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Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda
2. Approve minutes from February 2009 FCR meeting
3. Announcements
4. Requests for Information and Updates
   Office of Research (Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, Office of Research)
5. Old Business
   • Draft Resolution on Scholarly Communication (Charles Wilkinson, Haselkorn and Wright)
   • Office of Research Infrastructure Process Improvements (Lidstrom)
   • Recommendation from the Sub-Committee on Classified, Restricted, and Proprietary Research (Miller)
6. New Business
   • Royalty Research Review Report (Lidstrom)
   • Campus Stimulus Discussion (Camber)
7. Adjournment

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda

Chair Mark Haselkorn called the meeting to order at 12:10 p.m. He asked to move Mary Lidstrom’s report on Office of Research Infrastructure Process Improvements to the next meeting. The agenda was approved as amended.
2. Approve minutes from February 2009 FCR meeting

Sue Camber requested several corrections to the minutes. Hearing no other corrections, the minutes were approved as amended.

3. Announcements

There were no announcements

4. Requests for Information and Updates (Mary Lidstrom, Vice-Provost for Research)

This item was moved under New Business.

5. Old Business

- Draft Resolution on Scholarly Communication (Charles Wilkinson, Haselkorn, and Wright)

Chair Haselkorn introduced special guests Charles Wilkinson, Chair, Faculty Council on University Libraries (FCUL), and Tim Jewell, Director, Information Resources & Scholarly Communication, Libraries. Haselkorn explained how FCUL and FCR worked together on the Scholarly Communication Committee to create Class C legislation in support of online scholarly publication. The draft legislation has been approved by FCUL with one change, and is before FCR for its consideration today. Haselkorn noted that if FCR adds any changes to the legislation today, it will return to FCUL for approval before going before the Senate Executive Committee on April 6\textsuperscript{th}, and with approval, to the Faculty Senate on April 23\textsuperscript{rd}.

Haselkorn put the proposed amendment to the legislation on the table for the council. He pointed out that the wording in the final bullet in the third resolution had sounded negative and that he approved of the newly worded section:

3. the University of Washington administration is encouraged to:
work with departments and colleges to assure that the review process for promotion, tenure, and merit takes into consideration these new trends and realities in academic publication.

Haselkorn asked Wilkinson to speak to the council about the resolution. Wilkinson explained how the rising cost of serial subscriptions and packaged bundles has led them to open access publication. He noted that the legislation has become more of an author's rights document that asks faculty to make responsible choices and find out the costs for scholarly journals they use. Haselkorn noted that the legislation also encourages faculty to archive their work in the UW institutional repository. Haselkorn stressed that the whole publication model is changing, and the focus of the resolution is to get the University to think about an alternative future. Wilkinson explained that the UW repository, ResearchWorks, is under development and fully searchable by Google and other search engines. He felt that it will be a way for faculty to expand the number of citations of their research work, by having their publications available, with permission, in the repository. For faculty who don’t have access to the journals, they will still have access to the research. Haselkorn noted that it also serves as a part of the branding of UW intellectual
property. In response to an inquiry about getting a rating system for the electronic journals, it was noted that the Libraries is working on a system for ranking journals and providing information to faculty. Tim Jewell noted that there are some available sources, such as Carl Bergstrom’s eigenfactor (www.eigenfactor.org), that provide an alternative rating metric. The information is useful to authors and editors in making decisions.

Ron Stenkamp pointed out that the use of the word “consider” in the amended resolution opens up both negative and positive views. Richard Wright suggested that they replace the word “consider” with “reward.” Gerald Miller inquired whether the wording in the last bullet of the third resolution could be viewed as trying to avoid refereed publications. Haselkorn explained that it is intended to convey that everything else being equal, you should not be penalized for where your publication appears. Wright pointed out that in their discussions the SCC felt that it was important to address a very real issue, and to leave it vague enough so that for faculty in departments with limitations on journal publishing options, there would be considerations in place to insure that they were treated fairly in the review process. Wilkinson suggested a future discussion about creating a category in ResearchWorks for working papers, and a separate, identified one limited to published, reviewed materials.

