University of Washington  
Faculty Council on Research  

The Faculty Council on Research met on Thursday, January 16, 2003, at 8:00 a.m. in 26 Gerberding Hall. Chair Asuman Kiyak presided.

PRESENT:  
Professors Booth, Gordon, Heath, Kartsonis, Kiyak, Sarikaya, Stewart, Tolnay, Troll, Vogt  
Ex-Officio Blake, Dworkin, Kahl, Hogan, Parks, Zuiches

ABSENT:  
Professors Ruzicka, Vance, Vitaliano  
Ex-Officio Sjavik, Stygall, Ghosh, Camber

Synopsis:
1. Research Royalty Fund (Parks)  
2. UW guidelines re: "Allegations of scientific & scholarly misconduct"  
3. Implementing Rose Report recommendations for FCR  
4. A/B salaries: Preparation for January 30 FCR meeting

Kiyak called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

Approve agenda  
The agenda was approved.

Approve minutes  
The December minutes were approved, with one revision.

Announcements  
Craig Hogan announced that the next Internal Symposium, on Data Intensive Science, will take place on Saturday, March 1, and will be similar in format to the first Internal Symposium held last November. The day-long program will explore the surprising commonalities that appear when science is enabled by computational capabilities. The day will feature nine speakers with expertise in everything from protein-folding to gene networks to simulations of cells, organisms, planet systems, and climate, who will discuss the very large datasets that can be incorporated into databases and what they can reveal. Hogan encouraged all FCR members to attend and to invite other researchers they think might benefit by the symposium.

Mac Parks said the announcement for the Spring Round of Royalty Research Fund Grants has just gone out. These small internal grants (up to $40,000) are for the use of UW faculty. Proposals, which are due March 3, 2003, are reviewed during Spring Quarter and awards are announced June 15.

Royalty Research Fund  
Research Council member Mac Parks presented a five-year report, with data through June 2001, on the Royalty Research Fund to council members.

The Royalty Research Fund (RRF), which is supported by the central administration's share of licensing revenue, provides grants to UW faculty for a wide variety of research projects. Licensing revenue, which is administered by the Office of Technology Transfer, is divided among the investigators who created the technologies, the department and school or college responsible for the technologies, and the central administration.
Parks reported on the source of the RRF monies, the way in which they are allocated, who is funded, the impact of the RRF monies, and plans for change in the Fund.

Over the last ten years, Parks said, revenues have come primarily from the Benjamin Hall technologies - the hepatitis B vaccine and the yeast expression method. There are other small sources of licensing revenue as well. RRF monies total slightly less than two million dollars, which is distributed in two rounds per year. Individual awards range from $5,000 to a cap of $40,000, with the average award being $24,000.

Grant applications are reviewed by three standing Review Committees, each of which has three subcommittees (Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, Physical Sciences and Engineering, and Biomedical and Biological Sciences). The Committee that reviews each application is augmented by peers with expertise in the relevant discipline.

For purposes of the RRF awards, the definition of research is broad, Parks said. If a tenure and promotion committee would count the proposal as scholarly, it is considered for an RRF award. Preference is given to junior faculty or to senior faculty initiating new lines of research.

There are certain limits on the uses of RRF monies – the awards are not to be used as matching, startup, supplemental, or bridge money, nor for travel unless the travel is for data collection. Research Assistant support is limited to nine months. Applicants are asked to affirm that there is no other funding for the project; the RRF award may be withdrawn if external funding is received.

Between June 1996, and January 2001, the Royalty Research Fund received 1156 applications and funded 316 (27.3%).

- Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences: 381 applications, 124 awards (32.5% successful).
- Physical Sciences and Engineering: 202 applications, 55 awards (27.2% successful).
- Biomedical and Biological Sciences: 573 applications, 137 awards (23.9% successful).

Many Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences awards were in the $5000 range; Biological and Biomedical awards were generally larger, primarily due to equipment costs.

Assistant professors and research assistant professors were awarded 48.1% of the grants, associate professors and research associate professors were awarded 23.7%, and full professors were awarded 28.2%. The preponderance of awards to junior faculty is due to recruitment and award guidelines.

