1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda
Cathryn Booth-LaForce opened the meeting at 9:02 AM by asking for the approval of the agenda. The agenda was approved as written. Cathryn welcomed Barbara Perry who was attending via teleconferencing.

2. Approval of minutes from the 11 February 2008 FCR meeting
The minutes of the February meeting were approved with one correction made by Peggy Fanning regarding the approval of the resolution.
3. Announcements
Cathryn then asked Council members if there were any announcements. Hearing none, Cathryn distributed some blue sheets of “Opportunities on Faculty Councils and Committees” forms hoping to recruit some new members hoping to help Mark Haselkorn, who will be chairing the Faculty Council next year. Members, who will be continuing on, won’t need to fill out the blue form.

4. Requests for Information and Updates
   • Update on Human Subjects Division/IRB – Karen Moe, Director

Karen Moe, Director of the Human Subjection Division (HSD) handed out copies of a PowerPoint presentation titled, “UW Human Research Protection Program”. After briefly describing the structure, functions, and workload of HSD and the associated institutional Review Board (IRB) she described the two-part mission of the HSD and IRB as:

(1): Protect the welfare of human research subjects which consists of:

   • Address ethical issues of research projects
   • Promote ethical knowledge and understanding of researchers
   • Regulatory compliance of IRB application and review process
   • Regulatory compliance of researchers

(2) Enhance the University’s research enterprise

   • Efficient IRB review and oversight
   • Transparent IRB review and oversight
   • Consistent IRB review and oversight
   • Coordination with other UW research compliance functions
   • Leadership role in human subjects issues and regulations (national, regional, local)

She then described ten specific ways in which these goals are being addressed.

(1) The Office of Research started a process improvement initiative (i-STAR) last fall.

(2) Capacity building: The Human Subject Division has two new IRB committees and have added new support staff, a larger “Minimal Risk” team, completion of larger HSD management team, a “floating” high-level staff person (reviewer), an education specialist, project manager, new IRB members and will be making a move to larger quarters next month into the UW Towers.

(3) Written and revised policies, procedures, and guidance. These will be put on the UW website for easy access. They take full advantage of regulatory flexibility.

(4) Revising Forms – Plan to revise forms to make them better and clearer, obtain all necessary information in order to reduce “back and forth” with the IRB and to address a wider variety of research topics and methods.
(5) Self-assessment and measurement - to identify inefficiencies, identify bottlenecks and track applications to ensure they are handled in a timely manner.

(6) Revise process and procedures – numerous specific changes have been made and are being made to improve the quality of information provided, identify bottlenecks, and track work to ensure it is handled in a timely manner.

(7) Educating researchers – by improving the quality of applications, and improving the understanding of the review process, turnaround time will be reduced and there will be shared responsibility for compliance with researchers.

(8) Educating IRB members – the continuing education of IRB members will increase consistency of reviews and the handling of compliance issues.

(9) Educating HSD staff - this will increase consistency, efficiency, compliance and best practices through internal ongoing education and training, offering a staff web site, bi-weekly electronic literature review and in-depth research presentations by researchers.

(10) Improve communication with researchers – The resulting transparency and feedback will assist researchers in navigating the review process more efficiently and will assist HSD in providing better forms and guidance documents. The Human Subjects Policy Board is one important means by which researchers can bring forward their concerns about the IRB.

• Federal Demonstration Project Update – (Asuman Kiyak)

Asuman Kiyak is the UW faculty representative to the Federal Demonstration Project (FDP) along with OSP and GCA representatives from the UW. The FDP is a federal consortium of universities and research organizations that meets three times a year, usually in Washington, DC. This organization is an important one for the UW and other research universities because these stakeholders meet with representatives of all federal agencies that provide research funding (e.g. NIH, NSF, NASA) and have some influence on their processes.

Three years ago, in the fall of 2005, the FDP faculty committee surveyed 6000 faculty at universities across the country to ask about challenges and frustrations of doing research. The overall results revealed that 84% of respondents noted that administrative burdens had increased in past years. A major finding was that, on average 42% of researchers; time was spent on administrative issues rather than the scientific aspects of their research. This has resulted in active efforts by the FDP to encourage NIH and NSF to allow funds for administrative support in large grants, not just in clinical trials.

THE FDP has also heard from the director of the Center of Scientific Review at NIH, Dr. Anthony Scarp, about plans to change the peer review process at NIH. One of the concerns is that the number of applications has exploded from about 42,000 in 1999 to about 77,000 in 2007.

New RO1s represent the greatest proportion, along with submitted RO1 and R21 applications. Several methods of streamlining the review process of this burgeoning
number of applications are being considered, including reducing the maximum number of ROI Application pages from 25 to 15, and encouraging more emphasis on innovative and transformative research.

A preliminary report has just been released by the NIH committee charged with recommending changes in the grant review process.

Barbara Perry informed the council members that a draft of the peer review has just been posted online, and the scientific community can make recommendations after viewing the report at: http://enhancing-peer-review.nih.gov/

5. Discussion

- Royalty Research Fund (RRF)

Cathryn Booth-LaForce reported on G. Phillipson’s (secretary of the faculty) memo which stated that review of the RRF was an appropriate responsibility of the FCR.

Gerald Miller started the discussion regarding some of his concerns and questions regarding the role of the Royalty Research Fund (RRF). Gerald’s list of concerns and questions listed below were distributed in a handout to the council members in order to help start the discussion regarding the RRF.

