



# UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

## UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES

April 13, 1995

### MEMORANDUM

TO: Stead Upham, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

FROM: Keith Richard <sup>KR</sup>, University Archivist

SUBJECT: Institute for Community Art Studies

I could not find any reference through the 1960s that the OSSHE Board ever approved this Institute. Perhaps they did I just have not found when if they have.

The Institute was created in 1967-68. It first appeared in the catalog of 1968-69.

Director.....June McFee  
Research Director....Gordon L. Kensler  
Research Director....E. Marshall Pallett  
Research Director....Donald B. Driscoll

The Institute for Community Art Studies is a research and public service organization concerned with public understanding and appreciation of the arts, including architecture, community design, the natural and man-made landscape, the fire arts, an the traditional and experimental crafts.

Research is concerned with decision making int he arts, behavioral and aesthetic foundations of theoretical design, educational processes in the arts, and art as a means of social communication and cultural transmission.

Public service activities are focused on the development and evaluation of general educational programs int he different aspects of the arts in the schools and communities in the state.

As you know Ms. Holly Zanville, a member OSSHE's central staff, has the assignment of keeping track of board approved institutes. I am sure she could tell you exactly when the approval was granted if it was granted.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON LIBRARY SYSTEM

**Minutes**  
**Meeting of Directors of Centers and Institutes**  
**April 11, 1995**  
**Johnson Hall Conference Room**

---

Present: John Baldwin, Donald Corner, Frederick Dahlquist, Steven Deutsch, Stephen Durrant, Patricia Gwartney-Gibbs, Stephen Kevan, Sandra Morgen, Michael Posner, John Reynolds, Geraldine Richmond, Steven Shankman, Lynda Shapiro, Dave Soper, Steadman Upham, Hill Walker, Janis Weeks

Staff: Carol Rydbom, Maggie Morris, Ron Kellett

The meeting was called to order by Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Education, Steadman Upham and began with introductions around the table. S. Upham also introduced Carol Rydbom, who is serving as budget manager for the indirect cost budget, and Ross West, newly hired science writer whose services will be shared by the Office of Communications and the Office of the Vice Provost for Research to help increase and improve the University's communication efforts concerning research activity and successes.

### **Budget**

Copies of a summary of indirect cost recovery activity was distributed. Vice Provost Upham noted that preliminary indications, using figures which do not yet include March payroll, equate with last year's returns, suggesting that budgets for centers and institutes will also be approximately what they were last year. This is encouraging in light of the current budget climate. Budget worksheet packets were distributed for use when projected budgets are sent out. Procedures will be similar to last year's and will take into account previous agreements made under J. Moseley's authority.

S. Upham stressed the over- commitment to startup expenses. These represent great success in faculty recruiting if they are all realized, but would also force resource re-evaluation if they are all claimed within one budget period.

It was suggested that future indirect cost summaries might also include identification of projects that claim no indirect costs. Such numbers would not inform the budget process, but would provide additional evidence of research activity.

### **OMB A-21**

Vice Provost Upham summarized the current federal government proposals for restructuring the recovery of research related costs. Discussion has included a range of possibilities that cap all or distinct components of cost.

A decision is likely within the year, and we must stay ready to budget research proposals intelligently depending on what direct costs and depreciation rates are allowed. In general, UO is not likely to be seriously disadvantaged by the proposed changes because our present indirect cost rate is not excessive by national standards, and we do not have the costs associated with a medical school.

---

### **Proposed Indirect Cost Rate**

S. Upham distributed a copy of the new indirect cost rate proposal being submitted to the Department of Health and Human Services on behalf of the UO by the OSSHE Controller's Office. The rates it proposes are slightly higher in all major categories, but may still be subject to further negotiation. Superficial examination of the documentation suggests that the increase results from increased facilities costs. S. Upham intends to conduct further review of the documents to verify the basis for the increase.

