



Oregon
University
System

OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

JOINT MEETING OF THE OUS RESEARCH AND PROVOSTS' COUNCILS

MEETING MINUTES

OUS RESEARCH AND PROVOSTS' COUNCIL

WESTERN OREGON UNIVERSITY, WERNER UNIVERSITY CENTER, WILLAMETTE ROOM

THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 2007, 10:00 A.M. – NOON

1) CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Provost Sabah Randhawa called to order the joint meeting of the OUS Research and Provosts' Councils at 10:00 A.M. On roll call, the following members from each council answered present:

Provosts' – John Miller, Lesley Hallick, Linda Brady, Dave Woodall, Roy Koch, Earl Potter

Research – Rich Linton, Gary Tallman, Bill Feyerherm, John Cassady, Dave Woodall

Absent: Kirby Dyess, Dan Dorsa, Wayne Embree, Nick Konidaris, Jem Spectar

Chancellor's Office staff present: Charles Triplett, Ruth Keele, Mark Endsley, Susan Weeks

Other participants present: Brian Wall, OSU

2) DISCUSSION

a. Council Missions and Priorities

Provosts' Council Chair Randhawa reviewed the Provosts' Council mission and gave a summary of their roles and responsibilities within the Oregon University System. He compared the council to the former Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs role and said that the council approves programs for the seven OUS institutions. The council is made up of provosts from the seven OUS institutions and OHSU. The council reviews and approves undergraduate and graduate programs proposed by institutions. Less frequently, the council reviews program eliminations and the impact on students. They are responsible for approving and recommending admission policies to the Board of Higher Education, assessing academic programs, and working with the Chancellor's Office on system and legislative metrics. The council's work also encompasses a wide range of campus issues including: internationalization, faculty recruitment and retention, and research and scholarship.

Research Council Chair Rich Linton reviewed the Research Council's mission and membership. He noted that the council includes representatives from OUS, OHSU, private institutions, and private industries. Linton directed everyone's attention to a one-page summary of Research Council priorities.

The Research Council is an advisory council to the Board of Higher Education. They are charged with monitoring and recommending improvements in collaborative research, research administration, and research infrastructure. John Cassidy added that the increasing number of inter-institutional collaborations is challenging the historical definition of campus employees and facilities. He suggested that corresponding issues arising from these types of collaborations should be addressed at a system-level.

The Research Council focused much of its early work on the connections between research and economic development. Collaborative university/industry/government research opportunities are becoming increasingly important in academic research. The Council has worked to streamline the technology transfer policies in Oregon. In recent months, the council drafted recommendations to the Department of Justice and the Board of Higher Education. The Board approved the applicable recommendations in January 2007 and the Attorney General has responded favorably to the suggestions.

Finally, the Research Council is charged with advocacy and communication. A primary responsibility is to make the Board aware of the importance of research and to promote a better understanding of the research mission. Linton concluded by asking other Research Council members if they would like to add anything to his summary.

Provost Dave Woodall suggested rearranging the agenda by moving directly to the last agenda item – possible joint council efforts. Linton agreed to move quickly through the other agenda items and leave as much time as possible for the joint efforts discussion.

Provost Randhawa cautioned that there are too many items under “possible joint council efforts” to discuss them all adequately. He asked the group to identify two high priority items to focus the discussion.

Woodall said that provosts’ responsibilities extend to faculty research in all guises. Unfortunately, the perception of the Board is that the Research Council takes care of all things “research.” Provost Potter agreed that the Board misunderstands that many provosts are responsible for faculty research as a part of their workload.

Bill Feyerherm said that the Research Council’s charge dictates overlap with the academic responsibilities of the Provosts’ Council. Provost Linda Brady agreed but added that faculty research is critical for the educational enterprise as a whole. All stages of the innovation cycle are critical. She admitted being less concerned about “who is responsible for what” and more concerned with how both councils can work to advance research opportunities.

Randhawa suggested moving through the agenda items as written, while trying to leave enough time to discuss the “graduate education and research” topic at the end. He asked Rich Linton to introduce the next agenda item: interinstitutional opportunities in research and economic development.

b. Interinstitutional Opportunities in Research and Economic Development

i. Oregon InC Signature Research Centers

Linton directed everyone's attention to a handout on Oregon InC. Their *2007 Innovation Plan* proposes continued support for ONAMI and the development of two additional signature research centers (SRC). The Governor's recommended budget (GRB) includes all of the Oregon InC recommendations. Research Council members work closely with Oregon InC to insure that higher education is represented. The two new SRC proposals represent strong research collaborations and focus on moving academic research into products that serve Oregon and society in general. Oregon InC has a very strict translational research and economic development focus. Competitive advantage to Oregon is a key Oregon InC criterion.