By school and college, the top five award recipients in the last ten rounds are:
1. English
2. Medicine
3. Psychology
4. Chemistry
5. Art

Other recipients include Zoology, Radiology, Music, Education, Epidemiology, and Oceanography.
The Royalty Research Fund has surveyed award recipients to determine whether their research resulted in publication, a patent, license, or other product, or additional funding. Of the 202 who responded, 73% resulted in publication, 35% in a patent, license, or other product (e.g., a book or film), and 62% resulted in additional funding.

The results were particularly impressive in the category of additional funding:
- Awards totaling 2.6 million dollars led to 84.4 million dollars in additional funding
- Return on investment was 32:1 for those who received additional funding

While it cannot be proven that recipients would not have received additional funding without the RRF grants, many survey respondents indicated that the RRF awards were instrumental in their obtaining additional monies. The raw total from the survey was actually 123 million dollars in additional funding, said Parks, which he adjusted to a conservative number of 84 million.

In response to Mehmet Sarikaya's question about expanding the program, Craig Hogan said that he could imagine expanding the scope of the program into some different dimensions. A targeted panel might look into taking University research and deploying it into venture capital/private sector – basically converting the results of research into something that is deliverable to venture capitalists who develop products. This is not currently being done, and would be an appropriate use of monies that are derived from licensing income, Hogan added. These monies could also be used for societal impacts; for example, to support UW outreach in areas such as the environment.

Anna Kartsonis and Sam Dworkin each commented that awards in the arts may not result in dollars, but may result in other commissions. Sarikaya added that it doesn't matter whether colleagues in the arts and social sciences bring in money, as long as the level of their projects is high. The University would be very dull without the arts.

Sarikaya also suggested that local companies be invited for a one-day seminar on the RRF awards, and that they be asked to contribute to the program.

Kartsonis said that there are important impacts of this funding that cannot be measured. Perhaps this could be added to the RRF slide show as footnotes in an appropriate place. Parks said he could do this, and will also add specific stories about these kinds of intangible benefits.

Kiyak commented that she received an RRF grant in the late 1980's, which led her in a research direction she had not anticipated and resulted in two major grants and clinical trials. She would like to see more historical data to show how RRF funding affects the recipients' research over time.

Parks said there have been some suggestions from survey recipients that may precipitate changes in the RRF awards. Most survey respondents think the program is properly sized, but have suggested that RRF awards:
- Continue to be capped at $40,000, but allow a grant period to two years instead of one.
- Allow two months summer salary instead of one.
- Allow release time from classes.
- Allow a larger budget for human subjects.
- Include travel expenses.

Several council members commented from their own experience in the RRF review process, noting that peer reviewers do not always have expertise in the field they are reviewing and in
some cases have no experience in reviewing grant applications at all. This was seen by some as an important deficiency in the program. Kartsonis inquired whether the names of the Review Committee members are published anywhere.

Parks responded that it is not always easy to find experienced reviewers, particularly in the appropriate disciplines within the UW community. Review Committee members names are not published at present, but there is no reason not to – this information could be added to the Web site.

Parks will contact Mark Troll and Cathryn Booth individually, to gather more information about their experiences and concerns in the review process as RRF applicant and Review Committee member, respectively.

Ross Heath commented that he would like to see the Royalty Research Fund presentation used as the basis for a University Week article. Kiyak will follow up with Parks on this suggestion.

**Looking Ahead**

**A/B Salary Plan discussion:** On January 30, Vice Provost Steven Olswang will attend FCR and present information on the A/B salary plan. Please plan to attend, and bring questions, departmental rumors, and anecdotes from your own or others' experience with A/B salary plan.

**Scientific and Scholarly Misconduct Guidelines:** On January 30, the Council will discuss Lea Vaughn's December 10, 2002, memo entitled Executive Revisions to the Procedural Guidelines Addressing Allegations of Scientific and Scholarly Misconduct. Please review the materials supplied at this meeting.

**New Joint Research Committee:** Because the Research Council is the test case for the Rose Committee proposal on joint university committees, members should be looking at the list of existing committees cited in the Rose Report to see which committees should be folded into FCR, and should also be thinking about other offices of people who might need to be included on the new joint Research committee. This will be taken up at a future meeting.

**Intellectual Property Rules Changes:** Mac Parks asked that the entire February 13 meeting be devoted to a presentation he will give on this topic, and to discussion of the subject.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 a.m. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton.*