**Action:** Chair Haselkorn asked for a motion to approve the proposed amendment to the resolution. A motion was called, and seconded. The motion was approved.

**Action:** The chair called the question to vote on passing the Class C legislation. If approved, the legislation will be sent for approval to FCUL, SEC, and Faculty Senate. The motion passed.

Haselkorn thanked Wilkinson and Jewell for coming today. He noted that Jewell has offered to give a demonstration of the ResearchWorks repository and will put him on the council agenda when he is ready to show it.

- **Office of Research Infrastructure Improvements (Lidstrom)**
  This item was postponed until the next council meeting.

- **Recommendation from the Sub-Committee on Classified, Restricted, and Proprietary Research (Miller)**

  Haselkorn asked Gerald Miller to address the Anderson proposal that was passed at the last FCR meeting, but without an explanation from the subcommittee members. Miller noted that the subcommittee met with Anderson, who explained that his contract is classified because he must know about the military system in order to research and build a trustworthy computer network for the military. Miller added that Anderson met all the necessary criteria.

  **Action:** Haselkorn called for a motion to approve the Anderson proposal. The motion was approved unanimously.

  Miller noted that he will notify Professor Anderson of the council’s formal vote of approval.

6. **New Business**
Mary Lidstrom reported that the Office of Research had been tasked to review the policies and procedures of the grants awarded through the Royalty Research Fund (RRF). Members were handed a copy of the UW Royalty Research Fund Ad Hoc Committee Report. Special guest Tom Daniels, Professor of Biology and an RRF ad hoc committee member, gave council members a brief review of the committee’s work. He reviewed the committee’s charge, the goals and history of the RRF, the results of a WebQ survey from past RRF recipients, and the committee’s recommendations. Haselkorn asked Daniels if the committee had discussed payments to faculty who review RRF grants. Daniels noted that the committee felt strongly that reviewing was part of a faculty member’s duty to his colleagues. He did acknowledge that they have difficulty in recruiting faculty to do collegial reviews given the challenges to their time.

Daniels reported that the committee felt it was important to continue the RRF scholars program particularly for those in the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences. He was asked if the committee has spoken about expanding the funding to faculty outside of those areas. Daniels replied that the committee felt that limiting the funds to faculty in the Arts and Sciences was the “best bang for the buck” because they have little or no other funding sources, and that in the sciences there is so much other funding available. Haselkorn noted that RRF is funding fields that don’t generate money back into the pool. Daniels explained that the money is not a large part of the RRF flow because the grants are so small. He also noted how the funding spurs innovation in the arts and humanities which is good because it broadens the university, and does not involve a lot of money. Wright inquired if they would consider funding RRF scholars in other areas where there is little funding, such as faculty in the early years of engineering, and cutting back on the total number of large grants. Daniels noted that the committee did not discuss that.

Council members began a discussion on whether the survey results (55% of the funded projects lead to further funding, and 85% of the funded projects led to a book, article, or publication) suggested that RRF funding was successful. It was pointed out that survey respondents were only two years out and that it generally takes at least five years out before a faculty can get a publication. It was also noted that the amount of time it takes for publication depends upon the area of research and some research takes at least five years to get to the publication stage. Daniels explained that there was more analysis that could be gleaned from the data, but that overall the committee sees the RRF as an extremely valuable thing that the university is well positioned with to go forward.

Daniels was asked whether a faculty member with a publication in the university repository would be able to include it when answering the survey question about total number of publications. He noted that it probably would be included. Haselkorn pointed out the implications of the question for the class C legislation in support of a university repository. He imagined a future in which an RRF recipient would be required to post at least something in the university repository.

