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The primary activities of the FCR during the past year may be grouped into the following categories:

Synopsis:
1. Faculty Effort Certification Issues and Report
2. Human Subjects Division Progress
3. Export Control Policy and Information Resources
4. Network of Interdisciplinary Initiatives - NII
5. Grants.gov survey: Electronically find and apply for Federal grant opportunities.
6. Retirement Payout for Staff Leave Balances
7. Overview of Applied Physics Laboratory
8. Classified, Proprietary, and Restricted (CPR) Research Subcommittee
9. Thanks, Welcome, Succession; FCR Mandate and Charge, Scope, Representation and Liaison

1. Faculty Effort Certification Report
The Faculty Council on Research was asked by the Faculty Senate Chair to generate a report regarding the current state of Faculty Effort Certification. This was presented at the 26 January 2006 Faculty Senate meeting by the FCR Chair, Brent Stewart. This address is included in its entirety due to the importance of the matter.

Needless to say, the renewed emphasis on faculty effort reporting has caused quite a stir on campus, but as with any issue that presents itself, some background information helps provide perspective. Also important is what’s being done to resolve the challenges that the renewed emphasis on faculty effort reporting has exposed.

The FCR FEC report follows a Q/A format as it was felt this would best provide focal information transfer to the reader. This format also reflects the many questions that have been asked of administration and FCR since the mandatory training program was instituted last quarter.

Q: Why the renewed emphasis on faculty effort reporting?
A: Although effort reporting rules have not substantially changed since the early 1980s (A-21, see below), the impetus for FEC review included recent major federal settlements with several large research universities (e.g., $5.5M with Northwestern University) and increasing scrutiny and stringent interpretation of these rules by auditors. With the assistance of legal counsel, the UW began FEC Compliance Review during 2004/2005, including review of related organizations and internal practices. Ross Heath, then Faculty Senate Chair and Brent Stewart (FCR Chair) met with several high-level members of UW Administration twice in July to discuss proposed modifications of the then current UW FEC policy. Mandatory on-line FEC training was instituted during autumn quarter 2005. The new FEC policy can be found in Grants Information Memoranda (GIM) 35 (http://www.washington.edu/research/osp/gim/gim35.html).

Q: What are the faculty effort reporting rules?
A: The faculty effort reporting rules that are currently given in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-21 (Cost Principles for Educational Institutions; http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/a021/a21_2004.html) have been the product of compromise designed to free faculty as much as possible from the trouble and indignity of periodic timekeeping (e.g., punching timecards), while at the same time providing the federal government with some assurance that the faculty effort it is paying grantee institutions is in fact delivered.
Despite the relative liberality of the rules regarding faculty effort, or some would say because of that liberality, the accuracy of faculty effort reporting and the adequacy of its documentation represent a significant continuing compliance problem for research universities. The government states in A-21 that the process cannot be exact and there may be any number of acceptable methods of allocating effort and salary. However, A-21 does prescribe “Criteria for Acceptable Methods.” This leaves the general details of a faculty effort reporting program up to the grantee institution, as long as they abide by A-21.

Under A-21, the proper base for determining an individual’s effort percentages is the total activity for which the individual is compensated by the grantee institution. Requiring total effort to be the base for effort reporting purposes also makes it necessary to address the difficult question of what total effort is. This leads to anomalous results in some cases. For example, two faculty members receiving equal salaries and expending equal percent effort on a sponsored project (e.g., 50%) may expend very different amounts of effort if their total effort is significantly different (e.g., 80 hours/week versus 40 hours/week), even though they are paid the same for their efforts.

A few examples of effort allocation scenarios are offered. The UW FEC webpage Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section provides further effort allocation scenarios (http://www.washington.edu/research/maa/fec/#FAQs).

Materially inaccurate faculty effort reporting in connection with federal research is an area of great potential danger for universities, especially UW as we receive more federal research funding than any other American public university ($996 million in calendar year 2005). At best, the process of estimating and reporting effort associated with university research is an inexact process, as there are many different ways of considering what effort is and how it relates to particular sponsored projects.