Other initiatives like the wave energy proposal were not promoted as a SRC but they are no less significant to OUS research. State funding is intended to be a catalyst to attract additional private and federal funding.

Bill Feyerherm pointed out that Oregon InC expresses the return on investment in numbers of potential jobs. It really shows the Oregon Economic and Community Development Department (OECDD) influence.

Rich Linton said that the Oregon InC process has been very successful and complimented David Chen on his leadership. The primary pushback that they have received from legislators is related to the cost. The three SRC proposals account for \$20M of the \$38M request.

ii. Transportation Research Center

Bill Feyerherm gave a summary of the collaborative transportation research center headquartered at PSU. The center is a multi-campus five-year projected funded by \$16M in federal dollars. The funds require a one-to-one match. There are associate directors at OSU, UO, and OIT. The directors and representatives from ODOT form the executive committee. Campus senior research officers provide guidance on administrative structure and policy oversight. A formal MOU agreement for collaborative work is in process, and the faculty group has already received the first round of proposals totaling over 50 submissions.

iii. Climate Change Research Center

John Cassady summarized the climate change research proposal. The proposal is being promoted by the Governor's climate change task force. The initial challenge is to inventory and catalogue research strengths in this area. The center will be headquartered at OSU, but it serves the broad interest of OUS and Oregon.

Provost Roy Koch asked if the climate change center is competing with other OUS initiatives. Although it was originally in the OUS budget request, it did not make it into the GRB.

Rich Linton answered that the climate change research center was blessed by AEED and the Board. Although it didn't make it into the GRB, a Governor's committee is now recommending its inclusion. The Chancellor was also concerned about adding this initiative late in the process. He has recommended avoiding mixed messages that may come from competing agendas.

Koch said that PSU is interested in participating in the research but doesn't have access to the foundational conversations or understand the formal structure. Cassady assured him that it was still in a developmental stage. He pointed out that Mark Abbott met with Dave Irving from PSU and Bob Doppelt from UO.

Linton noted that UO is inventorying faculty with an interest in climate change and has counted fifty faculty members from four to five different colleges. OSU, UO, PSU, and OHSU all share a strong interest in this area.

Dave Woodall asked why legislation or state funding was required if there is such a strong interest at the campus level. He repeated that the Chancellor strongly cautions against competing with the existing GRB. Provost Randhawa agreed with Woodall's point but suggested focusing on how to reposition our message in light of the addition.

Provost Hallick said that competing initiatives can be handled internally if necessary. She added that Oregon InC has been a strong advocate for higher education and asked if they would be a good partner in this area. John Cassady worried that Oregon InC may not be open to adopting the center because it lacks the necessary translational research component.

iv. University Development Fund

Rich Linton gave a brief summary of the university venture fund that was approved in the 2005 legislative session. The legislation offers a 60% state tax credit for donations to research commercialization. Legal interpretations have drawn out its implementation. Proposed cleanup language is being considered this session in SB582. Linton added that if the venture fund is successful, campuses would like to ask to make this fund evergreen with additional credits issued as the initial allocations are paid back to the state.

c. OUS Technology Transfer and Research Metrics

Charles Triplett briefly introduced the five OUS research and technology transfer metrics. The Provosts' Council is familiar with most OUS metrics because of their involvement in performance reporting and target setting. In a similar capacity, the Research Council is working with OUS research metrics. Triplett pointed to the handout on related performance measures and offered to address any questions or comments.

Provost Hallick said that OHSU has similar metrics and suggested comparing them with OUS measures.

Rich Linton pointed out that many of the measures are normalized using research expenditures to give a more accurate picture of Oregon compared to much larger states. Compared with top universities across the country, Oregon is more competitive on the basis of per capita measures.

Ruth Keele added that the Provosts' and Research Councils input into the OUS performance measurement system will have a great effect on the credibility and effectiveness of performance reporting.

Linton noted that the OUS research funding per faculty member (OSU, PSU, UO) is especially impressive. Hallick agreed and said that although OHSU doesn't compete in absolute size, it ranks highly in research funding per faculty member. Roy Koch said that the ratio of dollars spent on faculty vs. dollars brought to the university by faculty is incredible.

d. Responsible Conduct of Research

Linton introduced the next agenda item and asked about the balance of supporting research vs. regulating it – risk management vs. research facilitation. Nationally, the fear of litigation and liability concerns are leading to additional regulation and associated legislation. OUS has no institutional conflict of interest policy at the system level. Provost Hallick said that OHSU has a policy in place and volunteered to provide it as an example. With regard to individual faculty issues, Provost Brady added that a faculty “conflict of commitment” often is as important as a “conflict of interest.”

Linton pointed out that the challenge for regional campuses is exacerbated by lack of experience and limited resources. Regional universities don't have the same research infrastructure and support as larger institutions. He suggested partnerships between research and regional institutions in addressing aspects of research compliance.

