Chair Brent Stewart called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Introductory comments
2. Call to order and approval of Agenda
3. Approval of minutes from 16 February FCR meeting
4. Announcements
5. Requests for Information and Updates
   a. Grants.gov (John Streck, OSP Associate Director)
   b. Update – Office of Research (Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, Office of Research)
   c. Update – Faculty Effort Certification and response to Draft DHHS OIG Research Compliance Guidance (Susan Camber, Assistant Vice President, Research Accounting and Analysis)
6. Discussion
   a. Classified, Proprietary and Restricted Research Committee (Vogt)
   b. Provost convened Future Information Systems Task Force (Needs Assessment Questions)
   c. Issues for upcoming quarter meetings from FCR at large
7. New Business
8. Adjournment

1. Introductory Comments

Brent Stewart opened the meeting by pointing out a few edits to the February 16 FCR minutes.

2. Call to order and Approval of Agenda
Agenda was approved unanimously by FCR Council members.

3. Approval of Minutes

Brent Stewart pointed out a few edits had been made to the APL presentation by William Bakamis. Minutes were approved unanimously by Council members.

Brent Welcomed Greg Benner who attended via conference call from UW-Tacoma.

4. Announcements

Brent expressed concern about next month’s meeting, because he has a conflict and is unable to attend as does vice-chair Cathryn Booth-LaForce. He asked Asuman Kiyak to chair this meeting, who agreed to re-arrange her schedule to make this work. Asuman and Brent will work details out through email. As it stands, the next FCR meeting will go as previously scheduled (April 6, 9:30am) with Asuman Kiyak acting as chair. Chairs note: Due to a conflict in Asuman’s schedule, Mark Hasselkorn has agreed to chair the 6 April meeting.

Brent asked Mark Haselkorn if he had any news regarding the Export Control Policy Committee (he represents FCR). There was no activity to report at this time. He also asked Cathryn Booth-LaForce (FCR representative) and Diane Morrison whether if there was anything to report regarding the Human Subjects Policy Board (HSPB). There was no activity to report at this time, though Mary Lidstrom did say that a meeting was planned for March.

5. Requests for Information and Updates

a. Grants.gov (John Streck, OSP Associate Director)

John Streck, Associate Director from the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP), provide an update about Grants.gov. John started his presentation by asking, “Why use Grants.gov?” The Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999, also known as Public Law 106-107 (P.L. 106-107), was enacted in November 1999. The purposes of the Act are to:

1. Improve the effectiveness and performance of Federal financial assistance programs,
2. Simplify Federal financial assistance application and reporting requirements,
3. Improve the delivery of services to the public, and
4. Facilitate greater coordination among those responsible for delivering services.

What is Grants.gov? It is a Federal portal that allows users to electronically find and apply for Federal grant opportunities. It simplifies the grant application process and creates a centralized, on-line process to find and apply for over 900 grant programs from the 26 Federal grant-making agencies. It may be accessed at: http://www.Grants.gov/.

NIH had originally planned to receive all R01 applications via Grants.gov on 1 October 2006. Due to pressure from universities and higher education organizations such as the Council on Governmental Relations (Cogr), the Federal Demonstration Partnership (Fdp), and the Association of American Universities (Aau). However, the first Grants.gov R01 deadline has been changed to 1 February 2007. A new application form, Standard Form (SF) 424 replaces previous forms (e.g., PHS 398), and the new submission process requires training for all PIs and grants support staff. Having an extra four months to prepare for this change will be of great benefit.
Some sponsors (e.g., NOAA) have already moved to Grants.gov. NIH is currently transitioning to Grants.gov; and others like NSF have yet to begin the transition. Eventually, all Federal granting agencies will require the submission of proposals via the Grants.gov system. Grant programs available via Grants.gov can be viewed at the Grants.gov website at: http://www.Grants.gov/assets/GrantsgovProgramsList.pdf.

