Chair Cathryn Booth-LaForce called the meeting to order at 9:05 AM

Meeting Synopsis:
1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda
2. Approve minutes from 7 December 2006 FCR meeting
3. Announcements
4. New Business
   a. Classified, Proprietary, and Restricted Research Subcommittee—consideration of application (Daniel Vogt)
5. Requests for Information and Updates
   a. Update - Office of Research (Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, Office of Research)
   b. Update: Interdisciplinary Research Committee (Mark Haselkorn)
   c. Update: Electronic Faculty Effort and Cost Share Project (eFECS) (Lisa Yeager)
   d. Request for Information: Research computing resources (Mani Soma)
6. Discussion
7. Adjournment

1. Call to order and approval of agenda
Cathryn Booth-LaForce opened the meeting by asking for the approval of the agenda, which was approved.

2. Approve minutes from the 7 December 2006 FCR meeting
The minutes were approved as written.

3. Announcements
Mark Haselkorn wanted to announce that DHS has come out with calls for proposals for four centers of excellence and that some UW faculty are in discussion about responding to the call for a Center of Excellence for the Study of Natural Disasters, Coastal Infrastructure and Emergency Management.

4. New Business
Daniel Vogt, Chair of the Classified, Proprietary, and Restricted Research (CPRR) Committee, which consists of Daniel Vogt, Gerald Miller, H. Asuman Kiyak, and Mark Haselkorn, have reviewed a classified research subcontract from APL-UW that would be submitted, if requested, to MANDEX to support the Office of Naval Research (ONR) Battlespace Environment’s program. MANDEX has a multiple Award Contract (MATOC) from ONR to provide technical and programmatic support services to the Ocean Battlespace Sensing Science and Technology Department (Code 32) and ONR had specifically requested support from APL-UW to support development of innovative signal processing algorithms. APL-UW is asking Faculty Council for Research (FCR) for approval of the appropriateness to submit this classified contract. The CPRR Committee met and discussed this proposal with Robert Miyamoto from APL on Jan. 18, 2007. This proposal is for $250,000 for a year with options for extending it for another couple of
years. The funds would mostly be for the PI, Keith Davidson, who would work directly with ONR program managers and reside in Virginia. The project consists of assisting ONR 32 in the development of signal processing algorithms that improve the Navy’s ability to rapidly detect, identify, and locate submarines and torpedoes. The PI will be expected to participate and evaluate projects, attend conferences, workshops, and design reviews. The PI will also play a major role in formulating strategies in the Discovery and Invention Program to support future signal processing algorithms development. The main questions that researchers are asked to respond to, when applying for a classified, proprietary, or restricted research contract, and APL-UW’s condensed responses to them are:

1. What unique capabilities do your program and the UW bring to this proposed project?
   - APL has acquired critical knowledge of ocean signal processing algorithms and the PI, Dr. Davidson, is highly qualified in these areas.

2. Describe the scholarly, scientific, and/or educational benefits of this proposed project.
   - Dr. Davidson will be able to bring back to the University a much broader background in signal processing that can be used to formulate new research ideas for the University of Washington. His role in building a new underwater acoustic program has many benefits to UW initiatives such as NEPTUNE or new NASA initiatives in underwater communications. As a project manager he will also be asked to help formulate future strategies in the Discovery and Invention Program to support signal processing algorithms development which certainly has the potential to place APL-UW and UW in a strong position to qualify for more research contracts.

3. In what way does the proposed project provide a public or community service?
   - This collaboration between DoD and academia is essential to maintain the best technical programs, i.e., a balance between technology push (academia) and requirements of the users (Navy).

4. In what way, if any, will UW students (graduate and undergraduate) be involved in the project? If they participate in the research, will they require security clearance or have restrictions placed on their thesis, dissertation, or other academia activities?
   - No students will be involved.

5. Does the proposed project engender any restrictions on publications by the PI, members of the research team, or postdoctoral fellows?
   - We do not expect to publish under this contract; however there will be procedures in place to review possible publications to release the information for unrestricted publication.

