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Appendix A

Individuals and Groups That Met with the RIGE Review Committee

1. President Michael Gottfredson
2. UO Senate President Margie Paris
3. Vice President Kimberly Espy and leadership team (Andy Berglund, Pat Jones, Moira Kiltie, Patrick Phillips, Beth Stormshak, Chuck Williams)
4. Former Provost James Bean
5. Former Interim Provost Lorraine Davis
6. Acting CAS Dean Andrew Marcus and Associate Deans Judith Baskin, Dana Johnston, and Gordon Taylor
7. Directors of UO Centers and Institutes – see minutes for which ones attended pre-set meetings with the RIGE Review Committee
8. Ed Kame‘enui and Pete von Hippel, who were part of the Research Advisory Panel (RAP) that authored a previous report on RIGE
9. Members of RIGE’s Research Advisory Board
10. Lou Moses, former head of Psychology, and Ulrich Mayr, current head of Psychology.
Appendix B
Full Set of Meeting Minutes
August 7, 2013 through January 31, 2014

Minutes
August 7, 2013

Current members: Bruce Blonigen (CAS), Bruce Bowerman (Biology), Michael Haley (Chemistry), Chuck Kalnbach (LCB), Brad Shelton (VP, Budget and Planning)

1. Discussed committee chair selection for recommendation to President Gottfredson and UO President Paris.

2. Nominees for committee members were discussed.

3. Discussion of future meetings and process.

Minutes
September 11, 2013

Present: Anderson, Blonigen, Bowerman, Bullis (via phone), Epstein, Haley, Kalnbach, Kwok (via Skype), Lindstrom, Shelton; Margie Paris (invited visitor)

1. Introductions.

2. Initial remarks by Blonigen. Provided context for the formation of the committee and general overview of the history and intended time frame for the committee’s review of RIGE. Also proposed and discussed with committee members basic principles to follow with respect to process and collaboration.

3. Remarks by Margie Paris about the charge of the committee and clarifying discussion by the committee.

4. Discussed next steps for the committee. Agreed that full committee should meet with Kimberly Espy, Vice President for Research and Innovation, for initial questions as soon as possible. Committee also began to list the various aspects of RIGE that will be important to review. Initial thoughts were to have subgroups of the committee each examine different aspects of RIGE in order to make timely review of RIGE tractable in the short time frame.
Finally, committee members suggested potential questions for committee to ask VP Espy. Blonigen will draft initial list of questions for review by committee members prior to meeting with Espy.

Minutes
September 26, 2013

Present: Anderson, Blonigen, Bowerman, Bullis, Epstein, Haley, Kwok, Lindstrom, Shelton; President Gottfredson (invited visitor)

1. Introductions.

2. Remarks by President Gottfredson about the charge of the committee. Included clarifying discussion with the committee about:

   a) Timeline;
   b) Expected breadth and depth of report given timeline and committee’s wide range of prior knowledge about RIGE;
   c) Ultimate use of the report by the President’s Office and UO Senate;
   d) The President’s perspective on the types of issues that would be useful for the committee to focus on;
   e) RIGE in the broader context of challenges and opportunities facing the university.

Minutes
October 4, 2013

Present: RIGE Review Committee: Blonigen, Bullis, Epstein, Lindstrom, Shelton. RIGE Executive Team: VP Kimberly Espy, Andy Berglund, Pat Jones, Moira Kiltie, Patrick Phillips, Beth Stormshak, Chuck Williams

1. Introductions.

2. RIGE Review Committee asked the list of questions (appendix A below) of the RIGE Executive Team.

Session mainly focused on questions 2 and 3. Responses and follow-up discussion were primarily focused on getting significant context to challenges facing VP Espy and RIGE when she began her position in July 2011, including:

   a) Initial financial health of RIGE budget
   b) Initial financial health of budgets in UO Centers and Institutes
c) Federal sequestration and its effects on grant funding


d) Issues in the former ORSA office, which ultimately required active management by an outside firm for a significant time period.


e) Frequent turnover in both the UO President and Provost position


f) Need for developing clear and consistent policies and procedures for allocating RIGE resources.


Question 6 was also addressed to the extent that VP Espy stated that she believes that coordination, promotion and oversight of research at UO should be a shared enterprise between her position and the Deans of the involved schools and colleges.

All agreed to defer responses to questions 1, 4, and 5 to a future meeting, so that VP Espy and Executive Team could provide fuller and more detailed responses. (This meeting subsequently scheduled for Monday, October 14)


Appendix A
Questions for VP Espy and RIGE Executive Team


1. Since you and your Executive Team have come into place, what are the main changes your leadership team has implemented? Why were these changes necessary?