Effort report forms must account for all University faculty effort. This normally would include all effort expended on university-related effort, including sponsored research, administration, instruction and unsponsored scholarly activity, clinical activity and other activities. Even where the number of hours of effort the individual expends each week substantially exceeds a ‘standard’ work week of 40 hours, it is necessary to base effort percentages on actual total effort [1].

Q: How much of this is University of Washington interpretation of the rules?
A: As stated previously, the government leaves the general details of a faculty effort reporting program up to the grantee institution, as long as they abide by A-21. There are a host of challenging issues that need to be considered in any FEC program: definition of the institutional base salary, faculty work week (determined by % federal effort), proposal preparation costs, 9 month faculty, deciding what’s ‘in’ and what’s ‘out’ of the effort calculations, related organizations and their FEC systems, conflicting guidance from sponsors, what to do regarding 100% research faculty and faculty perception of salary allocation.

Taking all these issues into account by and large, UW Administration has worked with its legal counsel Hogan & Hartson LLP in Washington, DC and in consultation with Ross Heath (then Faculty Senate Chair), Brent Stewart (Chair FCR) and the FCR (22 November 2005 and 15 December 2005 meetings) to formulate a training program and policy (see GIM 35) regarding FEC. To minimize risk and ensure that everyone was apprised of and would participate in the FEC process appropriately, a mandatory training program was instituted, required of all FEC faculty, deans, chairs and administrators (http://depts.washington.edu/fecnon). Also, an extensive (and growing) FAQ page was created (http://www.washington.edu/research/maa/fec/#FAQs). UW policy regarding FEC can be found in Grants Information Memoranda (GIM) 35 (http://www.washington.edu/research/osp/gim/gim35.html). GIM 35 also provides UW definitions for faculty effort, institutional base salary, faculty work week, distribution of effort and rules (OMB Circular A-110) regarding changes in level of effort.
Q: What are the major challenges?
A: Although nothing has substantially changed in terms of A-21, the more stringent interpretation thereof by auditors has fostered UW to relate current best practices regarding FEC to the faculty, not only to adhere to the new practice, but also to reduce institutional risk and raise consciousness regarding the issues involved. One of the major challenges regards faculty not being able to ‘volunteer’ or ‘donate’ time to the University for processes such as grant writing or curriculum development. Currently, there is no generally accepted solution to this problem.

A second issue regards 100% research faculty participation in events such as faculty elections, faculty senate and departmental faculty meetings. To the extent such activities are de minimis in nature, meaning that in the aggregate their inclusion in or exclusion from total effort would not affect the percentages of effort allocated to sponsored research, separate tracking and funding is not required. However, should such become greater than de minimis in nature for any reason, it may be necessary to reflect them in an administrative or other category of total effort. Questions about whether activities come within this guideline may require consultation. You may wish to consult the FEC EAQ webpage (http://www.washington.edu/research/maa/fec/#FAQs). Also, your departmental administrator, Management Accounting and Analysis (Executive Director, 6-1379) and Grant and Contract Accounting (Assistant VP, Research Accounting and Analysis, 3-8951) are available to assist in this consultation as needed.

Thirdly, efforts are underway through Administration, the Deans and department Chairs to ensure that the approximately three hundred 100% research funded faculty are paid on non-federal funds when they write new and competitive renewal grant or contract applications.

Q: What are our peer institutions doing?
A: Most are in the process of accomplishing what UW has already achieved: clarifying and/or developing policies, developing mandatory or voluntary faculty training programs and implementing new effort reporting systems. A recent anonymous survey of eight peer institutions found that none allowed any administrative, clinical or teaching activity to be considered ‘non-university’ (volunteered) work. Also, six don’t allow any proposal writing (new or competing) to be considered ‘non-university’ (volunteered) work (the other two were checking but didn’t think so). When asked whether research faculty participate in governance, all responded yes, but also stated that the time required to participate was funded through sources other than grants.

