Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order and approval of Agenda
2. Approve minutes from January 2009 FCR meeting
3. Announcements
   - Office of Research (Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, Office of Research)
4. Requests for Information and Updates
   - Office of Research (Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, Office of Research)
5. Discussion
   - Potential FCR Issues Associated With Faculty Effort Reporting (Sue Camber and Richard Wright)
6. Old Business
   - INSER Report and Final Review by Vice-Provost for Global Affairs (Haselkorn)
7. New Business
   - Recommendations from the Sub-Committee on Classified, Restricted, and Proprietary Research (Vogt)
8. Adjournment

Chair Mark Haselkorn called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

1. Call to order and approval of Agenda

Haselkorn asked for an amendment to the agenda because no faculty members were present from the sub-committee on Classified, Restricted, and Proprietary Research for item 7. The agenda was approved as amended.

2. Approval of minutes from January 2009 FCR meeting
Sue Camber asked for three small changes to the minutes. Axel Roesler noted that he was present at the January meeting. The minutes were approved as amended.

3. Announcements

Mary Lidstrom announced some good news: Matt O’Donnell, Dean of the College of Engineering has just been elected to the National Academy of Engineering.

4. Requests for Information and Updates

- Office of Research (Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, Office of Research)

Haselkorn reported on the morning’s Research Advisory Board meeting led by Lidstrom that addressed an array of process improvements with the Office of Research infrastructure. He felt that the information presented would be of value to this council. Lidstrom suggested that she might take the six presentations and turn them into a 2-3 page paper. Haselkorn asked the council whether they would prefer a longer presentation covering what is going on in research process improvements, or a shorter overview of the material, and time for council members to ask probing questions about the impact to research faculty. Council members indicated that they would prefer a shorter summary of the presentation. Sue Camber noted that she and Lidstrom would be able to cover all 6 topics if it was at a summary level. Haselkorn noted that they will be on the March agenda for research process improvement. Lidstrom said they would focus on those things that most directly affect faculty.

Lidstrom also addressed the recent stimulus package currently under consideration by the Senate. She reported that it is not certain, but there could be significant funds in the package for the National Institute of Health (NIH), the National Science Foundation (NSF), and the Department of Energy (DOE). Lidstrom explained how a certain percentage of the money would have to be spent this fiscal year, which ends in September. She noted that it means the pay lines will go up and that grants will be in the cue for the next 3-6 months. She asked council members to get grants in and to keep an eye out for supplements to existing grants.

Haselkorn inquired whether the council felt it was their job, in conjunction with the Office of Research, to alert UW faculty about the possible influx of research grant money. Richard Wright noted that while he would like to contact faculty informally, the tentative nature of the information makes it awkward to send out an official notice. People who might be able to pull something together in the next two months are the ones to contact with the information. Lidstrom says that they must wait until they get official word. Haselkorn expressed his concern about not sharing the information with all research faculty. Jonathan Nurse said that they should know by early next week about the stimulus package. Lidstrom asked Nurse to have his office send out information on how soon the research money must be spent. Nurse said he’ll have the information by next week.

A brief discussion began about how best to get the word out to research faculty. One idea was to send out an email using an effective subject line. Haselkorn suggested using the Senate Executive Committee to bring the news out to the faculty and college councils. It was also suggested that they use the Quarterly Research Administrators Meetings as a means to spread the word.

Lynne Chronister gave an update on the recent grants.gov deadline and the challenge OSP faced in preparing faculty for it. She remarked that her office is so grateful that the process went
so well. Chronister described as “really incredible” the fact that everybody got their grants in on time, that the submitted grants were also more error-free than normal, and that her staff really stepped up, along with the faculty on campus. She noted that they had done a lot of education prior to the submission deadline yesterday, which helped with the real partnership. Lidstrom reported that grants.gov is working on an upgrade to improve their capacity, incrementally. The upgrade should help eliminate erroneous error messages.

Haselkorn said he felt there was a great story here, and suggested that the council make a formal thank you to OSP workers that would get on the Senate agenda, as a way to acknowledge how well people worked together. It was suggested that they also acknowledge the efforts of the ORIS employees who worked day and night adding and upgrading computers to increase the tools for getting faculty submissions to grants.gov.

**Action:** Haselkorn called for a motion to formally thank the collaborative effort of OSP and ORIS. A motion was made that calls for FCR to extend the vote of congratulations and gratitude to OSP and ORIS for their collaborative campus efforts with research faculty to meet the demands and deadlines of the new grants submission process. The motion was seconded, and approved unanimously.

5. Discussion

- **Potential FCR Issues Associated With Faculty Effort Reporting (Sue Camber and Richard Wright)**

Haselkorn introduced the discussion on faculty effort reporting, noting the importance of the subject and that perhaps the largest issue is 100% research faculty who must justify work outside of research. Haselkorn indicated that the information was something the council had asked for, and he wanted to know if there was anything here they wanted to address from now until the end of the year.

Sue Camber and guest Mike Anthony, Executive Director, Management Accounting & Analysis, presented a power point on the overview and principles of faculty effort reporting. They wanted to provide background on the issue for council members, and update them on progress that is being made to the faculty effort reporting process. Anthony took council members through an overview of the key principles associated with faculty effort reporting. He pointed to a phrase used, “inextricably intermingled” as one that reflects the entire faculty effort reporting process in which research faculty must distinguish between their research efforts and everything outside of that. Anthony handed out a list of useful URLs on effort reporting.