As everything will be moving to Grants.gov, there may be some start-up requirements. Window users will need to download the PureEdge Viewer software via Grants.gov website (PureEdge Viewer is a small, free program which allows one to access, complete and submit applications electronically and securely on Grants.gov). Non-windows users (i.e., Mac and Linux) must download software to enable them to use the Citrix server. The PureEdge viewer will not be ready for non-Windows environments until early 2007. For NIH proposals, PIs must have an active account in the NIH eRA Commons. There are four general steps for submitting proposal via Grants.gov:

1. Download application package via Grants.gov
2. Complete the application package.
3. Submit the application package to OSP with e-GC1
4. For NIH applications only: Verify the application package via NIH eRA Commons

The Key impact on Faculty:

1. Applications must be filed electronically by OSP, which makes last minute revisions extremely difficult. Applications will need to be finalized well in advance of the agency due date. (OSP policy requires 3 days; some departments are setting earlier deadlines however).
2. New forms – SF424, plus variations to learn within these forms.
3. There are no templates. Each program application is unique and must be downloaded from Grants.gov and completed.
4. For NIH applications only: The PI must have Internet access at the time the proposal is submitted, or shortly thereafter, to verify the application package within eRA Commons.

Asuman Kiyak pointed out that Sinh Simmons, Associate Director in OSP, runs a 2-hour workshop that only about 2 faculty out of 40 attend. Sinh shows why things get kicked back, usually due to lack of information from the PI. Asuman feels that PIs may need to be more involved with submission of their proposal and not rely on their administrators entirely, especially during the initial transition. Council members wanted to know the best way of getting word out to faculty about this training, and it was suggested that schools/colleges could inform their faculty about workshops being offered.

John Streck mentioned that the training schedule for Grants.gov is on the OSP website (http://www.washington.edu/research/osp/gg_training.html). They also have hands-on training in computer labs, and departments can schedule special training for their department/schools. They will probably continue this training until there is a lack of interest. Information on training has been distributed in many ways. The Office of Research Information Services (ORIS) has been reaching out to people, the website is a good source, administrators have been getting involved and there have been emails sent out regarding training for Grants.gov. Jim Kresl has also been providing technical support and working with administrators and IT directors. It was suggested that perhaps FCR should echo this information through University Week.

What is the time duration from grant application submittal through Grants.gov until it is available through eRA Commons for verification? The current NIH goal is two business days, but the duration thus far observed has ranged from 15 minutes to 14 days. Be aware of this especially on your first submission.
5. Requests for Information and Updates (cont.)

b. Update – Office of Research (Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, Office of Research)

Mary Lidstrom reported that the search for an Associate Vice Provost for Research Compliance was moving forward. We are actually down to a short list and have a very strong pool of candidates. Mary is hoping to have someone on board by May 1.

In the Human Subjects Division, there is a lot of hiring going on. They just hired a new Minimal Risk Administrator, and are half way through hiring staff to support the new Behavioral IRB Committee.

ORIS hiring was put on hold for awhile because the projects had to go through two sets of reviews, which have just been completed, so they can now start hiring. They would like to hire a trainer and a business analyst.

Mary mentioned that the Human Subjects Policy Board will be meeting next week, and Diane Morrison and Cathryn Booth-LaForce are both members on this Board.

The Office of Research (OR) is undergoing a lot of restructuring. David Eaton has been hired 40% time as an Associate Vice Provost. OR is still searching for another 40% position Associate Vice Provost. The new Compliance Officer will be full time, and John Wilkerson is a part-time Associate Vice Provost that works with the Battelle Memorial Institute, Pacific Northwest National Lab (PNNL).

c. Update – Faculty Effort Certification and response to Draft DHHS OIG Research Compliance Guidance (Susan Camber, Assistant Vice President, Research Accounting and Analysis)

Sue Camber gave an update regarding the response to the DRAFT DHHS OIG Research Compliance Guidance. A letter (copy provided to the Council) was sent to the OIG. The OIG has not taken further action or announced their intentions but next steps usually take several months. We know that they received many letters and now wait to see if their position changes.

Two additional national efforts are underway on effort reporting:

1) The Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) is working with the AAU and developing an effort report ‘best practices guide’. Sue is on the committee. The guide is intended to assist member organizations in developing or reviewing their effort reporting systems. The committee hopes to use it also as a tool to work with the Office of Management and Budget to clear up some grey areas within the regulations and to push back on some issues where it is believed the auditor’s requirements exceeded or differed from A-21.

2) The Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP), of which Asuman Kiyak is a member, is having a meeting in May at which effort reporting will be discussed. There seems to be a potential breakthrough in that a strong federal partner may have committed to work with Universities to improve this process. The FDP hopes to develop demonstrations which may lead to a new approach to effort reporting. If a demonstration is approved, it is typically carried out on a trial basis at various universities before a decision is made as to whether federal rules can change.

There was additional discussion about challenges related to effort reporting. Mary Lidstrom will follow-up with the Provost on previous conversations about funding for 100% research faculty to write grant and
contract applications. Research Cost Recovery (RCR) funds that are returned to colleges and schools may be used to fund such faculty effort. Each college and school handles their RCR allocation in varying ways.