Q: What is being done to resolve these challenges?
A: All institutions of higher learning in this country are hamstrung and are seeking relief from the consequences of the current state of affairs regarding FEC interpretation which strike at the core of who we are as scholars. Some UW administrators are members of the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR, an association of research universities), the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) and the Association of American Universities’ (AAU) Committee on Effort Reporting, which are all actively seeking remedies to these problems with the government, though this is expected to be a long-term process with no quick-fix in sight.

In summary, it is the position of the FCR that there has been faculty participation in the renewed emphasis on faculty effort reporting and that the Office of Executive Vice President and the Office of Research, in consultation with FCR, is making best efforts in addressing the aforementioned challenges on the university and federal levels. FCR will continue direct dialog with the Office of Executive Vice President and the Office of Research with regards to FEC at each FCR meeting through the balance of this academic year.”
2. Human Subjects Division, Office of Research

The Human Subjects Division workload has exploded in recent years. This is the result of both increased volume of research, and increased regulatory burden. It’s been very difficult for the Human Subjects Division to keep pace. Concurrent with these increases, central administration hadn’t invested sufficient additional resources to cover the demand, nor did they invest adequately in a management structure within HSD. When Provost Wise arrived in August 2005, she assessed the need, developed a list of recommendations and set in motion some changes. Funds were appropriated to address both the workload and management issues.

Goals for HSD are threefold: protect participants, meet regulations, and serve researchers. HSD has been so overwhelmed that the service mission to researchers has faltered. Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, met with Associate Deans, and has learned that a large backlog exists with Humanities and Social Science applications. HSD received an NIH grant to develop the UWISE on-line system; this has been halted early in the deployment process because staff had to shift attention to responding to finds from the Office for Human Research Protection (OHRP) from February 2005. UWISE development and rollout will be resumed, but not until sometime into 2007 according to Karen Moe, Assistant Director, HSD.

Research compliance and risk management needs to be elevated within UW’s leadership. A full time Associate Vice Provost for Research, Compliance position has been created and is being filled by Jeff Cheek, from the University of Colorado. The purpose of the position will be to provide coordination and leadership. Focus will need to be on HSD, but Animal Subjects and Environmental Health will also be included. Lidstrom was willing to include a representative of the FCR in the application screening process, but this didn’t occur.

UW has decided to move forward and seek accreditation of the HSD. A pre-review process will be established within HSD, so that protocols can be returned prior to committee review, thus more efficiently addressing basic errors. Offering workshops for incoming graduate students, particularly in the Humanities, is another potential project.

Lidstrom is re-instituting the Human Subjects Policy Board (HSPB), which had been dormant. She wants to develop an iterative policy model, given the frequency of regulatory changes inherent in human subjects work. HSD will now report directly to the Vice Provost for Research, rather than through the Office of Sponsored Programs.

3. Export Control Policy

Universities enjoy the benefits of fundamental research exclusion if they comply with regulations. As a result, university publications are not restricted, and there are no restrictions on foreign nationals’ involvement in research activities. These exclusions and allowances date back to the 1980s.

The US Department of Commerce sought to undermine these exclusions via new rulemaking. This would have changed the definition of “use”, to include operating and maintenance of affected technologies. Such activities would have required a license for any individual foreign national. Per the new proposed rules, access would be defined by your country of birth. Congress received over 300 responses from academia and industry objecting to aspects of the proposed rules, including one from UW. Soon after Department of Commerce’s proposed changes were published, the Department of Defense proposed similar changes to their rules, and the same community responded with negative input.

Carol Zuiches, Assistant Vice Provost for Research and Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP), has formed an Export Control committee, including Purchasing, faculty representatives (including
a member of FCR), Tech Transfer, the Security Office of the Applied Physics Laboratory, staff from
OSP, Environmental Health and Safety, and Theresa Richmond from the Attorney General’s office.

