The Faculty Council on Research met on Tuesday, January 15, at noon, in 36 Gerberding. Chair Ross Heath presided.

**PRESENT:** Professors Booth, Gordon, Heath, Kartsonis, Kiyak, Ruzicka, Stewart, Troll, Vitaliano, Vogt  
**Ex-Officio** Blake, Camber, Perrin, Zuiches, Parks  
**Special Guests:** Sandra Lier, Karen Van Dusen, Vicki Pelzer

**ABSENT:** Professors Reh, Vance  
**Ex-Officio** Ghosh, Kahl, Ludwig, Sjåvik, Takhar

**Synopsis**
1. Approve agenda
2. Approve minutes of June 7, 2001 meeting
3. Announcements
4. USA PATRIOT Act: Overview and Effects on Research (Lier)
5. FCR Representation on IPMAC
6. Meeting with Provost for Research (Heath)
7. Status of Research Office/Indirect Cost Primer (Parks)

**Approve agenda**  
The agenda was approved.

**Approve minutes**  
The November minutes were approved with one correction.

**Announcements**  
None.

**USA PATRIOT Act: Overview and Effects on Research (Lier)**
The USA PATRIOT Act was passed by the United States Congress in response to the September 11 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Towers and the Pentagon. The Act, which is far-reaching, has implications for the way research is done on the University of Washington.

The name of the Act is an acronym that stands for Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism (USA PATRIOT), said Lier.

How the Act will affect the UW is not fully known at this point, but it deals with increased Immigration and Naturalization Service oversight of foreign nationals and amends the FIRPA Act to permit unconsented disclosure of student records in terrorism investigations. It also addresses law enforcement surveillance of Internet and voicemail, increases government power to investigate trespassing on computers, and punishes possession of terrorism-related biological materials. Part of the Act addresses research institutions ensuring themselves and the public that there will be security surrounding research materials. How all of this is implemented remains to be seen. The UW is cognizant of this Act and is addressing its provisions.

Lier introduced Karen Van Dusen, who provided Council members with some handouts of parts of the Act concerning on biological agents. If researchers order any of the listed biological agents, they become
subject to the provisions of the Act as soon as they are transported. The University is presently looking into ways to determine which researchers meet any of the criteria in the lists.

At present, the University of Texas at Galveston is being inspected by the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services to test the provisions of the Act. Galveston has required a signed self-disclosure of everyone on campus who works with the restricted materials. The UW is looking into what kind of program can be implemented to meet the requirements of the Act.

The Principal Investigator is responsible for determining which staff members, if any, meet the Act's criteria. Van Duzen wants their input on ways to meet the legal requirements, while protecting the research, the community, and the people in the labs. It will be necessary to justify materials ordered, and to ask staff members to certify their status as foreign nationals to determine whether they fall under categories restricted by the Act. The culture of the campus may change - labs should be challenging visitors, asking for credentials, and being serious about lab security.

Governor Locke is also proposing a bill to comply with the Federal Bill. Other bills are being proposed in Congress to deal with other aspects of terrorism. The Feinstein bill would completely bar non-Us Nationals from research, said Mac Parks.

Those responsible for labs should be looking at compliance with Labor and Industries Lab Safety Manuals and Bio-Safety manuals to be certain that Standard Operating Procedures are in place and that staff are trained; PIs should double check chemical hazards and all safety procedures. The University could be audited - no one really knows.

The Restricted Persons list includes people who have used controlled substances, have been institutionalized for mental illness, and other categories. Van Duzen commented that these kinds of records may or may not be available to the University, unless the person has already revealed them. It is also possible that a researcher who is a national of a named terrorist country might have to give up a lifetime of research, said Van Duzen - we just don't know. Lier's office is watching what happens in Texas, and on the rolling site visits by the Inspector General, and hopes to know more soon.

Heath commented that these concerns are not going to go away anytime soon, and that the Council will keep the Act on its agenda.

**FCR Representation on IPMAC**

Mac Parks has checked with IPMAC and there is no problem with FCR being represented on the Committee. Heath asked if anyone on the Council would like to serve; hearing no volunteers, Heath will serve as the FCR representative to IPMAC.

**Meeting with Provost (Heath)**

Ross Heath met with Provost Lee Huntsman to discuss the low visibility of research at the University. The fact that it is not possible to get to Research from the UW Web page is symptomatic of the institutional view of Research, Heath said. This low visibility often puts researchers at odds with state agencies as well.

The meeting included a discussion of the separation of the Graduate School from Research, the issue of whether the head of research at the University should be a Vice President, and the quality of communication between the FCR and the Provost. Huntsman agreed that the communication issue was a valid complaint. He sees the Vice Provost for Research as primarily an administrative/operational position. Heath suggested consideration be given to a Vice President for Research focused more on leadership and promotion of the University's research effort, particularly in Washington D.C. Heath felt
that the meeting was a civil exchange of views that did not go anywhere. The Senate Executive Committee may wish to pursue the issue

**Status of Research Office/Indirect Cost Primer (Parks)**

Mac Parks began his discussion of indirect costs by distributing copies of the Indirect Cost Primer, which is intended to familiarize Council members with the subject in preparation for an in-depth discussion. Indirect costs include essential items, such as heat, power, buildings, libraries, and research services, that cannot be attributed to specific grants. The Primer is an effort to explain those costs, and raise the level of discussion about these costs.

Parks described the current discussion of reorganization in the Provost's office. As detailed in the Provost's memo of December 19, the reorganization would shear off certain functions done in of the Office of Research and in the Graduate School. The Council is encouraged to review the plan and ask what functions objectives would be served by the proposal. Would Grant and Contract Services provide the best research support by reporting through a faculty-driven Office of Research or by reporting through the business-oriented Executive Vice President's Office? There are good arguments on both sides of that issue. Should Graduate Program Reviews - and ultimately departments - be run through the academically-oriented Graduate School, or through Institutional Studies with no faculty involvement? Parks believes the Council should be aware of the plan and have input to it.

Ruzicka commented on difficulties he has had in meeting grant deadlines through Grant and Contract Services in a timely fashion. Kiyak pointed out that the volume of grants processed by GCS has doubled, while staff has actually been decreased - she thinks they have been doing a good job, but questioned why more staff can't be hired with the additional indirect cost dollars generated by the increase in grant monies. Zuiches commented that most grants proposals come in three or four days before the deadline, accompanied by 75 other grants proposals -- the department is processing more grants than ever before, with fewer staff.

General discussion centered on what indirect costs are for, where the dollars go, and exactly what the dollar amounts are - is it possible to get more staff for Grant and Contract Services to keep pace with the increasing volume of grants? Indirect costs should be more transparent, so researchers have good information about how grant monies are administered and used.

Parks suggested that the Council invite Harlan Patterson, Vice Provost for Planning and Budgeting, to talk about indirect costs. It would also be good to have a debate about whether the reorganization changes will actually improve the lot of researchers, whether faculty involvement will ultimately increase or decrease, and how Research Services will meet the demands made upon them.

Heath asked the Council to read the materials Mac Parks provided; he will talk to Brad Holt about the reorganization proposal, and will invite Harlan Patterson to the February 12 meeting to brief the Council on Indirect Costs.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:28 p.m. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*