2. Are there major barriers and/or challenges you have faced? Please describe.

3. What are the major challenges that remain for RIGE in the next 2-3 years? What about in the long-run?

4. In January 2013, the Research Advisory Panel provided a report on RIGE and general UO research issues to the UO Provost, as well as a set of recommendations. What did you take from that report and what actions, if any, have you undertaken in response to this prior report?

5. In the coming weeks, our committee will be gathering information and talking to a wide set of constituents involved in UO research and innovation efforts. Are there areas of investigation that you would find useful for RIGE?


Some more detailed questions if time...


6. From your perspective, what should be the role of RIGE (and the VP of RIGE) relative to the schools and colleges (and their Deans) in terms of coordinating, promoting, and overseeing research at the University of Oregon?

7. How do the two roles as VP of research and innovation and dean of the graduate school connect and interact with each other? How is the linking of these two roles and other RIGE initiatives working to strengthen graduate education on campus?


Minutes
October 11, 2013

1. Committee briefly discussed their views on information gathered in the prior meetings. Conversation centered on the main themes that came out of these prior meetings and main questions that the Committee will want to find out more about in future meetings with others on campus.

2. Committee discussed more the charge, scope, and timeline for the committee’s work. The general consensus was that the committee needs to determine the key themes and questions and focus on those, rather than attempt to be comprehensive in its review. This will hopefully allow the committee to provide a useful report that reasonably meets the timeline that has been given.

3. Committee determined additional groups it would like to meet with, which included a) leadership in schools and colleges that interact significantly with the Office for RIGE, b) directors of centers and institutes on campus, and c) the members of the Research Advisory Panel (RAP) that provided the Provost’s office with a report on RIGE in January 2013.

Minutes
October 14, 2013


This meeting was a follow-up to the Oct. 4 meeting to fully discuss the committee’s initial set of questions (see previous Oct. 4 meeting minutes) for RIGE leadership.

1. VP Espy provided a Powerpoint presentation that provided further details on research activity at UO and the financial picture of RIGE as she arrived at UO, its current situation, and what is expected in the coming years.

2. Presentation also provided information on the changes VP Espy has made with the Office for RIGE, which directly addressed question 1 and indirectly question 4. These include

   a) Efforts to spur collaboration across faculty and disciplines (e.g., Faculty Breakfast Clubs)
   b) Updated internal funding programs, such as bridge funding for faculty between grants, paying for external reviews prior to grant submission, etc.
c) Enhanced research development efforts, including weekly emails with targeted information on grant opportunities and grant workshops.

d) New partnerships formed including National Energy Lab in Albany, and a development officer for RIGE.

e) Worked with the CAS, the COE, and central administration to handle the emergency situation with funding new faculty start-up packages.

f) Investing in shared infrastructure support, such as Genomics and Cell Services, CASE, and Bowerman Sports Science Clinic.

g) New initiative to encourage innovation and start-up accelerators with state. RAIN funding of $3.75 million secured for Eugene portion of an initiative involving OSU as well.

h) Communication to external communities, including a “listening tour”, annual report, monthly campus newsletter, and a revamped website.

i) Initiatives with graduate education, including development of new specializations, exit surveys of graduate students, development of data metrics with Academic Analytics, and new scholarship partnerships.

3. At one point in the conversation, discussion did come back to question 6. VP Espy stated that she believes that her office provides advice, while the schools and colleges make the ultimate hiring decisions. Discussion about how processes and communication have evolved over the most recent years. Also, discussion about the general need to continue efforts to align processes, funding and communication around recruitment and retention of faculty.

---

Minutes
October 18, 2013

Present: RIGE Review Committee: Anderson, Blonigen, Bowerman, Bullis, Kwok (by phone), Lindstrom, Shelton. CAS Leadership Team: Judith Baskin, Dana Johnstone, Andrew Marcus, and Gordon Taylor

This meeting went through the questions in Appendix A for the CAS leadership team, which we provided a few days in advance of the meeting.

1. Dean Marcus began with an overview of the CAS and general ways in which it interacts with RIGE.

2. In response to question by Bullis, CAS leadership team explained the relationship of the CAS to centers and institutes (C&Is) for research on campus. The main discussion was around the issue of the arrangements for where grant dollars for facilities and administration costs (F&A costs) will flow for CAS faculty who belong to a C&I. These arrangements vary and are apparently unclear to CAS in some circumstances.
3. The CAS leadership team also described the special arrangements that were made to fund new faculty start-up packages (and labs) when VP Espy arrived and faced extreme budget issues in the Office for RIGE.

