Meeting Synopsis:
1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda
2. Approve minutes from 7 February 2007 FCR meeting
3. Announcements
4. Requests for Input, Information, and Updates
   a. Update – Office of Research (Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research)
   b. Update: Federal report (Barbara Perry, Assoc. Vice President/Dir. Of Federal Relations)
   c. Requests for Input: Process of paying out leave on grants and contracts (Sue Camber, Assistant Vice President, Research Accounting & Analysis)
   d. Request for Input: Ownership of research data (David Eaton, Associate Vice Provost for Research, Office of Research)
   e. Request for Information: Federal Demonstration Project (Asuman Kiyak)
5. New Business
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 February 2007 FCR meeting
The minutes were approved with a few minor corrections.

3. Announcements
There were none.

4. Requests for Input, Information, and Updates
   a. Update – Office of Research
Cathryn called on Mary Lidstrom to give the committee an update from the Office of Research. Mary really didn’t have any updates to report but asked the committee if they had any questions or concerns. After hearing no response from the committee, Cathryn called on Barbara Perry to give the committee an update from the federal scene.

   b. Update: Federal
Barbara Perry reported that the Senate has begun working on its budget resolution. The budget resolution determines funding levels for the Appropriations Committees, and is the first step in the congressional appropriations process.

President Mark Emmert met with members of the Washington Congressional delegation in D.C. They talked about support for basic research, UW initiatives and general policy issues such as Medicare reform which impacts our hospitals. While the delegation was
very supportive and interested in the UW, it was sobering to hear about how few dollars are available for domestic discretionary spending. There will probably be an increase in NSF and the Department of Energy, as these are top priorities. Funding for the NIH is more problematic. As for the UW initiatives, the last year of our three year request for APL infrastructure should be completed in 08. We are seeking support for an expansion of ISIS, the Institute for Surgical Intervention Simulations. We have a few forestry projects as well as a request for some help with the clean up of toxic plumes beneath the UWT campus. Many of the delegation join us in the interest to work on an education program to study, educate folks and clean up Puget Sound. Upcoming federal events include a field hearing on STEM education in Tumwater. Representative Brian Baird is now chair of the House Science Committee and he is having a filed hearing on STEM education in Tumwater next week. Several participants from the UW will be there. Also, the Chairman has invited Mark Emmert to be a witness at a hearing in D.C. on the reauthorization of the National Science Foundation. Because the President will be out of the country, Provost Wise will be on the panel representing all research universities. Some of the issues under consideration include:

- Cap on number of proposals that can be submitted from one university for certain program e.g. IGERT
- How to help get young investigators launched into the grant world
- Maintaining a balance between the number of large scale interdisciplinary awards and individual awards
- Keeping the NSF STEM ED programs in NSF rather than diverting them to Dept of Ed.
- Addressing the push by the IT industry that would change the way Universities deal with their intellectual property
- Addressing the need for NSF and Congress to have a process of investing in science that is rational as NSF budgets go up so as to avoid the problems that have arisen since the NIH doubling (namely, love 'em and leave 'em)

**c. Requests for Input: Paying out leave on grants and contracts (Sue Camber)**

Sue Camber started the discussion by explaining the background of the Leave Payment Team. Mike Anthony from Management Accounting and Analysis is leading this team.

Sue explained that annual (vacation) leave at separation is paid by the employee's home department and distributed proportionately to budget(s) charged at the time of separation including sponsored budgets. Sick leave paid at separation is paid from central budget sources. Initially, we are trying to determine the feasibility of prospectively changing the process for charging leave payments at retirement, death, or separation to reduce the impact on sponsored agreements including, but not limited to, the inclusion of these costs in the UW's fringe benefit rate (preliminary estimate about ~0.5% impact on the rate). In the longer run, we could consider the financial impact of incorporating other leave costs and/or fully funding the current leave liability. A preliminary estimate for fully funding the leave liability is a ~0.5% - ~3.2% impact on the rate. In either case, our goal is not to disadvantage research grants.

For Phase I (separation leave, both annual and sick), leave would be paid centrally with funds captured through a higher benefit load rate.

The current challenges we face are the financial impact on the central budget, impact on
other operations such as self-sustaining budgets, medical center, APL and extension/summer quarter, and the security of funds in accrual accounts (i.e. concern about state "sweeping" dollars). Any of these could cause us to stop and look for alternatives. The challenge looking most significant at this point is the central budget impact. If we can resolve these challenges, then we would seek concurrence from DHHS Division of Cost Allocation, develop a formal campus communication plan, and include separation leave in the next benefit load rate calculation. We would then turn our attention to a study of other leave types and an analysis of whether fully funding the leave liability is feasible/desirable.

Gerald Miller asked Sue if this program started on July 1 and someone left on August 1, would they get paid from this new format. Sue said yes, there may not be enough money in the pot but there will be times where the pot has a positive or negative balance.

Cathryn wanted to know what the impact on other departments not funded by grants would be. Sue said there will be some costs to the budget office and they are trying to figure this out.

Asuman wanted to know if they could limit it to grant funded people only. Sue explained that they aren’t separated out and there is no separate rate. If we find out that the impact is too great on state budgets, we may need to look at different way to solve this payout problem.

Please send any feedback to Michael Anthony at mda1213@u.washington.edu or call him at 206-616-1379.