6. Are any foreign nationals working on this project?
   - No foreign nationals will be employed in this project.

When the Committee met with Robert Miyamoto, a discussion ensued. A question submitted by Mark Haselkorn (in absentia) generated the greatest discussion. That is, how will APL interact with UW on this contract or will the contract mostly just benefit APL? This question compelled Robert (encouraged by the Committee) to rewrite and clarify APL’s response to the benefits expected from this contract (see question # 2 above). With this discussion Daniel Vogt suggested that APL should be invited back
again to present an overview of APL’s role and interactions with UW. The Committee and Robert all thought that this would be a great idea and that this should be suggested as an item for a future FCR agenda.

**ACTION ITEM:** Gerald Miller made a motion to approve this proposal which was seconded and **approved** unanimously.

Theresa Barker asked Daniel Vogt how much time they spend on these classified, proprietary and restricted research proposals. Daniel replied generally only the time for multiple emailings and the coordination and convening of one meeting, unless the contract is questionable. If so, then multiple meetings could even be entailed, requiring much more time.

Carol Zuiches said there is another agreement that will need FCR review soon between College of Ocean and Fishery Sciences and another foreign university, where they are not allowing any publications without written approval. Of course, this is against our policy.

5. Requests for information and Updates
   a. Update – Office of Research
   Mary Lidstrom announced that the Provost’s office awarded 14 bridge awards for a total of $550,000 to the School of Medicine, School of Public Health and Community Medicine, and College of Engineering. These are awards to help support faculty span the funding gap in research programs where future funding is expected and critical personnel would be lost without the bridge funding. All funding requests must be matched 1 to 1 by the applicant’s college/school. The funding cannot be used for the salaries of faculty. The first deadline was December 1, 2006 and the next deadline is May 1, 2007.

   The federal budget proposal for 2007 includes a decrease of 1.7% for NIH and an increase of about 6% for NSF. 2008 also looks very good for NSF and DoE with a decrease in NIH, but congress may come back and push this up a little. NIH funding at UW is still down. Since about two-thirds of our federal funding comes from NIH this will affect our indirect costs. Funding from non-federal grants usually has a lower indirect cost rate so our indirect costs may be lower then normal.

   February 5 was the deadline for proposal submissions through grants.gov and things went pretty smoothly. The staggering of the dates from February 1 to February 5 (and later) probably have helped.

   Asuman asked the question about the proposed increases for NSF, NASA and DOE. These increases seem to be targeted at specific programs like the Ocean Observatory Initiative and nanotechnology. But will these targeted dollars help fund the wider areas of research conducted by UW researchers? Mary replied that she definitely thought it would help, because some of these are areas where UW researchers are involved and therefore could benefit from the increased funding. Also because these targeted funds would leave other funds for non-targeted areas of research.

   Theresa Barker asked Mary Lidstrom about the upcoming Human Subjects Policy Board. Mary said that Jeff Cheek was in charge of that board now. HSD is revising their
policies and procedures and the policy board members are making checklist procedures to help streamline the procedure.

The Safeco (UW Towers building) space allocations had proposals due for space on January 31. Mary may have some more information about the space in the UW Tower by FCR’s next meeting in March.

Cathryn went on a tour of the UW Towers building and was very impressed. Mary said they were thinking of ways on how to allocate the space and rental costs, for example charging a little more for the 4th floor on up because of the view. The disadvantage would be that groups that could benefit from being in the same location might be on different floors due to cost differences per floor. Some group may prefer the bottom area. On the whole, the average rent will be a lot lower than any other University district rent but not as low as Northgate. Indirect costs will pay for the rent.

Asuman wondered if they had considered making the 22nd floor as a conference center since space is so hard to find. The UW doesn’t have any conference facilities. The only really nice rooms are the Gates Commons in the Computer Science Building and the Peterson Room in the Library, and both are hard to schedule. It is under consideration.

The Safeco Building (UW Towers) has three conference rooms and a huge auditorium that will seat about 200. This is a huge asset and we need to figure out a good system for use of this space.