4. The CAS leadership team next addressed the main questions posed by the committee in advance. They discussed the difficult situation that faced VP Espy when she arrived and noted the appropriate efforts she has taken to address a number of critical issues. RIGE’s collaboration and communication with the CAS leadership team was pointed to as the area for improvement. The discussion then turned to a number of examples that illustrated the issues of communication and collaboration.

5. Conversation then moved to how the larger university-wide context may or may not contribute to issues with how RIGE interacts with schools and colleges. This included the lack of clear UO policy on the operations of C&Is with schools and colleges. Shelton also provided context for why RIGE and budgets for research activities were not part of the Oregon Budget Model (OBM).

6. Committee then discussed with CAS leadership more details about how new hire decisions are made and the role of VP Espy and the Office for RIGE in those hires. This led to a broader discussion about general processes for coordinating decisions on new hires and how they may be improved.

Appendix A
General Questions for CAS Leadership

1. What do you see as RIGE’s main achievements over the past few years?
2. What are areas for improvement for RIGE?
3. What are the main ways that CAS interacts with the Office for RIGE?
4. What is working well in these interactions and where are there areas for improvement?
5. Are there process or policy changes you would recommend for addressing any identified areas for improvement?
6. What other individuals or groups of individuals would you recommend that our committee meet to get their perspectives?

Minutes
October 25, 2013

Present: RIGE Review Committee members: Anderson, Blonigen, Bowerman, Bullis, Epstein, Kalnbach, and Kwok (by phone). Pete von Hippel, Professor of Chemistry, Member of the Institute for Molecular Biology, and one of the authors of the Research Advisory Panel (RAP) report.

1. Introductions.
2. Prof. von Hippel provided further context and perspective on the Research Advisory Panel (RAP) report he helped co-author, including

A. History on events leading to Provost Bean’s formation of the RAP,
B. Charge of the RAP report, and
C. Further clarification on main recommendations of the report, which includes issues over the structure of RIGE, the funding of RIGE (particularly the role of Oregon Budget Model), and the structure and process of how research decisions are generally made at UO.

3. Prof. von Hippel also provided his perspective on current operations of the office for RIGE, and changes that it has made in recent years.

4. Prof. von Hippel and committee also discussed the recent pay accounting issues in some of the Institutes and the role of the Office for RIGE in responding to these issues.

Minutes
October 28, 2013

Present: RIGE Review Committee members: Anderson, Blonigen, Bowerman, Bullis, Epstein, Kwok (by phone), Lindstrom, Shelton. Ed Kame’enui, Dean-Knight Professor of Education, College of Education, and one of the authors of the Research Advisory Panel (RAP) report.

1. Introductions.

2. Prof. Kame’enui provided further context and perspective on the Research Advisory Panel (RAP) report he helped co-author, including

A. Charge to the committee given by Provost James Bean,
B. Structure of the report,
C. Further clarification on main recommendations of the report, and
D. Subsequent conversations with UO leadership about the report’s recommendations.

Minutes
October 31, 2013

Members of the Research Advisory Board (RAB) for the Office for RIGE: Miriam Deutsch, Dana Johnston, Laura Lee McIntyre, Brook Muller, and Josh Snodgrass.

1. Introductions.

2. RIGE Review Committee asked the RAB members to describe their role and function for the Office for RIGE. This also led to a conversation about the main agenda items for the RAB since its inception.

3. The most substantial focus for RAB has been issues around Centers and Institutes at the UO, including funding, operations, long-run strategies, best practices and external benchmarking exercises by the RAB to better analyze UO situation.

4. Conversation about other issues that RAB members would like to see as topics of discussion and investigation for RAB in the future.

---

**Minutes**

November 1, 2013

**Present:** RIGE Review Committee members: Blonigen, Bullis, Epstein, Haley, Kalnbach, Kwok, Lindstrom, and Shelton.

Directors of Centers and Institutes: Holly Arrow, Dietrich Belitz, James Brau, Scott Bridgham, Bill Cresko, Miriam Deutsch, Cass Moseley, Bob Parker, and Ken Prehoda. (All Directors of Centers and Institutes were invited to a pre-set meeting one week in advance. If they could not attend, but wished to meet with the RIGE Review Committee in the future, this was noted)

1. Introductions.

2. RIGE Review Committee asked the Directors the questions in appendix A, which had been sent to them a few days ahead of time.