A small number of countries (Cuba, Syria, Liberia, Sudan, Libya, Iran, and North Korea) are embargoed,
and all activities involving them must be licensed. Faculty violating these rules are personally at risk fines
and incarceration. Shipping to foreign countries, collaborating with foreign countries, working with
foreign nationals, working with proprietary information (this is not protected under fundamental research
exclusion): these are reasons to consult with OSP when in doubt. A good summary can be found at:
https://www.washington.edu/research/osp/exportcontrol.pdf. Export Control regulation information can
be found at the Office of Sponsored Programs website: http://www.washington.edu/research/osp/ecr.html

4. Network of Interdisciplinary Initiatives – NII
This is an initiative of all campus interdisciplinary initiatives that began with the 17 interdisciplinary
programs housed in the Graduate School. The goal of NII is to reach out to interdisciplinary programs
across UW’s campuses to find better ways to seed, sustain and support interdisciplinary activity at the
University. For example, how can the University better address faculty promotion and tenure issues in
light of interdisciplinary program participation? How can the university foster unique opportunities for
engaging in interdisciplinary research, teaching, and training and also advocate for changes in University
structure to facilitate interdisciplinary work?

Three core areas, based on recommendations developed in November at the NII Working Group 2005
meeting, in which action could significantly increase support of interdisciplinary program teaching,
research and training at the UW are: (1) faculty appointments, promotion and tenure; (2) allocation of
resources, including indirect costs; and (3) development and outreach.

The report by Gail Dubrow and Jennifer Harris entitled, “Seeding, Supporting, and Sustaining
Interdisciplinary Initiatives at the University of Washington: Findings, Recommendations and Strategies,”
(http://www.grad.washington.edu/Acad/interdisc_network/ID_Docs/Dubrow_Harris_Report.pdf) details
findings about the successes and challenges of interdisciplinary activity at the University and outlines
strategies for implementation of their recommendations. It is available at the NII website:
(http://www.grad.washington.edu/Acad/interdisc_network/InterdisNetwork.htm).

At a workshop held January 17, 2006, interdisciplinary faculty and staff from across the campus formed
into three groups in order to address issues in the three areas of action. One of the dilemmas is for junior
faculty who become involved in interdisciplinary activity but do not receive full credit for these activities
when they are reviewed for promotion and tenure.

Mark Haselkorn created a wiki (http://uwnii.pbwiki.com) for input on a possible proposal from FCR to
the Faculty Senate to create a cross-campus committee to build on the work of the Graduate School's
Network of Interdisciplinary Initiatives. Provost Phyllis Wise has formed a committee, in consultation
with the Faculty Senate, to take a comprehensive look at how we are organized academically to do our
work. The Committee will be co-chaired by Professors Tom Daniel and Kathleen Woodward. This
committee was formed to explore whether the current organization of our colleges and schools best serves
learning experiences for our undergraduate and graduate student and postdoctoral fellows. Also, whether
our configuration best serves the growth of interdisciplinary research collaborations and takes advantages
of evolving programmatic interactions. This analysis complements the review of the undergraduate
experience and the leadership, community, and values initiative (LCVI). This committee will be gathering
information and opinions of the University community.

Mark Haselkorn presented a proposal at the 1 June 2006 FCR meeting to create a cross-campus
committee to explore and make recommendations on institutional change in support of interdisciplinary
This committee would report to the Faculty Senate, with oversight from FCR. It is proposed that this cross-campus committee will build on and coordinate with the Provost’s Committee on College and Schools Organization and the Graduate School’s Network of Interdisciplinary Initiatives (NII). They will investigate incentives for and barriers to creating and sustaining interdisciplinary research initiatives. This proposal was approved by FCR and will be presented to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in autumn 2006.

5. Grants.gov (http://www.grants.gov/)

Why use Grants.gov? The Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999, also known as Public Law 106-107 (P.L. 106-107), was enacted in November 1999. The purposes of the Act are to: (1) improve the effectiveness and performance of Federal financial assistance programs, (2) simplify Federal financial assistance application and reporting requirements, (3) improve the delivery of services to the public, and (4) facilitate greater coordination among those responsible for delivering services.