Theresa Barker asked Mary about the time-frame of the UW Towers space. Mary said that we should have decisions by May that will probably be finalized in August and people will be able to move in about a year from now. C&C will need to put in connections etc. We have put in a $30M request for a Data Center to the Legislature. There are a lot of issues to resolve like parking etc. If some people get moved from Mary Gates Hall to the UW Towers, then there may be a move of people to Mary Gates from Schmitz Hall. No research groups will be forced to move.

b. Update: Interdisciplinary Research Committee
Mark Haselkorn reported on the Senate Interdisciplinary Research Committee (SIRC). The SIRC is made up of 19 members including Dan Vogt, Gerald Miller, Ronald Stenkamp, Richard Wright, and Mark Haselkorn from FCR. The SIRC has established a wiki at http://wnii.pbwiki.com/. It can be viewed without a password, but those with a password can also change it by adding comments, pages, etc. Mark encouraged FCR members to visit the site since FCR is the oversight body for SIRC. SIRC is working on a list of recommendations taken from previous work by the Network for Interdisciplinary Initiatives and the Provost’s Organization Committee. The provost sent an email to Mark expressing her interest in attending one the SIRC meetings when the committee is further along. The Committee plans to meet about every two months while carrying on work continuously through the wiki.

c. Update: Electronic Faculty Effort and Cost Share Project (eFECS)
Lisa Yeager, eFECS Project Manager, presented a PowerPoint presentation to the FCR on an update of the eFECS project and passed out handouts of the PowerPoint presentation. The eFECS project seeks to improve compliance efforts by automating and simplifying the Faculty Effort Certification forms that faculty complete to document effort and cost sharing paid from both Federal and Non-Federal sponsored projects.
There is a process improvement team that meets weekly. Sue Camber is a business advisor and Mary Lidstrom and V’Ella Warren are the project’s Executive Sponsors.

The outcome of the first stage involved gathering of user feedback, establishing a PI Advisory Team, documenting requirements and priorities, and building a conceptual prototype and cost estimates. Demonstrations of alternative solutions are planned for this spring; two vendors have submitted proposals. The PI Advisory Team meets quarterly.

Stage 2 – is the final stage of the buy-build assessment that is underway. Stage 2 consists of soliciting information through a Request for Information (RFI), rounding out the conceptual prototype (specifically, this relates to the certification process itself and is developed by a User Task Group from across the University), and completing assessment of alternatives. Last fall, the group issued an RFI developed a conceptual prototype. In the winter, the group is conducting written evaluations of the vendor products, conducting reference checks and may schedule site visits if the vendor products and versions proposed are in production at another institution. We need to move as quickly as possible and decide if we should buy or build or have something customized for our needs. We have the cost sharing component which will probably require some special type of customization for us.

During the first stage of the project a survey was sent to faculty and staff for their input regarding priority reporting. About 70% of FECs are completed by staff, about 20% prepare the report themselves, and 10% don’t know or other.

By this spring, they plan to hold demonstrations by vendors and the Process Improvement Team will be able to make a recommendation in regards to buying or building. They also don’t want a temporary fix and have everyone learn a new system and then change the system in a couple of years and then have to learn a whole new system again.

The time frame for evaluation dates are: written evaluation sessions on February 8 and March 1. There will be vendor demonstrations on March 20, 21, and 22.

Asuman asked Lisa if they had consulted or checked with other universities about what they are doing. Lisa said they did have peer assessments, even some demonstrations on line. Other schools have differing approaches to managing cost sharing, and those approaches are under consideration here. However, since these would likely involve making significant changes to the University’s mainframe legacy systems, it is likely that they will have to internally develop or have a special piece developed to handle cost-sharing.