3. Directors gave their views on the changes they have experienced with the Office for RIGE in recent years, including

   a. Communication with the Office for RIGE
   b. Policies and transparency in their interactions with the Office for RIGE
   c. Whether collaboration with the schools and colleges was encouraged or discouraged.
   d. Funding support from the Office for RIGE
e. The extent to which the Office for RIGE engaged in collaboration with Centers and Institutes
f. Central staffing in the Office for RIGE

4. Directors gave their views on funding and structures to support research and graduate education at UO.

5. Directors also strongly suggested that the committee talk to department heads in the schools and colleges.

Appendix A
Questions for discussion with Directors of Centers and Institutes

1. What do you see as RIGE’s main achievements over the past few years?
2. What are areas for improvement for RIGE?
3. What is working well in your Center’s (or Institute’s) interactions with RIGE and where are there areas for improvement?
4. Are there process or policy changes you would recommend for addressing any identified areas for improvement?
5. What other individuals or groups of individuals would you recommend that our committee meet to get their perspectives?

Minutes
November 6, 2013

Present: RIGE Review Committee members: Anderson, Blonigen, Bullis, Epstein, Kwok, Kalnbach, and Shelton; Members of the Research and Outreach Council in the College of Education. (see addendum for membership)

1. Introductions.

2. RIGE Review Committee asked the members of the ROC the questions in appendix A.

3. Members gave their views on a number of issues connected to their interaction with the Office for RIGE in recent years, including

   a. Communication with the Office for RIGE
   b. Policies and transparency seen in their interactions with the Office for RIGE
   c. Changes in policies over funding by RIGE for certain expenditures.
   d. Assistance and support received for technology transfer issues
   e. The extent to which the Office for RIGE engaged in collaboration with COE and the various Directors of Centers and Institutes affiliated with COE
f. Performance of Sponsored Project Services (SPS) and Research Compliance Services (RCS).

4. Directors gave their views on general funding and structures to support research, as well as the role of RIGE in setting institutional priorities.

Appendix A
Questions for discussion with the ROC of COE

1. What do you see as RIGE’s main achievements over the past few years?
2. What are areas for improvement for RIGE?
3. What is working well in your interactions with RIGE and where are there areas for improvement?
4. Are there process or policy changes you would recommend for addressing any identified areas for improvement?
5. What other individuals or groups of individuals would you recommend that our committee meet to get their perspectives?

Minutes
November 8, 2013

Present: RIGE Review Committee members: Anderson, Blonigen, Bowerman, Epstein, Kalnbach, and Shelton

1. Committee reviewed and discussed information received in recent meetings with various groups.

2. Blonigen presented a proposed “rough outline” of the committee’s ultimate report for conversation and feedback by the committee. Exercise helped to focus on areas of agreement and take the first step toward drafting a report.

Minutes
November 15, 2013


1. Introductions.
2. RIGE Review Committee asked Professors Mayr and Moses the questions in appendix A, which had been sent to them a few days ahead of time.

3. Mayr and Moses discussed a number of issues surrounding their interactions with RIGE, including
   
a. Retention and start-up offers
b. Communication and collaboration in their interactions with RIGE
c. The recent establishment of the Prevention Sciences Institute
d. Allocation of physical (lab) space
e. F&A funding allocations

Appendix A
Questions for discussion

1. What do you see as RIGE’s main achievements over the past few years?
2. What are areas for improvement for RIGE?
3. What is working well in your interactions with RIGE and where are there areas for improvement?
4. Are there process or policy changes you would recommend for addressing any identified areas for improvement?
5. What other individuals or groups of individuals would you recommend that our committee meet to get their perspectives?

Minutes
November 22, 2013


1. Committee discussed information obtained in recent meetings.
2. Committee read over an initial draft of a section of the report and provided comments for revision.

Minutes
December 2, 2013

1. Committee discussed and coordinated questions for the RIGE leadership team in light of our review to this point. Also discussed and coordinated questions for former Provosts Lorraine Davis and Jim Bean.

________________________________________

Minutes
December 6, 2013

Present: RIGE Review Committee members: Bowerman, Bullis, Epstein, Haley, Kalnbach, Kwok, Lindstrom, and Shelton; Former Interim Provost Lorraine Davis.

1. Based on questions from the committee listed in Appendix A, Davis provided information on

   a) What she sees as RIGE’s main achievements over the past few years, as well as areas for improvement.

   b) Systems and procedures that were in place for reporting of RIGE activities to the Provost’s Office during her term as Interim Provost, as well as oversight of RIGE and coordinating its activities with the overall mission of the institution, and training and evaluation of RIGE leadership?

   c) An assessment of the strengths and weaknesses in these systems and procedures and any recommendations to address weaknesses.

   d) Provided quite a bit of institutional context and the substantial changes that have occurred in leadership in the past five years.

