Chair Mark Haselkorn welcomed special guests Jonathan Nurse, Assistant Director, Office of Federal Relations and Christy Gullion, Director, Office of Federal Relations who were attending the meeting in person today.

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda

Chair Mark Haselkorn called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. He asked for any changes to the agenda. Hearing none, the agenda was approved.

2. Approve minutes from March 2009 FCR meeting
Haselkorn asked for any changes to the minutes for March 2009. Two minor corrections were made. Hearing no other corrections, the minutes were approved.

3. Announcements

Haselkorn asked Nurse and Gullion for any announcements. Gullion noted that Congress is on recess now and things are pretty quiet in Washington, D.C. after a fairly hectic time. Nurse mentioned that they both participate in a government relations group, Association of American Universities (AAU). An issue that recently arose was the need for good stories to tell from the stimulus package and Nurse suggested that they be thinking about it.

Haselkorn inquired of Nurse whether he knew if graduate research assistants (GRA) can be counted as a job when he fills out the special report for stimulus funding. Nurse noted that while nothing has been seen in writing, the operating assumption is that GRAs would count. Haselkorn noted it would be good to let faculty know of any other details with the stimulus package that might impact how they organize their research.

Haselkorn also asked Nurse and Gullion about the relationship between the AAU and the Council on Government Relations (COGR). Nurse explained that the organizations were separate, but similar. He noted that because of time limitations, he and Gullion could not participate in all government relations associations. Haselkorn pointed to COGR as the body they hear from about government regulations most often, through FCR member Sue Camber. Gullion suggested that her office could get more involved in what COGR is doing and FCR could plug into the associations her office works with. Nurse noted that he posts information from the associations on the UW Federal Relations website which he would share with the council. Mary Lidstrom suggested that they put both Nurse and Gullion on the COGR email list that Camber administers. She explained that COGR focuses almost exclusively on administrative policy such as the reporting requirements for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). Lidstrom thought it would be good to have a single voice on a specific stance that they are pushing.

Nurse told council members that his office liked to get feedback, such as David Fluharty’s acknowledgment for the coverage recently provided on the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. He asked members to let him know if there is something they feel needs to be covered. Haselkorn asked about faculty who are putting up large proposals and have in the past been discouraged from contacting their congressional representatives about their proposals. He asked Gullion what message she would like to give to the faculty research community about on how to access their congressional delegation, when it’s appropriate to contact them, and who they should go through. Gullion said she would be happy to speak more about the issue, but offered a short answer that the congressional delegation is very interested in knowing when someone from the state is competing for something, but not when one state entity is competing against another. She noted that it would not be unusual to ask them for a letter of support if they express interest in the research proposal. Haselkorn asked council members if they felt that it was their role to make available to the research community some guidance on contacting their congressional representatives. Gullion offered to get them information guidelines from some of the congressional offices about what they support and when to know if it’s worth asking them. Lidstrom acknowledged that having those information links on the Office of Research (OR) website would be good, and added that Dave Eaton (Associate vice Provost for Research, EH Administration) is the person who handles federal relations.
4. Requests for Information and Updates
   • Office of Research (Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, Office of Research)

Lidstrom reported that she and Sue Camber put a quick proposal together asking Paul Jenny for temporary funds to help with the infrastructure needs for the large influx of stimulus money coming into the university. She cited the offices of Research and Grant & Contract Accounting (GCA) among the many units that will be impacted because of issues related to compliance or other bottle necks in processing what she expects will be $300M in grants. She noted the increased workload coupled with the shorter timeframe and urgency of the turnaround makes it very difficult for the academic units. Lidstrom said they are hoping that they will survive through the next 6 months. She explained the timeline facing the administration and departments in the grant award cycle. She noted that they are getting the word out to departments to have plans on how to provide the support needed, based on some idea of the workload needs. Haselkorn asked her if there was anything this council could do to help. Lidstrom replied that she thought they would be okay even while the university is in the middle of dealing with budget cuts that are consuming everyone.

Haselkorn inquired if she has heard whether the NIH of NSF is allowing ARRA money for administrative expenses. Lidstrom replied that COGR recently noted that they do recommend making a request for administrative costs and provide a paragraph to insert in the grant. The focus now is to get the word out to the people writing the grants. Lidstrom noted that she felt individual units will need to decide how to handle this. She added that NIH supported departments are going to see the biggest increase and she is working directly with the School of Medicine and Public Health, two units that will be the largest recipients of the stimulus money.

