Call to Order

Ron Stenkamp chaired the meeting because Jerry Miller was unable to attend. The meeting began at 9:36 A.M.

Approval of the minutes from the January 12, 2010 meeting

The minutes of the January 12, 2010 meeting were approved with one amendment to make it clear that PIs provide the answers to the prescribed set of questions.

ITEMS DISCUSSED

1. Announcements/Discussion-
   
   A. Faculty Orientation for Research Grants (Lynne Chronister)
      
      Chronister shared background on the origins of a possible Faculty Orientation for Research Grants for new faculty. The University currently has a policy that anybody that submits a research proposal must take a grants management every four years. During these, she has been consistently asked why something isn’t done for brand new faculty before they submit proposals. She brought the idea to the Council to gain their input. The Council discussed the idea and was generally favorable toward the idea. A motion was made to endorse the idea and that it would be useful. The motion passed.

2. New Business- Four Research contracts with restrictions (Ron Stenkamp)
A. Flores
Stenkamp presented a proposal from Oscar Flores (Mechanical Engineering) to approve a Technical Control Plan that would restrict access to the items depending on the nationality of the researchers. The basic issue is whether the nationality restriction is acceptable. The subcommittee believed that it is, and recommended approval by the full FCR.

FCR approved.

B. Moire
Stenkamp presented a proposal from Bob Miyamoto (Applied Physics Laboratory) for classified research involving a contract with Moire, Inc. The subcommittee viewed this project as operating within the guidelines for UW restricted research and recommended approval by the FCR.

FCR approved.

C. Matula
Stenkamp presented a proposal from Tom Matula (Applied Physics Laboratory) for a subcontract with the Honeywell. A possible item of concern in this proposal is a contractual clause requiring prior approval from the Department of Defense before anything can be published. The nature of the project might make this a non-issue, i.e., the review material generated might not be publishable anyway, but the contract contains a clause restricting the research. The subcommittee was told by Peggy Hartman (OSP) that they are seeing more “restrictive flowdown clauses from federal sponsor, usually the Department of Defense, to the Industry sponsor.” Stenkamp stated that it seems likely the FCR will see more of these in the future. The subcommittee recommended approval of this proposal.

FCR approved.

D. Miyamoto
Stenkamp presented a proposal from Bob Miyamoto (Applied Physics Laboratory) for an unclassified sub-contract with RADC, Inc. The funding for this project is from the Air Force Research Laboratory, but is being routed through the company RADC. The project started a year ago and was funded through APL’s NAVSEA contract. This year the sponsor wants the funding to come through RADC. RADC has agreed to use the same language as what exists in APL’s NAVSEA contract. ARFL has allowed APL to publish in the open literature under that language (after they reviewed).

FCR approved.

3. UW Technology/Communication Costs (Sue Camber and Kelli Trosvig)
Camber and Trosvig distributed a handout to the Council and presented the background of UW Technology’s financial issues. In Spring of 2008, it was learned that UW Technology had a large deficit and a committee was appointed to look into the causes. The main reason for the deficit is that UW Technology was not charging enough to cover the prices of their services provided. In Summer 2008, Trosvig was put in charge of UW Technology and had to make large cuts to ensure UW Technology did not exceed its budget. A second committee was then appointed to make recommendations on what needed to be done to make UW Technology financially sustainable in the future. The committee’s recommendations are what was being presented to the Council. The main recommendation is to move away from the large telephone charges and switch to a per-capita charge. The committee came to that conclusion after looking at what peers are doing as well as what the upcoming technology needs of the University.

The council discussed the matter and was interested in whether or not this would change the F&A rates. It was explained that is a separate negotiation with external groups.

4. F&A (overhead) negotiation update (Sue Camber, Cristi Chapman)

Chapman began the update by distributing a handout on the Facilities and Administrative Rate Proposal. The F&A rate proposal has been negotiated for the last three years. For the most part, the rates will be similar to what they are today. More details are available in the handout.

Adjournment
Stenkamp ended the meeting at 11:02 p.m.
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