Appendix A
Questions for Lorraine Davis, Former Provost

1. What do you see as RIGE’s main achievements over the past few years?
2. What are areas for improvement for RIGE?
3. During your time as Interim Provost, what systems and procedures were in place for

   a) reporting of RIGE activities to your office;
   b) oversight of RIGE and coordinating its activities with the overall mission of the institution;
   c) training and evaluation of RIGE leadership?
4. What were strengths and weaknesses in these systems and procedures listed in question 3? What would be your recommendations to address weaknesses, if any.
5. Are there institutional changes you would recommend for appropriately supporting research activities at the University and the role of RIGE in those efforts?

Minutes
December 11, 2013


1. Patrick Phillips provided some additional context about RIGE operations and achievements in past few years.

2. Committee asked the RIGE leadership team questions about a number of issues including
   a) efforts by RIGE to communicate and collaborate with the others in the UO community,
   b) RIGE’s role in establishing permanent funding of the Applied Computational Instrument for Scientific Synthesis (ACISS), and issues surrounding the assignment of space in the Lewis Integrative Science Building.

Minutes
December 13, 2013


1. Committee discussed information obtained in recent meetings.

2. Committee read over new drafts of a number of sections and provided comments to those taking the lead in writing those sections.

3. Committee discussed timeframe for additional meetings and plans for completing an initial draft.

Minutes
December 18, 2013
9-10am
Present: RIGE Review Committee members: Anderson, Blonigen, Bowerman, Bullis, Epstein, Haley, Kalnbach, Kwok, and Shelton; Former Provost Jim Bean

1. Based on questions from the committee listed in Appendix A, Bean provided information on

   a) What he sees as RIGE’s main achievements over the past few years, as well as areas for improvement.

   b) Systems and procedures that were in place for reporting of RIGE activities to the Provost’s Office during his term as Provost, conditions that led to his formation of the Research Advisory Panel (RAP), and the conclusions he drew from the RAP report.

   c) Provided his thoughts on what issues need to be addressed with how research is supported and funded on campus, as well as the role of RIGE and effective leadership from that office.

   d) Gave background and context to how physical space was allocated in the Lewis Integrative Science Building.

Appendix A
Questions for Jim Bean, Former Provost

1. What do you see as RIGE’s main achievements over the past few years?
2. What are areas for improvement for RIGE?
3. During your time as Interim Provost, what systems and procedures were in place for
   a) reporting of RIGE activities to your office;
   b) oversight of RIGE and coordinating its activities with the overall mission of the institution;
   c) training and evaluation of RIGE leadership?

4. What were strengths and weaknesses in these systems and procedures listed in question 3? What would be your recommendations to address weaknesses, if any.
5. Are there institutional changes you would recommend for appropriately supporting research activities at the University and the role of RIGE in those efforts?

Minutes
December 18, 2013
10-11am

**Present:** RIGE Review Committee members: Anderson, Blonigen, Bowerman, Bullis, Epstein, Haley, Kalnbach, Kwok, and Shelton; Barbara Altmann (VP for Academic Affairs and former Director of the Humanities Center), Jeff Hanes (Director of CAPS), and Carol Stabile (Director of CSWS).

1. Introductions.

2. RIGE Review Committee asked the Directors the questions in appendix A, which had been sent to them a few days ahead of time.

3. Directors gave their views on the changes they have experienced with the Office for RIGE in recent years, including

   a. The background and context around changes in their MOUs and/or relationship with RIGE in recent years.
   b. Communication and collaboration experiences with RIGE
   c. The extent to which they feel RIGE is serving needs of humanists and social scientists on campus.

**Appendix A**

Questions for discussion with Directors of Centers and Institutes

1. What do you see as RIGE’s main achievements over the past few years?
2. What are areas for improvement for RIGE?
3. What is working well in your Center’s (or Institute’s) interactions with RIGE and where are there areas for improvement?
4. Are there process or policy changes you would recommend for addressing any identified areas for improvement?
5. What other individuals or groups of individuals would you recommend that our committee meet to get their perspectives?

---

**Minutes**

December 19, 2013

**Present:** RIGE Review Committee members: Anderson, Blonigen, Bowerman, Bullis, Epstein, Haley, Kalnbach, Kwok, and Shelton; RIGE personnel Kimberly Espy, Pat Jones, Moira Kiltie, and Patrick Phillips
1. Committee asked the RIGE leadership team questions about a number of issues including:

   a) Processes and principles guiding the change in affiliation of various Centers and Institutes with RIGE in recent years. (e.g., CLLAS and CAPS).
   b) Background and context surrounding establishment of the Prevention Science Institute (PSI).
   c) Principles and policies for handling potential conflicts of interest in RIGE decisions involving members of the RIGE leadership team.
   d) Issues surrounding the assignment of space in the Lewis Integrative Science Building.