What is Grants.gov? It is a Federal portal that allows users to electronically find and apply for Federal grant opportunities. It simplifies the grant application process and creates a centralized, on-line process to find and apply for over 900 grant programs from the 26 Federal grant-making agencies. It may be accessed at: http://www.grants.gov/.

NIH had originally planned to receive all R01 applications via Grants.gov on 1 October 2006. Due to pressure from universities and higher education organizations such as the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR), the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP), and the Association of American Universities (AAU). However, the first Grants.gov R01 deadline has been changed to 1 February 2007. A new application form, Standard Form (SF) 424 replaces previous forms (e.g., PHS 398), and the new submission process requires training for all PIs and grants support staff. Having an extra four months to prepare for this change will be of great benefit.

Some sponsors (e.g., NOAA) have already moved to Grants.gov. NIH is currently transitioning to Grants.gov; and others like NSF have yet to begin the transition. Eventually, all Federal granting agencies will require the submission of proposals via the Grants.gov system. Grant programs available via Grants.gov can be viewed at the Grants.gov website at: http://www.Grants.gov/assets/GrantsgovProgramsList.pdf.

As everything will be moving to Grants.gov, there may be some start-up requirements. Window users will need to download the PureEdge Viewer software via Grants.gov website (PureEdge Viewer is a small, free program which allows one to access, complete and submit applications electronically and securely on Grants.gov). Non-windows users (i.e., Mac and Linux) must download software to enable them to use the Citrix server. The PureEdge viewer will not be ready for non-Windows environments until early 2007. For NIH proposals, PIs must have an active account in the NIH eRA Commons. There are four general steps for submitting proposal via Grants.gov: (1) download application package via Grants.gov, (2) complete the application package, (3) submit the application package to OSP with e-GC1, and (4) for NIH applications only - verify the application package via NIH eRA Commons.

The Key impact on faculty is fourfold. Applications must be filed electronically by OSP, which makes last minute revisions extremely difficult. Applications will need to be finalized well in advance of the agency due date. (OSP policy requires 3 days; some departments are setting earlier deadlines however). New forms – SF424, plus variations to learn within these forms. There are no templates. Each program application is unique and must be downloaded from Grants.gov and completed. For NIH applications only: The PI must have Internet access at the time the proposal is submitted, or shortly thereafter, to
verify the application package within eRA Commons. See the OSP Grants.gov webpages at: http://www.washington.edu/research/osp/gg.php for further information.

What is the time duration from grant application submittal through Grants.gov until it is available through eRA Commons for verification? The current NIH goal is two business days, but the duration thus far observed has ranged from 15 minutes to 14 days. Be aware of this especially on your first submission.

6. Retirement payout for staff leave balance
At the request of the Council, Sue Camber at the 4 May 2006 FCR meeting addressed the issue of accrued sick leave and annual leave. When staff members accrue sick leave and annual leave and they are paid on a grant, the grant ‘pays’ for that leave in reduced productivity. If an individual leaves the UW before retirement, accrued and unused sick leave is not paid out. At retirement or death, accrued and unused sick leave is paid from a central fund and is not charged to grants. Accrued and unused annual leave is paid from grants at retirement, death, or separation. The maximum number of hours paid out is 240. The process of paying annual leave on the budget(s) the person is paid on when they leave the UW has been approved by the federal government and disclosed in the UW’s Cost Accounting Disclosure Statement.

Recently, a large number of individual faculty members and faculty groups have expressed concern about annual leave payouts on grants as these costs are not anticipated in their research budgets. A further issue is that these anticipated costs may become a factor in hiring grant personnel, such that PIs may be reluctant to hire the most senior and experienced people from other projects because they do not want to absorb these costs. Sue Camber is developing data and consulting with Planning and Budgeting on a possible review of the process.

