



Oregon  
University  
System

OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION  
OUS RESEARCH COUNCIL

---

MEETING MINUTES

Room 333, Smith Center, PSU  
Thursday, May 7, 2009; 10:00 am – 12 noon

**1) Call to Order/Roll Call**

Chair John Cassady called the meeting to order at 10:05 am. The following members were present: Wayne Embree, Dan Dorsa, Bill Feyerherm, John Killoran (telephonic), Rich Linton, Gary Tallman (telephonic)

Members Absent: Kirby Dyess, Ray Werner, Fred Ziari

Staff present: Maggie Bice

Others: Dana Bostrom, PSU; Patricia Beckman, OTRADI; Ken Cone, OUS; Patricia Hawk, OSU; Nancy Koroloff, PSU; Arun Pradhan, OHSU; Kate Richardson, Governor's Office; Charles Triplett, OUS; Brian Wall, OSU; Chuck Williams, UO

**2) Discussion**

**a) Update on Oregon Way Advisory Group**

Kate Richardson, Program Manager and Educational Liaison, Economic Recovery Executive Team, Office of the Governor, gave a report on the Oregon Way Advisory Group. The Advisory Group was formed by Executive Order to advise and assist the Governor in identifying, developing, prioritizing, and evaluating signature projects that will showcase Oregon's green expertise. One project has been approved – electric vehicles charging stations.

Richardson would like to gather information and put onto the Oregon Way website ([www.oregon.gov/recovery](http://www.oregon.gov/recovery)). She would like to get some direct connections to and find out what is going on with grants and the grant process at the universities. At this time, Oregon Way has no process set up but thought that the Research Council might be a good entry. Richardson explained that the Group wants to hear what is happening and get the story out about the dollars that are coming into Oregon.

Cassady mentioned that his understanding is that as these grants are awarded, the agencies will earmark these and, as they come into the institution, they will be tracked and there will be special regulatory responsibility in terms of reporting. He went on to indicate that reporting will be on a quarterly basis and some of the main questions that will be asked are "how many jobs did it save?" and "how many jobs did it create?" The institutions will have some data with a subset of grants and contracts that come into the state that will quantify economic impact.

Dorsa pointed out that it was extremely important to the institutions that it be understood that these dollars are programmatically restricted dollars. There is a concern that they will be confused with money that is coming to the universities that can be used in other ways to support other missions. As the public hears that a university got X amount of dollars, they might think that the institution doesn't

have a problem. Richardson replied that as the information is reported as to where the money is going, that sensitivity will be included.

Linton thought it would be helpful to have some idea of not only what the format and kinds of proposals that are being entertained that would be more generally for unique avenues of funding but also ones that are already being put into the pipeline. He asked if the Committee could be helpful in endorsing, validating proposals? Richardson replied yes and that the Advisory Group is still figuring out how it will be doing that. It is not a clear process.

Cassady asked if there are opportunities for the research universities to get together to partner on proposals or is that restricted to public/private partnerships? Richardson replied it isn't necessarily restricted and that partnerships are encouraged.

## **b) Update on OUS Data Workgroup Metrics**

Patricia Hawk and Charles Triplett updated the information that was presented to the Council in March. Hawk began by handing out two charts (see attachment). The subgroup found that they were all using the same description for research and it was noted that Mary Gaffney, OUS Controller's Office, had provided clarification to the subgroup on the concept about the OUS performance measure. The OUS figure began as everything that wasn't student money and wasn't state money but the subgroup is recommending using the NSF R&D expenditure data for a more precise measurement of research performance, but knowing that there is also the opportunity for that broader OUS performance measure at some point.

The subgroup is recommending that the Research Council consider a blending of the science and engineering research numbers and the non-science and engineering research numbers. Hawk pointed out that the workgroup went through all the pieces that make up those numbers and decided to leave the unreimbursed indirect costs in because it creates transparency with the NSF metric. Nancy Koroloff added that the question about the indirect costs was one of not being sure how well it was being consistently computed either across or within institutions.

Pradhan observed that it has always been hard to explain what unreimbursed indirect expenses were. Hawk replied that the unreimbursed indirect expense data point is never published in NSF. There needs to be care taken in the terminology that is used outside of the Research Council.