---

**Minutes**
December 20, 2013

**Present:** RIGE Review Committee members: Anderson, Blonigen, Bullis, Haley, Kalnbach, and Shelton;

1. Committee discussed information obtained in recent meetings.

2. Committee discussed timeframe for completing full draft by start of winter term, concluding that no more meetings with external groups necessary.

---

**Minutes**
January 10, 2014

**Present:** RIGE Review Committee members: Anderson, Blonigen, Bowerman, Bullis, Epstein, Haley, Kalnbach, Kwok, Lindstrom, and Shelton;

1. Committee discussed recent draft of sections of report.

---

**Minutes**
January 17, 2014

**Present:** RIGE Review Committee members: Anderson, Blonigen, Bowerman, Bullis, Epstein, Haley, Kalnbach, Kwok, Lindstrom, and Shelton;

1. Committee discussed recent draft of sections of report.
Minutes
January 24, 2014


1. Committee discussed recent draft of sections of report.

Minutes
January 31, 2014


1. Committee finalized report.
Appendix C

RIGE Powerpoint Overview:
Slides of information provided to the RIGE Review Committee by RIGE in Fall 2013
RIGE Overview – Part I

October 2013
The University of Oregon is a comprehensive research university that serves its students and the people of Oregon, the nation, and the world through the creation and transfer of knowledge in the liberal arts, the natural and social sciences, and the professions. It is the Association of American Universities flagship institution of the Oregon University System.
UO Extramural Funding

Total Sponsored Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>$60,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>$80,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>$120,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>$140,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>$160,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>$180,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>$200,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>$220,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>$240,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>$260,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$280,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$300,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$320,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$340,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$360,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$380,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$400,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recognized Faculty: Honors & Awards
(from Academic Analytics)

Guggenheim Fellows
Fulbrights
ACLS Fellows
NEH Fellows
American Academy of Arts & Sciences Fellows
American Association for Advancement of Science Fellows
PECASE
Howard Hughes Medical Institute Investigators
Beckman / Getty / Pew Charitable Trust
Sloan Foundation / Burroughs Wellcome
Institute of Advanced Studies Fellow
Columbia / Harvard / Radcliffe / Stanford University Fellows
UO Research-related Companies
Graduate Students

Students Enrolled in UO Graduate Programs (includes part-time and full-time; excludes Law)
Compared to AAU Peers?
UO is #109 in research expenditures in NSF survey among publics

Bottom quintile of AAUs, Even if normalize per TRF

Very bottom of PhD Degrees (226), mid = 331
What is different about UO?
Figure 15. Core expenses per FTE enrollment, by function: Fiscal year 2011

Expense function

- Instruction: $10,031, $14,916
- Research: $4,046, $13,977
- Public service: $1,844, $1,232
- Academic support: $1,983, $5,038
- Institutional support: $2,892, $3,444
- Student services: $1,362, $1,283
- Other core expenses: $1,085, $2,312

Dollars per FTE

Source: IPEDS, 2011
What is different about UO…

Institutional resources are not aligned with UO mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Federal Research Expenditures</th>
<th>Institutional funds expended on research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U Kansas</td>
<td>127M</td>
<td>78M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Missouri</td>
<td>118M</td>
<td>90M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State U</td>
<td>96M</td>
<td>57M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U Oregon</strong></td>
<td><strong>61M</strong></td>
<td><strong>8M</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Nevada</td>
<td>64M</td>
<td>32M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Mississippi</td>
<td>62M</td>
<td>18M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Advocacy Steps taken thus far

### Recurring Fund Sources for Research Operations and Graduate Student Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>FY11 Funds</th>
<th>FY14 Beginning Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Funds – VPRI operations</td>
<td>313k</td>
<td>1.23M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal reimbursements for earned F&amp;A costs</td>
<td>21.10M</td>
<td>18.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTF tuition funding – training grants</td>
<td>737k</td>
<td>+ 212k*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTF tuition funding – 86 IPSAs</td>
<td>1.26M</td>
<td>+ 360k*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To address tuition increases since 2011 and thus avoid decreasing the number of graduate students funded*
Human subjects costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protocol Counts</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Active Protocols 9/6/2013</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>1466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protocol Counts</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Funded Protocols</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfunded cost = $350,000/year for master/doctoral theses review
$261,000 for nonsponsored faculty project review
Over 70% of F&A is reallocated as funding in support of faculty scholarly activities such as new faculty startup packages, retention, matching and cost share programs, research facilities including the libraries, and faculty support programs.
National context