The Faculty Council were comfortable with this approach of trying to resolve the dilemma of big payouts on grant budgets.

d. Request for Input: Ownership of research data (David Eaton, Associate Vice Provost for Research, Office of Research)

David Eaton along with other committee members (Ana Mari Cauce, Jim Severson, John Slattery, Carol Zuiches, Martina Morris, Paul Olsen, and Chair, Clark Shores), have been working on a proposed policy on ownership data. This policy, developed initially by Clark Shores and Paul Olsen, both attorneys in the AG's Office, was created to help preserve, protect and share research data in accordance with academic and scientific norms. The Committee met several times and provided detailed revisions, and feel that it is now time to solicit additional input from the broader University Community. The Committee is therefore requesting feedback from the Faculty Council on Research. No formal approval is necessary, but the committee welcomes any comments from FCR members.

Although there was not an urgent need for such a proposal, several recent issues related to data ownership has arisen, such as what data / samples can faculty take with them if they leave the UW, who is responsible for archiving data, etc. Thus, the Committee was asked to formulate a GIM Policy that addresses ownership of data. Basically, all research data is owned by the University, except where precluded by the specific terms of sponsorship or other University agreements or policies, such as a copyright policy. The Principal Investigator (PI) is responsible for the collection, management, and retention of research data.
The basic approach to the policy is that, when there is a conflict regarding the data, the PI tries to resolve the conflict and if he can’t then his chair or the dean will step in to help resolve the problem. The dean may even set up a committee to oversee the conflict, and ultimately, the dean can make the final decision. If there is a dispute between the PI and the dean, the draft policy provides an appeals process to help protect the PI from vindictive actions. The Vice Provost for Research has the final say in such disputes.

Dave Eaton told the FCR that the Data Policy Committee welcomes any input- if they missed something, just let him know via email.

Theresa Barker spoke up saying she was a graduate student and has collected data and wondered how they will get the word out regarding this new policy to other students who may be collecting data and involved in research. Dave told her that once this policy gets adopted, it will be put into the Grants Information Memorandum (GIM) book. Faculty will be informed of this policy through the Board of Deans, information via their dean, and other groups such as the Faculty Council on Research, Research Advisory Board, etc.

This policy will not only protect the University securing its intellectual property rights, but also protects PIs/faculty, graduate and undergraduate students and ensuring and protection of human subjects, the appropriate use of animals and the proper use of tangible research materials.

Theresa Barker asked about the timeline of this proposed policy. David Eaton still needed to present it to the Research Advisory Board for their input and expects to get it finalized within a couple of months.

Asuman asked about projects that had multiple PIs and multiple centers. Dave explained that when there is more than one PI, then there must be an explicit agreement identifying who will fulfill which responsibility under this policy. PIs should adopt an orderly system of data organization and communicate the chosen system to all members of the research group. PIs should also maintain procedures for the protection of essential research records in the event of a natural disaster or other emergency.

If you have any input or questions, please just email them to David Eaton at: deaton@u.washington.edu.

e. Request for Information: Federal Demonstration Project (Asuman Kiyak)
Asuman Kiyak had planned to present a Powerpoint presentation but the projector was not in the room. She had sent copies of the slides to committee members last month, so proceeded to go over the slides with the committee. She started by saying that there were two very good presentations.

The Federal Demonstrations Partnership (FDP) is a federal consortium of universities and research organizations that meets three times a year. We have three representatives from the University on FDP; Jim Kresl, Carol Zuiches and Asuman Kiyak. This organization is an important one for UW and other research universities because these stakeholders can meet with representatives of research funding sources and have some influence on their processes. The AAAS is not very optimistic for funds in FY2007. The war budget is taking away from the R&D resources. Asuman pointed
out that in slide seven you can see the surge in funding since 2002-2003. Most of the funding in 2004 was for NHLB, NIAID, and NCI. But funds are all down now. With more applications coming in, we need to push for more funding for R&D.

At a hearing for FY08 and funding for the National Institutes of Health (NIH), Chairman David Obey announced that democrats are pushing for an increase in appropriations for NIH. President Bush’s proposed amount would be a step backward and would hamper biomedical research. Mr. Obey criticized President Bush for proposing to divert millions from the HIV and AIDS programs. The reduced budgets in 2007 is not good and don’t know the outcome for 2008 yet. If you are doing research for defense, funding opportunities are very good.

The other presentation, challenges and opportunities facing NIH Peer-Review, the key issues were:

- faster review and faster turn-around
- recruit and retain experienced reviewers
- applications are up from about 40,000 in 1998 to almost 80,000 in 2006 (about 33,000 in RO1s and 11,000 in RR1s)
- respond to the concern about shortening the limit and shorter RO1 applications

Out of about 5,000 responses, about 74% were in favor of a shorter form (RO1). There are many advantages of shorter applications. Each reviewer can read more applications, study sections can be smaller, and more experienced reviewers can be recruited.

Asuman said she would send the survey results from the research group to Cathryn showing a summary of administrative burdens such as animal care and human subjects.

The goals of the Trans-NIH committee are to shorten the applications and focus on RO1, consider reducing the page limit and align the application more closely with review criteria.

Some committee members were concerned about shortening the applications. Mary was concerned about the junior faculty being able to get all the information into shortened grants. Asuman mentioned that we may need to encourage mentors from senior faculty to help fill this gap and work with the junior faculty.

5. **New Business**
Cathryn asked the committee members if there was any new business and nobody had anything to bring up.

6. **Discussion**
No discussion

7. **Adjournment**
Meeting adjourned at 10:20 AM. *Minutes by Peggy Fanning.*
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