Discussion followed regarding the inclusion of statewide research laboratories (Agricultural Experiment Station, Forest Research Laboratory, Extension Service) in the recommended definition. The question was asked if the statewides' missions are all research or if some public outreach and engagement service is included. It was noted that on the Grant and Contract Expenditure Recommendation spreadsheet, Agricultural Experiment Station and the Forest Research Lab are captured in the science and engineering R&D expenditures but the Extension Service falls under the non-science and engineering section. Koroloff pointed out that on the question of whether to leave or take out the OSU statewides in the new recommended definition, the discussion centered on should it be comparable with the nation or within the state. Cassady indicated that if there are NSF guidelines, reporting should be the same for all land-grant research universities and, if some productivity is excluded or parsed out, the portfolio also need to be parsed out.

Pradhan suggested using four columns in the Grant and Contract Expenditure Recommendation spreadsheet : R&D (NSF definition), R&D + S&E, R&D + S&E and non S&E, and All Grants. Cassady said that he would like to move to a goal of getting to a number that reflects what the research enterprise is. Linton amplified on Pradhan's suggestions. Linton reiterated his concerns from the Council's prior meeting discussion that the campuses do not have a consistent approach to

classify a sponsored program as research or some other category (such as instruction or public service). For example, the majority of grants awarded to UO's College of Education are not classified as research grants, although research is usually an important component to the work. Linton suggested that OUS use all sponsored program awards (grants, contracts, cooperative agreements) that are processed annually through the grants and contracts offices as a fundamental performance metric. This would include all competitively awarded funds, but not gifts. A second metric could be research expenditures (including science, engineering and non-S&E research) as reported annually by NSF and allowing comparisons to other research institutions nationally. This would include data for statewide laboratories under OSU to the extent that such research expenditures are counted by NSF. In short, the first metric would provide the most inclusive way to capture competitively awarded funds, and the second would provide a research expenditures measure that can be compared to national data. Linton also suggested both metrics should be normalized to the number of faculty to indicate relative productivity. Cassady pointed out that there is a need to get closer to something the Research Council can vote on that will measure, to the extent possible, all productivity, then fine tune it.

Action: Subgroup to report back at the June meeting.

### **c) Update on Oregon Proteomics Consortium**

Cassady began the discussion stating before a budget for the Proteomics Consortium is formulated, there has to be some sort of agreement in place. Patricia Hawk was asked to put together an MOU. Pradhan had shared the model for the Oregon Innovation Portal and that is going to be used as the basic model for the MOU for the Oregon Proteomics Consortium. Cassady mentioned that while not every institution needs to sign on; however, the interest may never get to the point where it can grow at an institution where the interest doesn't now exist. A regional consortium will have impact at the federal level and there will be opportunities to go out for stimulus money.

Action: A draft MOU will be given to the VPRs for review.

### **d) OSUVF Demand/Capacity/Fundraising Goals**

Cassady began by noting last month's discussion about the UVDF discussion with Oregon InC and expressed the importance of having a good relationship with and be responsive to the Oregon Innovation Council. He pointed out that "we want to frame up the demand and capacity and have some goals and send a message to our Foundations with regard to what the demand is and what we would like to see coming in on an annual basis."

Pradhan asked about the definitions of demand and capacity. Linton replied that demand is how much is in the pipeline that would benefit from funding. Capacity is the ability to raise money. Dorsa asked if the goals should be recalibrated – will money be able to be raised in today's economy? Cassady responded that he doesn't believe there is any problem at the legislative level about the amounts raised.

Cassady went on to state the need to put a goal out there to work toward in order to get some capacity built in and show some output. Pradhan pointed out the need to set realistic goals – perhaps an annual goal and an expenditure goal; here are the types of projects that are going to be funded and to note that economic and societal impacts are not going to be realized immediately. This is a long-term investment. Linton suggested convincing the institutional development structure that when sealing a deal on a major gift, they should roll the UVDF out as an add-on strategy.

### **e) High Performance Research Computing Group**

Cassady gave a brief update on the High Performance Research Computing Group, indicating that it going well and hopefully will lead to additional consortial collaborations.

#### **f) Energy Discovery Institute (EDII) Taskforce**

Cassady reported briefly on the Energy Discovery Innovation Institutes Taskforce, noting they are right now an Oregon group with the goal of being the EDII – Northwest. They are beginning planning to get visioning and groups together to eventually compete for federal support.

#### **g) Review of Technology Transfer Systems and Processes**

Based on the aggregate of all pertinent considerations, the Attorney General has decided, effective immediately, to exempt all OUS technology transfer agreements from any mandatory Department of Justice review, including legal sufficiency review and review under ORS chapter 190. The Attorney General also will promptly and on an ongoing basis consider for approval as special assistant attorneys general any attorney the universities anticipate wanting to voluntary consult on technology transfer matters. Together, these changes should eliminate any hindrance that Department of Justice review may have created to technology transfer at the universities.