There are several broad general concerns.

1. The RRF makes no reference to the current UW emphasis on interdisciplinary research.

2. Younger people should be encouraged and have special access to research funds, but is the RRF the only appropriate mechanism?

3. The instructions to applicants specifically state that "among proposals of comparable merit, preference is given to junior faculty". This might be tantamount to age discrimination.

4. The main purpose of the RRF "is to advance new directions in research, particularly in disciplines for which external funding opportunities are minimal". Is this choice of funding the best way to advance the UW mission? For example, another statement might be "The main purpose of the RRF is to advance research in new directions in areas with potential for growth in funding".

There are several detailed considerations:

1. The choice of referees is often difficult and flawed. One slightly negative remark by a less qualified person trumps an entire page of elegant praise from an expert in the field.

2. The instructions to rejected proposals often encourage reapplication, when in reality there is often little change of success.

3. There are severe restrictions on the possible use of the RRF funds. The RRF can not be used to support faculty summer salary for those who already have more than 1.5 months of summer salary. This is in apparent conflict with the fact that much of the UW research faculties are supported for twelve months. The RRF Scholars Program can not
be used in departments that require teaching only three courses per year. Why are such restrictions in place? Do they make sense now?

4. The instructions to favor junior faculty has been implemented with far more force for the last three years or so than in earlier years. What is the reason for this change in policy?

Mary Lidstrom addressed the council members reminding them that the policies of the RRF are set up by the faculty and reviewed by the faculty. The RRF is reviewed every five years and it should have been reviewed this academic year, but due to dealing with other crises will probably be reviewed next fall.

Another point that Mary made was explaining where the monies come from to supply the Royalty Research Fund. Monies from royalties from patents are distributed one-third to the inventor, one-third to the inventor’s department/school, and one-third to the Royalty Research Fund. Two-thirds of the monies go back to the units and only one-third of the money is set aside for the RRF and used as seed money. Mary also mentioned that it takes about one and three fourth FTE to administer and audit the RRF program, so the burden is pretty high. As far as peer reviews, if you were to get real reviewers, you would have to pay them which would cut into the RRF funds, so we get faculty across campus who volunteer their time to read and rank the RRF proposals. The RRF awards follow a peer review process.

There are a lot of trade offs and many issues. The RRF is a very important mechanism. The RRF did not replace the BRSG (funds through the NIH and distributed via the Graduate School); those funds were discontinued from NIH. The RRF funds come from royalties and about 90% of those funds came from Dr. Ben Hall’s invention.

Mary has attended three rounds of RRF meetings and so has Jeff Cheek. There has always been a discussion of the criteria for the RRF, do we want to change it, what criteria should we have, do we need to have an advising board to help advice? Again, in order to take a serious look, it would take a lot of data, stats, percentages and it would take extra staff to crunch these numbers.

The RRF is the only seed money on campus. The Provost offers money for start-up matching funds that cut across schools/departments.

Theresa Barker thought that maybe we could have a subcommittee to discuss the RRF since there seems to be enough issues that need to be reviewed. A subcommittee from the FCR could provide the faculty perspective and address some of these issues.

Richard Wright thought that we need a contact person. Mary Lidstrom thought that Alvin Kwiram would be a good source to turn to, since he started the program and knows the historical background surrounding the RRF.

Theresa suggested that the Faculty Council on Research should take leadership for these concerns and that a couple of council members could get together to formulate a plan. There was general agreement that the FCR should undertake some form of an independent review of the RRF. Gerald Miller and Mark Haselkorn, members of the Faculty Council on Research, will consider the form and charge of a potential committee to review the RRF and present their ideas to the FCR at the next meeting.
6. Old Business
Cathryn informed the council members that she had sent the resolution letter, which was approved last month regarding concerns about funding for OSP and GCA to the Provost.

- Conflict of interest policy, Classified Proprietary, and Restricted Research Subcommittee

Last month, when the Classified Proprietary and Restricted Research Committee met regarding approval of a classified project with PNNL, Mark Haselkorn excused himself from the discussion since he is Director of a center funded through PNNL and did not want to be viewed as having a potential conflict of interest. Dan Vogt wanted to know if we feel there is a potential conflict of interest, and if so how we should handle it. People generally agreed that there was the potential for people to see a conflict of interest in this type of situation. As one person put it, "If you think there could be a conflict of interest, then there probably is." Lynne Chronister was asked for her input on this situation. She felt that in this particular case, it probably is a lower threshold; most conflict of interest issues are focused more on federal policies.

Mark Haselkorn and Daniel Vogt will work on language to help clarify how the Classified Proprietary and Restricted Research Committee will identify and deal with possible conflict of interest issues.

Adjournment
Meeting adjourned at 10:27 AM. Minutes by Peggy Fanning.

Present:
Faculty members: Booth-LaForce, Fluharty, Haselkorn, Miller, Stenkamp, Vogt, and Wright
President’s designee: Lidstrom
Other ex officio members: Barker, Redalje, Russell

Absent:
Faculty members: Finrow, Khagram, Roesler, Schwartz, Ex-officio members: Allen, Foster, Harrington, Nathu

Guests: Cristi Chapman, Jeff Cheek, Lynn Chronister, Peggy Fanning, Asuman Kiyak, Karen Moe, and Barbara Perry (Via teleconferencing)