Oops.

Thank you, Sir. And yes, I we had a DOE meeting that's going on. I had to jump off, but I really think, I think I want to thank you for having me here today to talk about some tech Parker updates. We talked about student opportunities and I hope this.

Next endeavor that Tech Park is going. Actually let me do presentation mode so you can see better.

Um, he? Oops. Yeah. Can you see that?

**PR Philip Rubin** 38:52

Yes.

**AE Anagnostou, Emmanouil** 38:53

Yes, that this would actually open opportunities for our students. So in the tech part we do, we have outreach to a number of companies and some of the recent of course having some recent additions, we're at full speed right now the the, the, the,

the IPB especially building.

Is at full capacity with C2E2's move, but most importantly some of the new company additions like Assab Loy, which providing funds for sustainable manufacturing focus, of course some startups.

Or centers that are faculty oriented based optical science technology hub. But we do have collaborations going on with a number of companies right now at different levels. Casella, Trains, Nider, the Water Corporation that actually contributed a major instrument and the Harvard that opened a.

Student Fellowship program on power systems. So we do hope this will grow significantly. But what I want to talk to you today is about Flame, which is a new center that we established.

On semiconductor testing and laser technology with Testcan and this is the frame actually kind of a new way of envisioning I would say collaboration with the industry and and I just I wanted to start by.

Kind of giving you the pathway of that of that partnership. So obviously it started with a innovation that was established was by Sina here in IPB and eventually that led through multiple and.

Projects and innovation support funds that he received SBIRS, STTRS and through the TIP program into a technology that got the attention of a major company, international company.

And Tescan, which is again in the semiconductor instrumentation business, they expect around generally the approach scene and they said, OK, how about we acquire your IP? We acquire your company.

And then she brought them to IPB and I met with them around Mark's time frame and we said what if we you were to be here and accelerate the IP instead of taking the IP and going. So they didn't like the idea initially, but eventually.

As a business which was actually funded by Carlisle, a major investor, they were a little bit concerned about being in a university environment, but then I brought Gin on board and then Gin and I, we really worked out something that we felt.

Is mutually beneficial and that led into an MOU that establishes the company's R&D and small scale industrialization in IPP agreements. The MOU was signed. SESCO is here.

And then we are, we're in the last stages of signing the contractual agreement. I think it's going to be done very soon. Now with that said, Nescan is a big company as I mentioned. I just want to give you a shout out a little bit about their technology.

They are in the business of both.

3D X-ray laser, optical microscopes, scanning electrons and they're actually covering the whole scale from centimeter to nanometer. So they're competing with some of the other big companies that we also have here.

Also presence in IPB. Now what is important about them is their will. They're coming from Europe and they are willing to establish their business in US, a big part of the business in Connecticut.

In UConn Tech Park, even furthermore that recently we heard that the company that Carlyle exited or is exiting and they are SIMaju Corporation is acquiring the company at the full scale. So the entire company now.

Corporation puts that at a different level in terms of instrumentation, types of capabilities and global growth. We go way beyond now the semiconductor manufacturing business to instrumentations for batteries, health, life science.

Water, everything, environment. So that's big, big news for us.

Now I want to step back and open this conversation about what the lessons, what really different here is different here with the flame center. You know on the left side, I mean we, I think we are bringing a structural shift and we are testing it obviously.

From from their traditional approach where we create IP, we license the IP, the IP exits the ecosystem to a more embedded partnership where where the company acquires the IP, stays within us and then we have.

R&D, workforce training and manufacturing all at the same place and all interacting and and of course collaborative and and that enhances our economic growth and retention.

So with that in mind, I just wanted to kind of give you some some numbers obviously of what flame entails. The initial investment of course was about \$30 million. Not all came to UConn. That \$30 million includes.

The acquisition, I mean the the employment of a number of specialized experts, the acquisition obviously of the Femton innovation company, but also the cost for R&D, which the cost for R&D that is happening now in IPV.

Is in the range of five to \$7 million. The company brought and eventually by April will have brought to IPB about \$4.5 million of equipment that will be open for use by our research faculty.

They also made some infrastructure improvements, but very importantly, they hired back our PhDs and they brought them back to UConn. They're all downstairs now,

experts now that they're advancing.

Semiconductor work. They also gave us money for student fellowships and we hope that this number will grow as their business grows and their and their funding grows.

They they built a clean room that we didn't have in IPP and now we can we have a clean room and it's gonna be used also for our research purposes.

And and of course there are licensing patents from UConn and they they pay their dues to they pay fees and royalties. But very importantly they're they're hiring top names and they're bringing them to UConn.

And I can give you a, it's a, it's a two or three people who already have been targeted and they're coming, they're coming to UConn. And the the last piece is the future potential. They they're going to be applying to major federal funding and that is going to be jointly with UConn.

So with that, I just want to give you a little bit of some of the future vision where we go, where we can go from here. Number one, I mentioned about funding. So the company will go after major semiconductor initiatives, of course.

US Chips Act and Science Act is a target for the US piece of the company, but they're also going after European Chips Act and of course the major Asian, but those are the different other businesses that they have around the world.

The other thing is the Simaju test scan alignment. That is something that we should work really close because that brings Simaju to UConn will expand our global instrumentation ecosystem. Hopefully Simaju can contribute.