Asuman also wanted to know if the PI Advisory group had adequate representation from all types of faculty users particularly faculty with clinical responsibilities. Sue Camber responded that it is a well-rounded group from around campus.

d. Request for Information: Research computing resources
Mani Soma, Associate Vice Provost in the Office of Research, passed out handouts on the Research Computing Infrastructure to council members. Mani outlined the research computing infrastructure such as the research directions, infrastructure considerations
and strategies, and the current status. Research directions indicate large interdisciplinary teams, covering a wide range of topics such as health care, biological systems, environmental initiatives, astronomy and nano-pico-femto computing systems. To continue in this research direction would require a larger annual budget and longer duration, could offer a leveraging between research programs and inherent linkage between academia, government, industry, foundations, and in appropriate cases, agencies in other nations. The common themes: collaboration requires shared computing resources, massive data collected from a wide range of sensors/instrumentation from miniature biological scale to macro environmental scale, quick analysis and visualization required by research, education, and marketing, and would enable verification of hypotheses and creation of new theories via a combination of simulation (what if?) modeling and experimental data.

There are many infrastructure considerations such as physical, computing power, people, fiscal, links to education and possible obstacles to consider. The physical infrastructure consists of distributed networks (e.g. sensors—fixed and mobile, communication systems between sensors and back to base stations, and low-power wireless and wired networks) and central facilities (e.g. base stations for wireless and wired networks along with data centers). Also, a closed-loop control system between distributed resources and central resources should permit real time reconfiguration and real time data collection. Sufficient computing power is needed for analyzing large data sets. Being simultaneously accessible to a large number of researchers and/or education programs with real-time computation and real-time visualization is desirable. The computing power also consists of a reconfigurable computing grid to optimize processing power depending on needs, provide multiple accesses, and control and isolate failures in nodes and sub-networks.

The people infrastructure consists of expert staff that can assist researchers and education programs to become productive quicker. Faculty researchers could exploit the system capabilities in their research and enhance processing power through computational research. Also, to complete the people infrastructure we would need competent administrators to manage the large-scale projects in daily operations and long range projections.

The fiscal infrastructure would need to be efficient, timely and accurate. The development of a research administration system would be needed for access cost, use cost and training cost and the costs for maintenance and upgrades along with people and space, etc. A contingency plan is needed for risk management in case of budget overruns and large scale failures of computing networks due to earthquakes, volcanic events or a tsunami and a recovery method for costs, time to repair, up-time, etc.

The research computing infrastructure could promote the integration of research and education by providing the tools to enable quick transition of research materials into classrooms and even in remote classrooms like space, the forest or the ocean. This concept of distance-learning enhancements of “anywhere and anytime classroom” would be a great education enhancement. Education propels research and vice versa.

There are potential roadblocks such as security, hackers, intellectual property issues, fiscal insufficiency and/or fiscal management, and lack of appropriate leaders in faculty, staff and administration.
Current strategies are to actively consult with faculty (e.g. those working in Neptune and astronomy etc.) and closely cooperate with C&C, Catalyst, ATAC and the new Information Management office. OR is working to establish the physical computing infrastructure such as space request in the UW towers, initial grid-display in R&T (Ben Hall) building, exploit existing GigaPop and other UW C&C efforts and Neptune infrastructure design to be started when funding is approved.

Our strategies are to develop personnel who will be able to provide leadership workshops through the use of the ADVANCE templates, fiscal, and SAGE systems. These overall administration systems are currently under development and improvement and will be enhanced in the near future.

We continue to work on proposals to foundations/industry to build hardware/server networks, data centers, along with proposals to federal agencies for Neptune and NEON and the Washington legislature for funding for staff and faculty. Initial research-education seed fundings are under consideration. Mary Lidstrom is working on a proposal to Murdock Foundation for money to help with the infrastructure. Also, a request for space in the UW Towers has been submitted.

Due to a shortage of time, council members were unable to ask questions, so Mani Soma was invited to come back to the next Faculty Council on Research meeting, which will be Monday, March 12, 2007, in Room 26 Gerberding from 9:00 to 10:30 AM.

6. Discussion
No discussion

7. Adjournment
Meeting adjourned at 10:35 AM. Minutes by Peggy Fanning.
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