Sue has also been suggesting to colleges and schools that volunteer cost sharing be reduced to a minimum in order to reserve funding for faculty salaries.

Brent Stewart suggested council members might wish to determine from their department chairs and/or deans how RCR money is used in their particular school or college.

6. Discussion

   a. Classified, Proprietary and Restricted Research Committee

Brent Stewart asked Daniel Vogt if he had any news regarding the work of the Classified, Proprietary and Restricted Research Committee. He had nothing to report at this time other than the PI is going back to the sponsor to re-negotiate the proposal. The Air Force decides what is classified or not. If there are too many restrictions as to the research (e.g., sensitive but unclassified), FCR has decided in the past not to accept such. One major problem occurs when the DOD or DOE instate classified research designations after research has commenced, resulting in students working on the grant not being able to publish.

   b. Provost convened Future Information Systems Task Force (Needs Assessment Questions)

The next twenty minutes were spent on the answering questions from the Future Information Systems Task Force, which has been charged by the Provost to develop a broad 5-10 year vision for the future of our information systems (task force membership may be viewed at http://depts.washington.edu/isfutureForceMembership.pdf).

Brent asked if the council would mind if he made an audio recording of their discussion, and there were no objections.

The following list of proposed interview questions was handed out to council members.

1. What should be the attributes of excellent information systems at the University of Washington?
2. What the strengths and the weaknesses of the current UW experience with informative systems?
3. What are the national best practices for information systems, and what models can be adopted for the UW?
4. What kind of information systems needs do you envision will be needed to implement the Provost’s vision statement?

The handout also contained a DRAFT Vision for the University of Washington.

We will enhance the lives of the people of Washington by leading the state into a pre-eminent Position in a dynamic and complex world. We will lead by providing our students an engaging and transformational learning environment. We will lead by tackling the most challenging and fundamental problems. We will lead by forging new partnerships that will add to our rich cultural diversity. We will sustain and develop the humanistic and artistic bases that form the foundation for the highest values of our society and enhance the quality of living in the Northwest.

Brent first asked for input on question number two above. Gerald Miller commented that our email system has too many gliches. We get way too much SPAM and processing email takes too much time. We have filters to help stop junk mail, but unfortunately junk mail still gets through and sometimes important messages
don’t. He commented on the difficulty of sending emails to large groups of people. On the other hand, one of the strengths is the ease of downloading journals online. The UW Libraries online systems are great.

Diane Morrison felt that one of the issues is the amount or volume of information we need to be on top of. How can we deal with all of the information being sent? Is the information being sent truly for you or just information for down the road?

Carolyn Booth-LaForce didn’t like that she doesn’t have complete access at home or on the road, which may be due to security issues. The university environment is insecure and we need to educate people how to keep it secure.

Richard Wright didn’t like how our email is open to SPAM and less accessible for open access. He has paid for firewalls from grant money but not sure if this is violating the relationship to public access at UW.

Council members agree that email is very time consuming. Nanette Welton, Head of Information Resources at the Health Sciences Libraries, pointed out that you do need a UW Net ID in order to download from the library. Computers in the library have public access or “open access” for sharing information.

Theresa Barker commented on how you can email your TA a question or even your instructor outside of the time schedule – which is a wonderful attribute since you can facilitate learning after hours. Unfortunately, email offers not only information overload, and you feel compelled to answer email immediately. Asuman Kiyak pointed out people sending emails expect an immediate response.

Brent Stewart said that we were running out of time, so you could email him any concerns that you have. He specifically asked about research IS needs. Should we catalog archives for immediate accessibility? Only about 50% of campus has wireless, which also causes problems. Is original research stored on individual computers a security issue? Accessing software stored on another server without difficulty and having all the software packages you need without spending a fortune would be beneficial. For instance, the version of Adobe Acrobat (Standard) necessary to scan paper documents into PDF files is not free to UW faculty ($99.95 at the Bookstore).

Elizabeth Campbell, Executive Assistant to the Vice President, from Computing & Communications Services, stated that she is working to establish a software license office. This would allow access to shared software throughout campus. There is a proposal for this in the Budget Office that is being considered.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:03 AM. Minutes recorded by Peggy Fanning, Assistant to the Director, Office of Research. Minutes to be approved at the next FCR meeting scheduled for 6 April 2006.
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