- **Increased Competition**
  Everyone wants to be an AAU, R1 institution
  UO challenges – state $, capital access, benefits, operational agility

- **Increased focus on use-inspired research tackling larger challenges at disciplinary intersections**, (e.g., energy, environment, food security)
  Not fully aligned with our traditional liberal arts & sciences core
  More difficult without traditional “applied” disciplines
  (i.e., agriculture, medicine, engineering)

- **Declining federal budget for research - Sequestration**
  Particularly NIH, NSF that are ~ 1/2 of our sponsored resources

- **Pause in Congressionally Directed Spending (earmarks)**

- **Ongoing Congressional Budget Deadlock – Continuing Resolutions**
Impact on Sponsored Expenditures/Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY04</td>
<td>$80,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY05</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>$120,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>$140,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>$160,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>$180,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>$200,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>$220,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>$240,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>$260,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RIGE Actions: Enhance Excellence
FY13 Federal Awards

This graphic illustrates the detailed breakdown of Federal funding, including Federal flow-through funds for FY13. The U.S. Department of Education (30%), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (38%), and the National Science Foundation (18%) were the three leading Federal funding agencies in FY2013.
Faculty Breakfast
Clubs
100+ Sr. & Jr. faculty
Cross cutting themes

DEVELOPING CELLS, MINDS, AND HEALTHY COMMUNITIES
SUSTAINABLE FUTURES
SHAPING THE INFORMATION SOCIETY
IDENTITIES, CULTURES, AND CONNECTIONS
TOOLS AND TECHNOLOGIES FOR TOMORROW
OREGON: A PLACE, A LABORATORY, A CANVAS

OFFICE FOR RESEARCH, INNOVATION, AND GRADUATE EDUCATION
New/Updated Internal Funding Programs

- Faculty Research Awards
- Incubating Interdisciplinary Initiative Awards
- IDEA Awards
- Showcasing Oregon Research: Conference Support Award
- Book Completion Awards (new, administered via OHC)
- Subvention partnership with CAS (administered via OHC)
- RIGE Bridge Funding
- New Junior Faculty Start-up Awards + Large Startup Program
- UO Dissertation Completion Award
- Stellar Scholars Award
- Promising Scholar Awards
Faculty Large Start-up

- Previous VPR committed 12M in startup costs over 3 years (3.8M for FY12 alone)
- Start-up support for FY 2012 had only ~$150,000 available due to these multi-year obligations that ate into current year availability.
- $4million loan from SAGE-LOKEY funds by Provost to VPR Linton to support start-up investments two years prior was fully obligated.
- 4M loan for a routine operational expense such as large startup is not a sustainable business practice, and should have warranted notice by campus leadership.
- Met with provost, CAS dean, CAS department heads & search committee chairs to inform them of the problem
- Worked with Provost & CAS Dean, meeting together several times over months, to address
- Met with CAS dept heads to describe resolution of these discussions
- CAS and VPRI agreed for the CAS to bear nearly all startup costs for fy12, save about 40-50k per search from VPRI
- For FY12 searches/FY13 hires and beyond, CAS/RIGE split costs of startup, with RIGE= equipment, core facility use, and facilities renovations; CAS = personnel, buyouts, supplies, etc.
- CAS required unit search plans (5 years); at search request, units estimate startup and facilities costs to enable proactive planning, CAS gains RIGE input prior to CAS decision making & position release.
  - Some searches have stipulations (agreed by CAS dean & VPRI) because of previous investments and stated priorities.
- FY13 searches outcome (although facility renovation costs are not finalized & are coming in larger than estimated): RIGE ~3.9M in start-up for CAS faculty, CAS = ~ 3.5M
Research Development Services

- 1:1 assistance in grant writing, funding source identification
- Honors & Awards calendar, app assistance
- Successful Grant Writing workshop; Humanities/Social Sciences
- Topical sessions (e.g. CAREER, MRI apps)
- Procures External Review of Proposals before agency submission
- Project management for large scale applications
- Weekly emails of new solicitations
Pursued expanding sources of support

- **New partnerships**
  - NETL

- **State opportunities**
  - Oregon University Information Research Collaboratory (300k planning funds awarded)
  - 2nd floor Huestis remodel (not funded)

- Initiated Donor/Development activities for RIGE
Invest in infrastructure support

Developed/Enhanced support for Research Core Facilities

Genomics & Cell Services
CASE
Bowerman Sports Science Clinic
TMF/Histology

Equipment Investments: FIB, MRI, Cell Sorter, 3 microscopes, IMB core, Cell Imaging, Light Sheet
Partnership: LCB & LAW