Provost Potter said that SOU doesn't have trouble complying with research policies, but he admitted that SOU could use support for technology transfer matters. Linton noted recent Research Council discussions on ways to better support tech transfer at the regional campuses, and that cooperative efforts already occur.

Linton added that the university venture fund has a regional component. Potter said that the venture fund won't be particularly useful at SOU. He appreciates the smaller campuses being included, but said that there are too few faculty members needing this type of support.

Linton indicated that most new research initiatives included attempts to build ties to the regional campuses. He pointed to ONAMI as an example. Potter cautioned that the organizational structure and culture of smaller and larger institutions is very different.

Provost John Miller said that EOU would benefit from OSU and UO sponsored workshops on proposal development. It's difficult to develop a strategic plan for research given the limited experience and resources on smaller campuses. Provost Randhawa said that Miller's comments point to a broader system issue. How do you sustain a strong research engine connected to academic opportunities and recognize the diverse scale and missions of the various institutions?

Rich Linton pointed to a map in the Oregon InC handout discussed earlier. The initiatives connect to all points in the state, not just the I-5 corridor. He suggested that the provosts help to identify and inventory places where their faculty members connect to these statewide initiatives. The door to participate is open but it's often challenging to find the appropriate place to connect.

Provost Potter noted a federal grant to help regional cluster development in southern Oregon. The grant is helping SOU stay ahead of the regional economic growth. Linton asked if the cluster

findings are starting to drive research priorities at SOU and suggested discussing the findings with the Research Council.

John Cassady suggested educating Board members on the connection between graduate education and research. The two are intimately connected and a systemwide strategy may be appropriate. Linton pointed out that the Provosts' and Research Council missions have natural overlaps in these areas.

Hallick agreed and said that one acute common need of both groups is to have the Board understand this area better. The Board needs to understand the fabric of higher education and appreciate the connectivity of research, faculty, and students.

Brady suggested that some of the Board members understand professional education, but they lack an appreciation of graduate education (humanities, etc.). Undergraduate education is given a priority because of a lack of understanding about the importance of graduate education to the system and state economic health. The legislature thinks of education and economic development as a function of community colleges and job specific training.

Gary Tallman asked if OUS has statistics on where PhD students are coming from and going to. Linton answered that a majority of UO doctoral graduates stay in the state to pursue their initial jobs. Hallick said that OHSU is only a few years into the longitudinal data on tracking graduates.

Woodall suggested that bachelor's graduates make a much larger economic impact than research centers. OUS provides a steady flow of educated citizens into the state economy.

Randhawa agreed with Woodall, but surmised that the Board understands the importance of undergraduate education. He cautioned that undergraduates may receive too much focus. Other states have more flexibility to regulate tuition investment.

e. Additional Topics for Future Discussions

Linton asked council members for other issues that might be added to the list of "additional topics for future discussions." All agreed that the items listed are immense topics and suggested prioritizing the list.

Linton suggested that undergraduate and graduate research should remain a top priority as a joint topic. Randhawa agreed and suggested developing a whitepaper for the Board to describe the synergies and connections between research and education. Cassady suggested drafting an illustration of students moving through the various stages of the pipeline. He suggested connecting to the Board's draft strategic plan that was released in September 2006.

Susan Weeks said that the broad priorities adopted by the Board include a research component. She added that the newly formed Strategic Initiatives Committee led by Director Dyess will be prioritizing and assigning relevant tasks to various lead groups.

Linton asked Weeks to keep the Research Council updated on the committee's activities. Weeks responded that Director Dyess - a member of the Research Council – will keep council members engaged.

Provost Hallick pointed out that a lot of sponsored activities fall under “service.” Rich Linton agreed and said that a significant share of sponsored program funding at the UO focused on outreach and service. Hallick asked Linton if the Research Council envisions working in the broader sponsored program areas. He answered “yes” and indicated there is considerable overlap in many sponsored projects that naturally combine elements of research, outreach or service.

Provost Randhawa said that the key going forward is learning to work together on these overlapping issues. Linton suggested clearly articulating the councils' connections. He said it's clear that the Research Council is focused on building the resource base and infrastructure for research.

Woodall pointed out that as a normal part of the managing and reporting requirements for grant processes, infrastructure is a major concern for provosts. He said that there are naturally going to be areas that overlap between how provosts support faculty research and how the Research Council enhances research. John Cassady suggested identifying the councils' connections as a next step.

Randhawa said that its clear that the Provosts' Council will continue to lead some things and the Research Council will lead others. He suggested focusing on the points of common understanding and suggested continuing the discussions within the separate councils. Linton agreed and said that the council chairs would continue to connect periodically. He thanked participants and suggested reconvening the joint councils on an occasional basis in the future.

3) **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at noon.