Lidstrom raised a concern with the implications of the committee’s third recommendation on page 8 which would require her office to track the actions of all RRF award recipients. She recommended that the wording be changed to say, “you would be expected to,” instead of “you are required to,” because it sounds less draconian, and she also doesn’t have the staff to do the tracking. The idea would be that you would be expected to do it if asked.
Lidstrom raised another concern in the last recommendation that states that “. . . PIs could indicate if they feel their proposal would benefit from joint review.” Her concern was that joint review can sometimes be certain death to an interdisciplinary researcher’s work when neither review group takes ownership of the proposal. A discussion began about the challenge in finding qualified faculty to review interdisciplinary research, how the process makes it difficult to know what expertise will be needed because the panels are formed very early, and how some researchers feel like the process is double jeopardy while others feel like they could never be reviewed fairly by one panel. One idea offered was to identify interdisciplinary researchers to do the reviews because they would be more tolerant of interdisciplinary ideas. It was pointed out that the real challenge is in finding someone qualified to judge because the interdisciplinary nature of the work means that no one else is doing the kind of research under review. Lidstrom noted that she will work with people in the program to find a solution to the problem. Daniels added that it would help if researchers wrote proposals in a way that someone outside of their discipline could review. Lidstrom noted that Jeff Cheek has been running this program but has been asked to focus on Compliance, and Judy Ramey has agreed to take it on for a couple of years.

Haselkorn asked for a motion to thank the committee members for their great work, especially since FCR requested the report, and endorse the recommendations with two minor modifications. He noted the two changes:

1. On page 8 the word “requiring” is being changed to “expecting.”
2. On page 9 the last recommendation on interdisciplinary proposals should say it will “develop a plan for interdisciplinary review.”

Lidstrom responded to a concern raised about interdisciplinary proposals not all getting through by noting that if the numbers are small enough then they could hold back one or two awards every round and allow Judy Ramey, as she listens to the discussions, identify one or two proposals she feels didn’t get as good a review as they could have and make an award.

Action: A motion was made to endorse the proposed changes to the recommendations in the UW RRF Ad Hoc Review Committee Report. The motion was seconded, and approved unanimously.

- **Campus Stimulus Discussion (Camber)**
  Lidstrom updated the council on the government stimulus plan, referred to as the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). She noted the large amount of Federal money coming into research funding at a time when the university is facing a large budget cut from state funding. Lidstrom reported that the total research package is $15 billion for research, of which $13 billion will go to the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Institute of Health (NIH). She predicted that the university would do very well and estimated that about $300 million will be coming in over the next 6 months. Lidstrom highly recommended a website that she uses daily to track the most recent updates on the federal funding plan. Sue Camber explained that the website, jointly coordinated with the OSP and GCA, was created out of a need to help administrators keep track of all the information. The website provides basic information about opportunities with government grants, links to other informative websites, and links to both the OSP and GCA websites. She noted that the information is updated daily, and the information changes hourly.

Lidstrom noted that they don’t have all the information on reporting yet from the Office of Budget Management and that reporting will fall heavily upon Camber’s unit, Grant and Contract
Accounting. She said they are still working out how to do this internally because the reports will be due 10 days after the end of the quarter. Lidstrom explained that the workload increase to central administration will increase, temporarily, as much as 50%, and that researchers must start spending the grant money within two months of the award or else the Federal government will take it back. She outlined the two-year temporary staffing needs and how they will likely hire undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral students. Jonathan Nurse (by phone) was asked if graduate research assistants would count as a job. Nurse said that he will get clarification and send details back to the council.

Lidstrom outlined issues the university will face related to receiving a large amount of research funding for only two years. She noted that while the huge influx of grant money is only temporary, the university’s base will increase between 4-5% for the next two years. Lidstrom also cited possible short-term help for graduate students, bridge funding, and research space needs. Haselkorn noted for the record that FCR will want to revisit this issue once the craziness dies down, from a long term perspective. Lidstrom suggested a future discussion on the topic of the increasing disparity between units with external funding and those without it because of the lack of TAs and the increase in research funding. Suzanne Redalje noted the enormous budget cut that the UW Libraries is facing. Camber inquired about ways to get the word out to faculty about the influx of research funding as well as the website where to find information. She offered to send information to the recorder to be sent out through the Faculty Senate to College Council chairs.

The meeting adjourned at 1:33 p.m.
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