Instruments and also help us enhance our inspection metrology and analytical integration all at UConn Tech Park. Now would that mean that we can also hope from some expansion of the test scan manufacturing in the vicinity?

Of IPB question number one, would that mean that that will help grow Connecticut's advanced manufacturing cluster here? Question #2. Now with that even further, I can even dream something beyond this, right?

So can they be the magnet, the catalyst that would actually help us grow into a IPB 2.0, meaning an ecosystem that of companies of of expertise or industry partners I would say that cover all aspects?

Of semiconductor business from design to fabrication, inspection, verification and failure analysis. These people are coming here. We have, we had Samsung, we had, we had, I think Dell came. We also had.

We're gonna have Apple coming in. Several companies are coming to, of course, to evaluate the instrument, the unique that's built here. But at the same time, these

companies are bringing people to IPB who can then network with our own. Faculty and leadership to identify ways to grow business opportunities and collaboration opportunities. And of course that all it goes along what we said, capital investment, advanced manufacturing jobs, additional funding and workforce pipeline retention and of course IP that's retained with us.

And I want to close with, of course, some challenges, because all of that requires that we pay attention to some aspects that are critical to making this happen.

Number one is the pace, the way industry goes versus university. We experienced that here in IPB. We managed to to get things under control and and run and we have both thumbs up both from the company and Carlisle. So I'm I'm really.

I'm thankful to everybody who has contributed to this. It was not a pave and easy, easy, easy path. We but but we have other things legal and contractual agility. I need to think about this. We the contract is still under an under negotiation.

We need the state to be engaged with the Terpark to remain competitive and I I have some ideas there and then and then we need the broader university engagement.

We need to know, we need to bring all the expertise to show that capacity that we have to supply talent and.

And expertise and I mentioned about leveraging semiconductor powerhouse within the tech part and then long term partnerships and engagement planning and I'll post here. Maybe I can stop sharing or I can.

Have so that I can see you, but I will be happy to bring back the slides and I'll I'll send the slides to Jan to to share it with everybody.

**PR** Philip Rubin 51:08

Thank you. Uh, time is short, but are there any comments? Jit.

**BA** Banerjee, Abhijit 51:14

Yeah, I I was intimately associated with Mono Sonda's deal. I I think it's it's important for UConn to start recognizing and and really thinking is Tescon had other choices when they came to us.

They were going to Boston, they were going to Austin. They were in different places in New York. But finally they chose us, which was very important. And I think we need to keep that momentum going and we need to have a strategy that is.

Universal for UConn on laying out the red carpet so that we can attract companies like Tescon to UConn, right? Each company is different, but we need to have that

strategy. Having worked at Pfizer, a company does not always partner with a university.

Because we have lots of faculty, they want to partner because they want to see can they actually work with us and we need to give them that confidence if we are to do this as a model. Beyond Teskan, Manas is working with other potential companies, one that we are.

**PR Philip Rubin** 52:20

Yeah.

**BA Banerjee, Abhijit** 52:28

Working or about to start working that the foundation brought the relationship to UConn is Voyager Technologies. It's an aerospace company. Extremely lot of potential on that and and and that allows us to grow the ecosystem because once the.

They commit themselves to be here. That allows us to have that academic industry partnership in the true model. So I'll stop there.

**PR Philip Rubin** 52:55

Thank you. So this is remarkable. And following up on what you'd says also and Manos, it's going to be something we're going to be discussing a lot, but also talking to the need for other methods of engagement, Board of Trustees participation, university-wide participation.

So this is really exciting to hear. It's been a day of innovation today, so a lot that we went over very, very quickly. So with that and in the interest of time, I'm going to ask Jan, do we have a University Senate?

Report.

**IH Ilies, Horea** 53:33

No, we do not have this week a University Senate report.

**PR Philip Rubin** 53:36

OK. Thank you and thank you for being here. Is there any other business?

Uh, hearing not.



**Rockwood, Jan** 53:44

No, Doctor, there is not.



**PR Philip Rubin** 53:47

Do Is there a need for an executive session?



**Rockwood, Jan** 53:50

There is not.



**PR Philip Rubin** 53:51

Hearing none, can I get a motion and a second to adjourn the meeting?



**Dunn, Sean** 54:00

So moved.



**RV Rich Vogel** 54:01

So moved after women.



**PR Philip Rubin** 54:02

So moved from Rich and seconded by.



**KD Konstantine Drakonakis** 54:07

Passing team.



**PR Philip Rubin** 54:07

Thank you. Any discussion of that? Hearing none, all in favor say aye.



**RV Rich Vogel** 54:16

Hi.



**IH Ilies, Horea** 54:17

OK.



**PR Philip Rubin** 54:17

Anybody opposed or abstaining? The motion passes. Before we go, I want to thank some others have been here. I see of course Dan Weiner has been here the entire time and Dan Toscano.

And we'll be seeing you all soon. And Bruce Lang has been here and many others. Thanks everybody. It's been a remarkable attendance, a remarkable meeting. Look forward to seeing you all soon. With that, we're going to end the meeting. Thank you, Jan, for everything.



**Rockwood, Jan** 54:51

Not a problem. Have a great day.



**Rich Vogel** 54:51

Thanks, all. Thank you. Bye, bye.



**Anagnostou, Emmanouil** 54:53

Bye, everybody.



**Philip Rubin** 54:54

Yep. Bye bye everybody.

● **Board of Trustees** stopped transcription