Planning and Budgeting considers that vacation and sick leave accrual is an issue that the UW needs to address at some point. This is a considerable financial issue as the total dollar value of accrued vacation and sick leave is large. Based on knowledge of what other institutions have done in this area, UW could transition into vacation accrual over a number of years. UW would also have to look at the complexity/cost of necessary modifications to our administrative computing systems.

Current thought on converting to vacation and sick leave accrual would be accomplished through a modification (i.e., increase in) the benefit load rate. Gary Quarfoth suggested that it would be useful for him and Sue Camber to work up a brief summary of the issue to better inform any future discussion at FCR and/or Research Advisory Board (RAB) meetings. FCR members agreed to support Sue Camber and Gary Quarfoth in beginning a discussion of this issue with the RAB.

7. Overview of the Applied Physics Lab
Some of the basic and applied research programs at the Applied Physics Laboratory at the University of Washington (APL-UW) today are: acoustic and remote sensing, ocean physics and engineering, medical and industrial ultrasound, polar science, environmental and information systems, as well as electronic and photonic systems.

APL-UW collaborates with other UW departments or units within the College of Arts & Sciences, College of Engineering, School of Medicine, and College of Ocean & Fishery Sciences. APL-UW is a unit of the College of Ocean & Fishery Sciences. APL-UW has a very strong focus in field experimentation. Each year APL-UW undertakes numerous field experiments in the oceans around the world. These field efforts can be experiments for basic research or efforts that are more applied and operational.

APL-UW has a special partnership with the US Navy as one of four Navy University Affiliated Research Centers (UARCs). They maintain expertise in areas of Navy relevance, such as underwater acoustics and
oceanography, and are therefore capable of quickly responding to Navy needs in these areas. Almost two-thirds of the research monies for APL-UW (in FY05) came from the US Navy. The other third comes from Federal agencies such as NSF, NASA, NIH, NOAA, Army, Air Force and DARPA. APL-UW’s federal research funding has grown in the past five years from just over $30 million to almost $50 million (FY06).

APL-UW is witnessing a funding shift away from basic research towards applied research and engineering. In FY05 APL-UW funding was 60% basic research and 40% for applied research & development, compared with 76% (basic) and 24% (applied) in FY01. Federal agencies are encouraging more multi-institutional and multi-disciplinary initiatives, and so APL-UW expects to engage in further collaboration with other UARCs, academic units at UW, and with other academic institutions and industry.

Developing R&D initiatives at APL-UW include: operational ocean gliders – unmanned undersea vehicles for undersea sensing; ocean observing systems – cabled networks of ocean sensors, encouraged by NSF (e.g., Neptune) and NOAA; Puget Sound initiatives – related to anoxia in Hood Canal and undersea noise in the Sound; counter-IED – aimed at defeating the threat of improvised explosive devices; and photonics applications – developing highly capable sensing and communication devices.

APL-UW is very entrepreneurial and has played a role in the development of several local companies, focused on ocean instrumentation or ultrasound, including: Allez Physionix, Blue View Technologies, EKOS, Sea-Bird Technologies, Second Act Partners, Sound Metrics, Therus and UST.

Over two thirds of APL funding is defense related, since two thirds is Navy funding (mostly from ONR) and though the other third is mostly from NSF it includes some funding from NOAA, NASA, NIH, DARPA, Army and Air Force. APL received more NSF funding than any other UW unit for FY 2005. They also clarified that the amount of research that is classified varies and is only 10-20%. Much of this research is classified only because the data sets were collected via classified methods.

8. Classified, Proprietary and Restricted (CPR) Research Subcommittee

Prof. Daniel Vogt (Chair, Classified, Proprietary and Restricted Research subcommittee) reported at the 1 June 2006 FCR meeting that his subcommittee reviewed two proposals from the Applied Physics Laboratory and recommended that they be approved by FCR. The proposals were unanimously approved by FCR.