Anthony explained key government terms such as “payroll certification” and “cost share,” and noted that the government does not want to pay for something that it isn’t getting. He explained that the UW uses an after-the-fact confirmation process that is one of the most common processes colleges use and seems to be the least onerous of the options the federal government provides. He presented some recent audit findings, such as when a principal investigator (or key personnel) has a reduction of 25% or more of what was originally agreed to in the proposal, it becomes an audit issue. Haselkorn asked how they determine that a researcher hasn’t delivered the percentage they committed to. He was told that the percentage is compared to what is in the proposal, based upon the researcher’s self-report (FEC) of the actual effort put into the grant. Camber noted that the reporting is an estimate over a period of time. Chronister emphasized the importance of coming back to OSP if a researcher changes the level of reporting more than 25%, where they will then contact the sponsor to officially update the contract. Camber noted that the electronic system would be able to indicate
proportionality, with a balance sheet. Haselkorn pointed out that faculty need to know all these rules, and many of them don’t have support. Lidstrom pointed to a survey done a few years back that revealed that over 20% of research faculty do their own reporting. Cambers described the past mandatory faculty training, and asked the council if that is something they would want to consider doing again. Anthony described past efforts to train faculty and administrators on the FEC.

Anthony gave an overview of the results of some recent audit assessments. There was some discussion of the cases and the size of the penalties imposed for violations. He explained what faculty efforts fall into the category of research activities. He provided examples of what could be considered de minimus activities. Haselkorn sought clarification on whether anyone other than the principal investigator can be at risk for violating de minimus. Camber noted that the one who wrote the grant would be the researcher credited with the activity. Anthony reviewed the principle for reporting the number of hours worked per week, explaining how proposal writing can take place at any time of the day and must get charged to a non-sponsored funding source. Some exceptions do exist such as K-awards and non Federal grants that are specifically permitted by the sponsor.

Anthony reviewed the formulaic approach used for determining proposal writing and administrative activities. Haselkorn asked what they formally send to researchers who are 100%. Camber noted that they don’t formally notify researchers, but once they submit a proposal their status comes up on the OSP report sent to deans. Richard Wright noted the importance of remembering that if a researcher submits for 95% of his salary but is not getting paid the other 5% from the state or some other source, it doesn’t mean that he is not 100% research, he is simply giving himself a 5% pay cut. A discussion began about the situation that faculty face that are less than 100% and have a fluctuating salary. Anthony also addressed the issue of the government’s 3.6% allowance, or cap, as a way to recover indirect costs of administrative activities, which includes proposal writing. It was noted that this does not preclude the need to charge proposal preparation time to non-grant sources with the exceptions noted above.

Anthony and Camber listed alternative sources to charge proposal preparation time to, and clarified whether 100% research faculty on only federally sponsored grants need to seek coverage for their proposal writing time. Camber reported on UW compliance in effort reporting. She noted that proposal writing is one of their biggest risks, and described a series of initiatives her office has pursued to help lower effort reporting errors, including the development of the FEC Compliance Advisory Team. She showed an actual UW compliance progress report that reflects the effort reporting activities of schools and colleges with 100% research faculty. Camber announced that she had just this morning received approval for going to semi-annual effort reporting periods.

Haselkorn acknowledged the great progress that has been made. He also expressed his concern for the research faculty who are at risk for unknowingly violating the effort reporting rules, and asked members if they feel like they should do something to help make them more aware. Haselkorn raised the issue of using the GC-1 form to alert faculty. A discussion began about the risks in using the GC-1 to notify faculty. Wright noted the usefulness of clicking through a form and having a box pop up that alerts you to a rule, even if it’s not stated explicitly. Haselkorn asked council members to consider whether they felt an obligation as a faculty council, to push for relief for the research faculty who are forced to be 100%, to make sure there is money available to them to help free them. Camber noted that they have worked hard to make deans aware of the problem and know their responsibilities. She discussed the challenges
with having a central pot of money. The council seemed to agree with leaving it like it is. Haselkorn said he would like to know the number of faculty who need that help. Anthony guessed that there were about 300 faculty in that situation. Haselkorn said he thought that number of faculty deserved their attention. He noted that additional discussion will be held until there is further information.

6. INSER

Haselkorn informed the council that a report on INSER was submitted to the Faculty Senate and there was no discussion. He noted that the issue is not completely closed, because Steve Hansen, Vice-Provost for Global Affairs, will continue to look into the issue of student safety. Haselkorn said that Hansen communicated with him first to ask about FCR’s investigation, and to inquire if he felt alright about him only investigating the issue of student safety. Haselkorn noted that he will report this information to the Senate Executive Committee.

7. New Business

- **Recommendation from the Sub-Committee on Classified, Restricted, and Proprietary Research (Vogt)**

Haselkorn reported that three members from the Subcommittee on Classified, Restricted, and Proprietary Research (not here today), told him that Tom Anderson, Computer Science and Engineering, has a proposal with the Department of Defense with a potential classified aspect to it. The subcommittee reviewed it, reporting that Anderson responded to their questions, and they approved it. Haselkorn asked the council what they wanted to do since none of the subcommittee members were here today. It was determined that the proposal is due the first of March, before the next council meeting. Chronister noted that they can always rescind the approval, even if it gets awarded. The final decision was to have the chair contact Anderson directly, and copy the subcommittee members, to say that the proposal has been tentatively approved, that it will be formally approved on a date in March, and that he should proceed as if it was fully approved (noting that the council has the right to rescind its approval).

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.
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