Fluharty announced that the Puget Sound Business Journal had an interview with Mary Lidstrom. The article was passed around for council members to read. Lidstrom spoke about the difficulty in getting state legislators to understand that stimulus money will not help replace a loss of state dollars for instruction at the university. Gullion noted that the issue is the same at the Federal level.

5. Old Business
   • Draft Resolution on Scholarly Communication – Update (Haselkorn)

Haselkorn reported that the Class C Resolution on Scholarly Communication passed at the recent Senate Executive Committee meeting. It noted that it is not a radical open source statement, but rather encourages faculty to publish in the university’s open source venue. It will now go to the Faculty Senate for a vote on Thursday, April 23rd. He noted that the council will perhaps revisit the issue and ask if there is anything in it that the research community should consider.

Richard Wright inquired if anyone knew whether NIH has rescinded its requirement that publications be available in an open format. The general understanding was that NIH still has the requirement.

   • Campus Stimulus Discussion – Continued (Haselkorn)

Haselkorn reported that two center directors recently approached him with complaints concerning how they are not receiving their Research Cost Recovery (RCR) money even though they are paying for off-campus space and their own administrators. He provided an overview of the typical process for handling indirect cost returns at the university, noting that
there are variations across campus. Haselkorn theorized that the current economic situation has brought on a greater effort on the part of department chairs to hang onto the RCR funds. He asked council members if they felt this was an issue to address and laid out implications of the current practice. Wright pointed out potential consequences for faculty who associate with research centers that would pit their department against the center. He also noted that faculty who conduct interdisciplinary research could be negatively impacted by this problem.

Lidstrom explained that Dave Eaton created guidelines for centers on handling indirect cost returns that he presented to FCR a year ago. She would like to see the plan brought back to the council to get at the issue. Lidstrom explained that they don’t want centers to compete with departments but rather to complement them in order to build a strong, healthy research enterprise. Lidstrom explained a reasonable way to administer the RCR funds. She noted that she would like to bring the guidelines back to FCR for discussion, and then to the Research Advisory Board, and ultimately, to the Board of Deans.

Haselkorn raised two concerns he saw from the problem: the impact of the current economic situation on how department chairs are changing the protocol for paying out RCR money, and the question of whether or not faculty members have a voice in the process of RCR distributions. Lidstrom explained how the guidelines will require centers that receive matching funds to follow the rules, and if there are any differences, it would require approval from the Office of Research. She saw this as a way to build adherence to an equitable policy.

Haselkorn asked the recorder to get the draft proposal and put it on the next agenda for FCR to review and discuss. Vogt described a problem he is experiencing with indirect cost recovery in his department and noted that it was a transparency issue for the faculty in the unit. Lidstrom explained that this part of the indirect cost is negotiated based on the administrative supportive research that occurs outside of central, at the school, college, or department level. While the fund is not a venture capital fund it is often treated as one. She pointed out that there is a piece of the RCR which is negotiated specifically to help pay for the time for 100% research faculty. Haselkorn shared a particular concern brought to him about RCR funds not being distributed to faculty and felt that it was an issue the council should track, and quickly. Lidstrom suggested that they invite Dave Eaton to the next FCR meeting, noting that he is very knowledgeable about the details of RCR. Haselkorn suggested that they look to get the Senate or SEC to do a survey on how each department is handling the RCR issue.

6. New Business

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

Since Gerald Miller was not present today Daniel Vogt presented the subcommittee’s recommendation on a request by the Applied Physics Laboratory- UW to host and manage a classified meeting of researchers funded by the Office of Naval Research. Vogt explained that the subcommittee handled the request through an email from Robert Miyamoto, Associate Director, Applied Physics Laboratory. He noted that they have approved two other meetings and the subcommittee saw no conflicts and was very similar to what they had done before.

Haselkorn told council members that in the past the applicants have made a presentation to the council but he felt that it was appropriate to use electronic means for this third request. On that note, he called the question to vote on approving the request. The subcommittee’s recommendation was approved. There was no other new business.
The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 p.m.
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