Procured $3.75M from the State
Communicate

- Telling the story
  - Web communications
  - Annual report
  - Editorials
  - Monthly Campus Newsletter
- RIGE Innovation Series
- Celebrating Oregon Research/Research Month
- Presidential Research Lecture
- Recognition Events
Research Advisory Board

http://uoresearch.uoregon.edu/content/research-advisory-board
Graduate Education

- Developed Specializations Mechanism
  - Grad Council approved
  - Aligned GS Innovations awards
  - Neuroscience, Food Studies, Prevention Science, Sustainable Business Practices so far
- Expanded GIP
  - Bioinformatics program
- Graduate Program Assessment data dissemination effort (meetings with Dean, Head, DGS + GS)
- Initiated new partnerships (Trillium, Solarworld)
- Recommended reduced credit hours after candidacy (declined to move forward)
I. SPS & RCS Rebuilding
II. new Financial Conflicts of Interest in Research
III. RCR Education
IV. Small Business requirements
V. Research Misconduct policy
VI. A-21 & Effort Reporting
VII. 4 federally reportable events (3 animal, 1 human)
VIII. Biosafety noncompliance
IX. VPR office Audit
   1. Institute debts
X. FTE/overtime uplift audit
XI. NIH Oversight
RIGE Overview – Part II

December 2013
I. Research Centers & Institutes

II. Research Core Facilities

III. Service Units:
   I. Research Development Services
   II. Sponsored Projects Services
   III. Research Compliance Services
   IV. Animal Care Services
   V. Innovation Partnership Services
   VI. Graduate School
Figure 12. Full-time equivalent staff, by assigned position: Fall 2011

Source: IPEDS 2012
UO Research Administration/Compliance Challenges

I. SPS & RCS Rebuilding
II. A-21 & Effort Reporting
III. new Financial Conflicts of Interest in Research
IV. RCR Education
V. Research Misconduct policy
VI. 5 federally reportable events (4 animal, 1 human)
VII. Biosafety noncompliance
VIII. VPR office transition IAD Audit
IX. Institute debts
X. FTE/overtime uplift IAD, SOS audits, OIG investigations

Ongoing NIH Oversight with quarterly reporting on achievement
Increased faculty connection to research services with oversight by AVPs (2, ≤ .5 FTE)
Hired AVPRFBA to improve business practices & capacity
  • Consolidated 2 positions, Assoc VP & Director into 1; Terminated position of one AsstVP
  • Closed RRP unit (ended 2 positions)
SPS: New Director, Fully staffed with professionals
RCS: New Director, Professionalized Staff
  • Reorged work flow
IPS: Reorganizing services in FY13 to better connect with industry in multiple streams.
  • Worked with VPFA, Provost, Units to implement Innovation Services Fee to expand services
  • O-corps – going into units to help faculty & students
  • Contract staff expertise now in house
GS: Increased professionalization of staff with Manager level
  • Initiated institutional diversity partnership/recruitment initiatives with OEI, Provost & Enrollment Management
Outcomes:

SPS Award set up:
• 4-20 days average in 2009, 3-5 days average in 2013.

SPS Contracts (incl master agreements, subs to/from):
• 35 days from intake to execution in August 2010 / 5 days in August 2013;
• Average number of days from intake to return to external agency was 41 days (65 contracts) in 2009 / in August 2013, average days was down to 6 (~110 contracts)
Projects reviewed in FY2007 = ~375; in FY2013 = 1466

on track for accreditation in 2 years
42 Innovations Disclosed (up from 27)

47 Licenses >$1000 (Same as last year)

24 US patent application filed and 7 US patents issued

$1,165,201 Industry Sponsored Research (up from $665K)

$7,441,277 Licensing Revenue (down from $7.8 million)

8.55% Yield (Licensing/Research)- Top 14 schools

$ 6.6 M / 88% royalties returned to Inventors/Authors, Academic Units, State Treasury

$235K invested in IP
Graduate Admissions Cycle:  
Fall 2008 - Fall 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applications Master's</th>
<th>Applications Doctoral</th>
<th>Admitted Master's</th>
<th>Admitted Doctoral</th>
<th>Matriculated Master's</th>
<th>Matriculated Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013*</td>
<td>2832</td>
<td>2896</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3694</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2573</td>
<td>2471</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2954</td>
<td>2131</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2122</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2055</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The 2013 cycle is still underway. The number of applications and admissions are likely to increase over figures shown here. Matriculation figures are not available for fall 2013 at this time.