University of Washington
Faculty Council on Research

The Faculty Council on Research met on Friday, February 4, 2005, at 8:00 a.m., in Mary Gates Hall 420. Chair Brent Stewart called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

Synopsis:
1. Announcements, approve agenda, approve minutes
2. Recommendations on Miyamoto Classified Research Proposals
3. Discussion of proposed NIH Regional Bio-Containment Laboratory
4. Discussion of President Emmert's draft letter on stem cell research
5. Follow-up on Effort Reporting Training for Faculty (Sue Camber)
6. RBL Discussion with guests Albert Berger, Samuel Miller, Karen VanDusen, Theresa Gordon
7. Export Control Policy and Training Policies (Carol Zuiches)

Comments, Announcements, Agenda, Minutes
The agenda was approved. The minutes of the last meeting were approved as revised. The Spring Quarter scheduling matrix will be sent out on February 11 – Stewart urged members to return the matrix promptly, so that FCR can get priority for dates and meeting room space.

Announcements:
- Carol Zuiches would like an FCR member to join the Export Controls/ITAR committee she is forming. Please let Carol and Brent know if you can serve.
- Today, the Research Advisory Board will hear a presentation on plans for the Deep Underground Science and Engineering Lab (DUSEL). Last month, the Data Center Task Force presented information on development of an off-campus Data Center to house general UW and Medical Center information.
- At the IPMAC meeting, members were briefed on open information and open-source intellectual property, and also discussed the technology gap innovation fund. Mac Parks has more information on this fund.
- A February 3 press conference by NIH clarified the NIH policy on open access to archived publications. Stewart provided handouts from the press conference for the information of FCR members.

Discussion of President Emmert's Draft Letter on Stem Cell Research
In reviewing the draft letter, Stewart thought that the reference to stem cells helping Alzheimer's disease may not be correct, and should be changed to Parkinson's. Kiyak was not clear about the letter's purpose – supporting new stem cell lines, or supporting space to do research? Hogan said the legislature wanted the UW's position on stem cell research in general. Heath commented that the letter should say we support stem cell research, and this draft does not communicate that well.

Franza said that the letter should begin by citing the many researchers in the Pacific Northwest who have done distinguished stem cell research. It is very important to be explicit about the need to counter the three billion dollar account being created in California, which will draw stem cell talent out of this region. Franza said he has already been approached by headhunters for referrals to talented colleagues who might be hired away from the UW.

Hogan asked whether the consensus is that the document is too weak, and should be made much more forthright. Council members agreed, and asked Hogan to convey this to President Emmert. Stewart thanked Hogan, on behalf of FCR, for the opportunity to comment.
Recommendations on Miyamoto Classified Research Proposals
Kiyak reported that the subcommittee on Classified, Restricted and Sensitive Research reviewed the Miyamoto proposals and recommended that they be approved by FCR. The proposals were unanimously approved, with 15 yes votes received. A checklist of review questions for these kinds of proposals has been drafted by the subcommittee and will be discussed at a future FCR meeting.

Question on EGC1
Stewart asked council members to consider a question that has come up on the EGC1. There is a discrepancy between the paper and electronic versions – the paper version fully states a question on pathogens (Question 1), but the electronic version does not appear to be specific enough. Zuiches said this could be easily changed – she and Stewart and Hogan will confer and decide whether the original question needs to be restated or revised so it will be clearer.

Follow-up on Effort Reporting Training for Faculty
Sue Camber said that the training for effort reporting needs to be done soon, since it is a very sensitive issue right now. It is an additional mandatory training, but might be made more palatable to faculty if it replaces a session of the Faculty Grants Training. If this is approved, it would satisfy the 2005 mandatory training requirement. If faculty do not complete the FEC training module, their grants will have to be shut down. The training is Web-based, and can be done in parts.

Camber said that Faculty Effort Reporting was not an issue at all a year ago, but now it is a very big issue so the training must be done. She also needs testers for this module, and will give testers credit for completing the mandatory training. Several FCR members volunteered to be testers.

RBL Discussion with guests Albert Berger, Samuel Miller, Karen VanDusen, Theresa Gordon
Albert Berger described the proposed project to build a Level 3 Regional Bio-Containment Laboratory, the only one on the West Coast. The project was a response to an NIAID RFP, and was applied for in Fall, 2004. It would provide $25,000,000 in Federal monies to build a new laboratory facility.

One consideration in deciding to apply for the monies was the information that another very large grant, which funds a Regional Center for Excellence in BioDefense and Emerging Infectious Diseases at the UW, might not be renewed if a new facility were not built. The grant is currently in the NIH application process, and nothing will be known about the outcome until June, 2005.

Issues include the academic freedom of the faculty to apply for grants to further their scholarly work, versus the perceived sensitivity of the kind of research that is being done. Where do you draw the line? Samuel Miller added that Level 3 facilities are not considered particularly controversial by the scientific community.

Theresa Gordon (Sp?) said there is much confusion among the general public about the difference between a level 3 and a level 4 facility. Her office is working within the requirements of the prescribed public process to address this over the next 4 to 5 months.

Kiyak said it seems very unusual to do all this after the grant application has already been submitted – FCR and the Faculty Senate leadership should have been on board this decision before the application went in.

Gordon described the three phases of the application as a long process, and said she is following the NIH process. Kiyak did not agree that "following the NIH process" should ever take the place of engagement upfront with the UW faculty and the surrounding community. We shouldn't wait until we get a negative reaction and then try to fix it.
Gordon said the President will look at the grant and decide whether to go forward or not; there is ample opportunity over the next three or four months to look at everything – that is the way the process is laid out and that's what we're going forward and doing.

Miller said that several UW officials have admitted that the process could have been handled better. The issue is what to do now – whether to go ahead with something that most people feel is good for the community. Miller said there may be issues of faculty governance, but he doesn't have anything to do with that.

Heath thanked Miller for acknowledging that some things might have been done better. Other council members reported that the situation has raised broader questions in the community about UW research in general. The UW must be very proactive in public education and public relations about the benefits of UW research efforts. A big part of this is letting FCR know what's happening, so the council can make certain no one in faculty governance is blindsided. There needs to be an ongoing dialogue, so everyone knows what is going on.

It is imperative that Miller, the President, and the Provost all know what is happening, so that they can take a consistent position. The issue is how and why the RBL should be sited at that particular spot on South Campus. It may also be necessary to have a working group to protect the existing labs, and effectively engage the people who are concerned about the project. Berger agreed that it would have been very helpful to talk to Craig Hogan and to have made the members of the Research Advisory Board aware of the project.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45. Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.

Present: Professors Booth-La Force, Franza, Haeseleer, Heath, Kiyak, Kumar, Miller, Morrison, Rasmussen, Stewart, Tolnay, Vogt
Ex-Officio Blake, Camber, Kahl, Hogan, Parks, Zuiches, Ashby-Larrabee

Absent: Professors Benner, Sarikaya
Ex-Officio Stygall, Fredericks, Dworkin, Barker

Guests: Albert Berger, Vice Dean, Office of Research and Graduate Education, School of Medicine
Samuel Miller, Professor, Medicine/Division of Infectious Diseases
Karen VanDusen, Director, Environmental Health and Safety, Hall Health Center