No further action is needed at this time.

#### **h) Other Business**

- Dorsa to provide a short background paper on the OHSU Medical Research Foundation
- Cassady would like input from Council on agendas
- Cassady would like Council members to think about the Council makeup

**3) Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 12:08 pm

Next meeting: June 4, 10 am – 12 noon

## Grant and Contract Expenditure Performance Definitions

### Current Performance Definition

"Total Sponsored Research & Other Sponsored Activities" combines all restricted fund expenses (Federal, State, Other Government, Private and Foundation) and excludes any financial aid activity and indirect cost recoveries. This measure represents all expense functions including Research, Instruction, Public Service, Auxiliaries Programs, Academic Support, Institutional Support and Student Services.

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
OSU	\$157,167,218	\$157,866,034	\$160,964,551
PSU	\$36,160,646	\$34,372,631	\$36,368,262
UO	\$97,980,143	\$100,962,182	\$105,018,505

Note: OSU "Statewide" research expenditures are NOT included in the current OUS performance measure definition.

### Recommended Definition

"Sponsored Research" is an aggregate of research expenditures reported in Item 1 and 2a of the NSF *Survey of Research and Development Expenditures at Universities and Colleges* (Academic R&D Expenditures Survey). Item 1 reports the total current expenditures for separately budgeted research and development (including indirect costs) for **science and engineering (S&E) R&D** expenditures. Item 2a reports total current fund expenditures for separately budgeted research and development (including indirect costs) **non-S&E R&D** activities.

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
OSU	\$227,693,000	\$231,895,000	\$233,358,000
PSU	\$32,308,000	\$30,203,000	\$35,705,000
UO	\$66,602,000	\$71,362,000	\$78,934,000

Note: OSU "Statewide" research expenditures ARE included in the recommended definition for consistency and comparability with NSF reporting. In FY08, statewide expenditures are \$66,202K or 28.7% of total OSU expenditures.



## Grant and Contract Expenditure Recommendation

Data definition – An aggregate of expenditures reported in Item 1 line J and 2a line I of the *NSF Survey of Research and Development Expenditures at Universities and Colleges* (Academic R&D Expenditures Survey). Item 1 reports the total current expenditures for separately budgeted research and development (including indirect costs) for science and engineering (S&E) R&D expenditures. Item 2a reports total current fund expenditures for separately budgeted research and development (including indirect costs) non-S&E R&D activities.

Expenditure Items Included	NSF S&E R&D (Item 1) Expenditures (Program Code 1xxxx)	NSF Non-S&D R&D (Item 2a) Expenditures (Program Code 2xxxx)
Direct Expenditures	X (Program Code 1xxxx)	X (Program Code 1xxxx)
Indirect Cost Expenditures	X (Account Code 7xxxx)	X (Account Code 7xxxx)
Centers/Institutes Expenditures	X	
Cost Sharing Expenditures	X (Program Code 17xxx)	X (Program Code 2xxxx)
Sponsored Instruction		
"Statewides" Ag. Experiment Station Expenditures	X	
"Statewides" Forest Research Laboratory Expenditures	X	
"Statewides" Extension Program Expenditures		X (Program Code 21xxx)
Sponsored Public Service Expenditures		X (Program Code 2xxxx)
"M2" Gift Expenditures		
"FS" Gift Expenditures		
Accruals (Fund Type 39)		
Unreimbursed indirect costs (waivers, program restrictions)	X	X

NSF S&E R&D Expenditures (Currently reported in Item 1)	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
OSU	189,606	189,368	188,056
PSU	28,763	26,025	27,007
UO	57,153	61,694	67,378

NSF Non-S&E R&D Expenditures (Proposed addition, Item 2a)	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
OSU	38,087	42,527	45,302
PSU	3,545	4,178	8,698
UO	9,449	9,668	11,556

Total R&D Expenditures (Aggregate of NSF S&E and non-S&E R&D expenditures)	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
OSU	227,693	231,895	233,358
PSU	32,308	30,203	35,705
UO	66,602	71,362	78,934

OSU's "Statewide" FY08 portion of the S&E R&D Expenditures is \$41,672 (in thousands)  
 OSU's "Statewide" FY08 portion of the Non-S&E R&D Expenditures is \$24,530 (in thousands)

Note: \$ in Thousands