The CPR subcommittee and FCR apply five criterions to researchers applying for a classified, proprietary or restricted research contract (found in the University Handbook, Vol. 4, Part II, Chapter 1, Sec. 3):

a. What unique capabilities do your program and the UW bring to this proposed project?
b. Describe the scholarly, scientific, and/or educational benefits of this proposed project.
c. In what ways does the proposed project provide a public or community service?
d. In what ways, if any, will UW students (graduate or undergraduate) be involved in the project? If they participate in the research, will they require security clearance or have restrictions place on their thesis, dissertation, or other academic activities?
e. Does the proposed project engender any restrictions on publications by the PI, members of the research team, students or postdoctoral fellows?

9. Thanks, Welcome, Leadership; FCR Authorization, Charge, Scope, Representation and Liaison

Our Thanks and Welcome. FCR would like to thank outgoing members Subodha Kumar, Diane Morrison and Brent Stewart for their sacrifice of time and energy in participating on this and past years FCR activities. They have our esteem and gratitude. We would also like to welcome incoming FCR
members for 2006-2007: Sanjeev Khagram (Evans School of Public Affairs), Ilene Schwartz (Education) and Ronald Stenkamp (Biological Structure). Many thanks also to those participating as FCR Members for 2005-2006:

**Faculty:** Greg Benner (Education, Tacoma), Cathryn Booth-La Force (Nursing – Vice Chair), David Fluharty (Marine Affairs), B. Robert Franz (Bioengineering), Francoise Haeseleer (Ophthalmology), Mark Haselkorn (Technical Communication), H. Asuman Kiyak (Dentistry), Subodha Kumar (Management Science), Gerald Miller (Physics), Diane Morrison (Social Work), John Rasmussen (Arts and Sciences, Bothell), Brent Stewart (Radiology – Chair), Daniel Vogt (Forest Resources), and Richard Wright (Linguistics).

**Ex-Officio:** Suzette Ashby-Larrabee (PSO Representative), Theresa Barker, GPSS Representative, Niki Cheema, ASUW Representative, Sam Dworkin (Emeritus Faculty), Mary Lidstrom (Vice Provost for Research), David Lovell (Legislative Representative), and Nanette Welton (ALUW Representative).

**Passing of the Torch:** FCR Chair will pass from Brent K. Stewart (Professor, Radiology) to Cathryn Booth-LaForce (Professor, Family and Child Nursing) on 16 September 2006. Brent and Cathryn have kindly served as Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively, for the 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 academic years. According to FCR vote, it was decided that, if at all possible, the Chair serves for a two-year term with the Vice-Chair succeeding the Chair. This will be brought up at the first SEC meeting of the 2006/2007 academic year. It is planned that a new Vice Chair will be recruited at the first FCR meeting of the 2006/2007 academic year.

**Council Authorization, Charge and Scope:** The Faculty Council on Research (FCR) is one of twelve advisory bodies to the Faculty Senate and is responsible to the Senate Executive Committee (*University Handbook Vol. 2, Part 4, Chapter 42, Sec. 42-31*). The FCR serves as the deliberative and advisory body for all matters of University policy relating to research and is the primary forum for faculty-administrative interaction in determining that policy (*University Handbook Vol. 2, Part 4, Chapter 42, Secs. 42-31 and 42-37*). One of our weightier responsibilities deals with Classified, Proprietary and Restricted Research (*University Handbook Vol. 4, Part II: University Research, Chapter 1: Classified and Proprietary Research*). The FCR does not have general oversight responsibility for University policy on the protection of human subjects, which is the responsibility of the Research Advisory Board (*University Handbook Vol. 4, Part 2, Chapter 2, Sec. 7*).

**Representation and Liaison:**
1. The FCR Chair is a member of the Research Advisory Board.
2. The FCR Chair is a member of the Senate Executive Committee.
3. The FCR Chair is an *ex officio* voting member of the Senate.
4. The FCR Chair is an *ex officio* member of the Intellectual Property Advisory Management Committee (IPMAC).
5. An FCR member is appointed by the Provost for Research (Mary Lidstrom) to the Human Subjects Policy Board (currently Cathryn Booth-LaForce).
6. An FCR member participates on the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) Export Control Committee (currently Mark Haselkorn).