### **Graduate Tuition**

S. Upham notified the meeting that non-resident graduate tuition is scheduled for a major increase of up to 21% beginning as early as Fall 1995. This will have a major impact on training grants and other non-GTF support. Although it appears that the institution cannot prevent the eventual increase to a level comparable to non-resident undergraduate tuition, efforts are being made to control the rate at which the increase takes place, to phase it in over a period of three to five years.

It was noted that increased tuition for graduate assistants may result in researchers electing to hire postdoctoral assistants instead of graduate students; postdocs would represent a fully-trained and cheaper source of assistance and collaboration for investigators who are concerned about the effect of budget on renewal of grants for long-term projects. It was also pointed out that the non-resident tuition increase will have a disproportionate effect on certain student populations such as non-traditional students, students of color, older students with families.

S. Upham solicited the group's opinion on the idea of establishing a fund to be created from a portion of any indirect cost recovery in excess of budget. It could function like the equipment or startup funds with guidelines for drawing on it to assist with tuition for graduate students on training and other grants which are not budgeted to accommodate higher rates. In discussing the proposal, it was pointed out that such a fund need not detract from the existing funds for equipment or startup and should not be made available to subsidize the institution's teaching mission by paying for training grant students who are teaching as part of their program.

It was decided that the prospect of such a fund had merit. F. Dahlquist and H. Walker agreed to serve as a subcommittee to explore the concept further and to propose guidelines for its use.

### Research Corporation

Copies of the *Articles of Incorporation* for the proposed University of Oregon Research Corporation were distributed. S. Upham summarized the history of the proposal, emphasizing the need for institutional sophistication in the area of intellectual property if UO is to capture the many business opportunities that arise as a result of research. The proposed corporation has been modeled after other highly successful ones at major research institutions, and the proposal has been examined, modified, and reviewed by the Technology Transfer Committee, the Research Advisory Committee, and discussed at a public meeting. Response was uniformly positive, and the proposal has now been forwarded to OSSHE for approval by the Board of Higher Education at one of its upcoming meetings. Assuming approval, the next step will be to identify appropriate individuals for its board of directors.

There was discussion of the relationship between the proposed research corporation and the present technology transfer services and ASTI. It was noted that institutional technology transfer activities might be transferred to the new corporation, with UO contracting for specific services. Because ASTI is jointly funded with other state institutions, it is less likely that its services could be folded into the research corporation. S. Upham stressed that, whether it is funded through a university office or through the research corporation, UO's technology transfer activities will require an additional investment in staff and seed money for patent applications. Financially, the research corporation would remain at arm's length from the University, and the UO could not be held responsible for its financial solvency.

It was pointed out that increased commercialization of research results reintroduces the issue of proprietary and classified research. It was suggested that some form of discussion be initiated to examine the possible impact of proprietary research, particularly on the training of graduate students and the ethical issues which arise when students are used in research that provides the principal investigator alternative sources of revenue. Because the University does not engage in classified research, the issues involved in proprietary research may be new to many faculty members. It was recommended that the Vice Provost for Research form a committee of junior and senior faculty to examine this issue.

It was also suggested that the institution be encouraged to place value on patent and technology transfer activity in faculty evaluations for promotion and tenure.

## **Conflict of Interest**

R. Kellett distributed copies of a draft revision of institutional conflict of interest policy and a background summary identifying the major features of the revision. He noted that revision at this time is motivated by new NSF and PHS requirements that there be a written and enforced institutional conflict of interest policy in place at each institution which receives federal research funds. The new UO policy parallels the present academic conflict of interest policy and is tied to research proposal submission. Full disclosure is triggered by the threshold value of \$10,000 of income or stock holdings. A worksheet is being devised to assist researchers in preparing disclosure statements. It will include examples of various risk categories culled from existing scientific research cases. The aim of the UO's response to the new requirement is to establish a process and guidelines that are responsive but will manage multiple financial interests without discouraging outside activity. The draft policy has been reviewed by Technology Transfer Committee and the Research Advisory Committee and will go next to the President's staff and the Faculty Advisory Committee.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

M. Morris  
recorder

cc: President  
Vice President  
Vice Provosts  
Academic Deans  
Department Heads