Chair Cathryn Booth-LaForce called the meeting to order at 9:03 AM

Meeting Synopsis:
1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda
2. Approve minutes from 12 March 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: Interdisciplinary Research Committee (Mark Haselkorn)
   c. Update: Global Support Project (Ann Anderson, Asst. Vice President and Controller)
   e. Update: FEC Compliance Advisory Team (Sue Camber, Assistant Vice President, Research Accounting & Analysis; Richard Wright)
   f. Update: Human Subjects Policy Board (Cathryn Booth-LaForce)
5. New Business
6. Adjournment

1. Call to order and approval of agenda
Cathryn Booth-LaForce opened the meeting by asking for the approval of the revised agenda, which was approved.

2. Approve minutes from the 12 March 2007 FCR meeting
The minutes were approved with a one minor correction.
3. Announcements
Cathryn announced that she will be out of town on May 18th, when the next meeting is scheduled for the Faculty Council on Research from 10:00 to 11:30 in Room 26 in Gerberding Hall. Mark Haselkorn has agreed to the Chair the meeting in her absence.

4. Request for Input, Information, and Updates

a. Update – Office of Research
Cathryn called on Mary Lidstrom to give the council members an update from the Office of Research. Mary started by giving an update on the UW Towers. Not much progress has been made due to the uncertainty about the O&M funds requested in the state budget. Once that is clear, it will be possible to develop an allocation plan. Mary noted that the requested space is greater than the space available, so not everyone will be accommodated. In addition, the amount of space being released on campus is not as much as might be imagined, because the Brooklyn Building (housing Human Resources), is slated for demolition.

Theresa Barker asked about the timeline when people can move into the space. Mary said that the space will not be available until January 2008, but moving in may be around February/March due to updating outlets, phones and computer connections, etc. Also, the lease on the Pancake House will be up shortly and if they don’t renew, that area may become a conference center or a possible food service area.

Sanjeev Khagram asked about the magnitude of the requests being more than the space. Mary said the requests are for about 600,000 square feet and there is only about 510,000 square feet available.

Some of the areas that may be moving to the Towers are: Computing and Communications, Human Resources, Office of Sponsored Programs, and Human Subjects. Other possibilities are Planning and Budget, AG’s Office and some of School of Medicine’s Administration.

Mary had some positive updates regarding SAGE. You will be able to cut and paste abstracts and there is no longer a space limit, and you will also have the ability to use an old template for updating proposals. Mary will give a complete update at the next meeting in May.

b. Update: Interdisciplinary Research Committee
Mark Haselkorn has been leading a national center of excellence proposal and hasn’t been able to give much time to the Interdisciplinary Research Committee. However, Daniel Vogt has volunteered to Co-Chair which will help move the committee effort along.

Mary also wanted to remind council members that the Bridge proposals are due May 1. The Bridge proposals do require one-to-one matching and applications can be found on the Office of Research website along with policies and procedures. Bridge money is a way to help young professor who have a strong track record but are now loosing
funding, where this bridge money may help them to stay on track with their research during leaner times.

c. Request for Input: Global Support Project

Ann Anderson explained that the Global Support Project was created to analyze administrative support needs related to global activities and recommend mechanisms to meet them. The project is trying to bring organization into areas where little organization exists.

The opportunities for engaging in global activities are many:

- Expand institutional presence in international health research and other sponsored programs
- Establish broad-based partnerships with developing countries and institutions
- Develop health care worker training programs
- Expand knowledge of infectious diseases
- Increase access to treatments
- Expand global learning experience and opportunities

There are many challenges to face by engaging in global activities. An example of one is how you need to register in foreign countries. You cannot open a bank account or rent space or even hire people unless you have registered. Ann handed out a handout about the Global Project and in that handout was a list of the many challenges they face like:

- Collaboration with developing institutions
- Limited availability of financial services and institutions
- Dramatically expanding scope and volume of funding
- Different and unique personnel policies and practices
- Legal barriers (i.e., constraints for government and public entities)
- Logistic barriers (i.e., time and distance)
- Infrastructure challenges
- Information Technology (bandwidth, hardware, etc.)
- Language and cultural differences
- Modifying and aligning internal processes and structures for better support
- Making/transferring payments overseas

Moving money is a specific challenge. You may have short lead times to prepare a funding mechanism and many other challenges to face regarding money. Some are listed below:

- Short lead times to prepare funding mechanisms
- Sponsoring agency deployment schedules and expectations
- Emerging needs in-country
- High volume cash needs - in-country personnel (both US and foreign Nationals), vehicles, space, medical supplies, in-country travel
- Inadequate, insecure, and/or weak banking systems and structures
- Currency fluctuations
- Risky financial or political conditions
- Employment status of in-country personnel
Ann reported that the Global Support Project has made many accomplishments such as:

- Developed Subteams
  - Field advances/moving funds
  - Information Technology
  - Subcontracts (to be formed in May 2007)
- Developed a Website  - [http://www.washington.edu/admin/finmgmt/globalsupport/](http://www.washington.edu/admin/finmgmt/globalsupport/)
- Developed single points of contact
  - Financial Management (financial services, purchasing, risk management)
  - Human Resources
  - Computing and Communications
  - Real Estate
  - Office of Sponsored Programs
  - Attorney General

They plan to launch a Newsletter in April 2007. A Faculty Advisory Team has been put together by professors, Directors, and Lecturers from around the UW campus. Asuman Kiyak wanted to know when we would contact this advisory team. Ann explained that you can contact them when you have a problem in a foreign country or contact them to keep from having delays or money transfers. They are a good source with controls in place. Asuman also wanted to know what type of mechanism for PIs to learn about this global project? Ann explained that the website is a good source and maybe through the Office of Sponsored Programs they could add a place to mark if your research would have a global impact, which could flag their advisory team. They also plan to hold a workshop on cultural competence. A good example would be all official documents should be signed by the Provost/Deans and government documents should be signed off by the Provost’s Office. As far as getting equipment overseas, the Office of Sponsored Programs usually handles that.

Ann concluded that the issues are complex and the solutions are not always simple. These challenges are not unique among institutions and the UW continues to seek university partners experiencing similar challenges in supporting global activities. We have so much to do and by improving our administrative processes will help the UW continue to grow as an international leader for global education and research, while stewarding state and other resources and protecting the institution and individual employees and students from risk. This initiative will help achieve Financial Management’s strategic goals of improving operational excellence by leading a University-wide project that entails developing effective relationships with strategic partners and streamlining the business processes.

Ann will come back in the fall to provide council members with an update of the Global Support Project.

Cathryn thanked Ann for coming and providing an update of the project.

**d. Request for Input: Human Embryonic Stem Cell Policy**

Jeff Cheek and Michael Corn presented a draft document on the Policy and Guidelines for the Conduct of Research Involving the Use of Human Embryonic Stem Cells, Grants Memorandum 30 (GIM 30). A Draft – For Comment Only GIM 30 document for discussion was emailed to council members along with the meeting agenda. The Office
of Research will have oversight over this policy, which was developed in part due to the restrictions announced by President Bush on August 9, 2001, as to what federal funding could be used to support research on human embryonic stem cells. Researchers and institutions are required to monitor costs, expenditures and use of resources in a manner that assures that expenditures for research on ineligible cell lines is treated as “unallowable” under applicable federal accounting rules. It will be the University’s policy to permit and encourage qualified investigators to engage in responsible and ethical research requiring the use or derivation of human embryonic stem cells and human embryonic germ cells, and human adult stem cells obtained from any source, providing the cells are obtained and the research is conducted with appropriate oversight and in accordance with all applicable laws, rules and regulations. The UW expressly prohibits certain activities relating to human embryonic stem cells, such as human reproductive cloning.

Section V. of the proposed policy, Rules and Procedures and Guidelines, sets forth requirements for legal compliance, and compliance with applicable UW policies, regulations and procedures, as well as describing certain prohibited activities. The charge and membership of the UW Embryonic Stem Cell Research Oversight Committee (ESCRO) is detailed in the draft policy. Under the proposed policy, certain HESC research, including research involving the use or creation of new HESC derived cell lines, must be reviewed and approved by the ESCRO Committee prior to the commencement of the research.

The administrative support of ESCRO will be through the Office of Research. OR is trying to minimize any compliance-related burdens and are thus coordinating oversight of HESC with the Human Subjects Division to prevent redundant or conflicting reviews. A research registry of all HESC cell lines and a research project database are also being established. Questions will be added to the eGC1 to facilitate tracking and oversight of HESC research. Targeted compliance training will be required for all HESC investigators as well.

The policy has been presented to and approved by the Research Advisory Board, the Attorney General’s office, senior HESC investigators, and administrators with the final draft likely to reflect a few minor changes.

Mark Haselkorn wanted to know if there had been enough research faculty involved and are they comfortable with the draft policy? Michael Corn said that research faculty from the Institute for Cell Research and Medicine (ISCRM) provided critical feedback throughout the development of the policy. He also noted that from the investigators’ perspective, there is some urgency in finalizing this policy, since the Institute has several million dollars of gift funds that cannot be utilized until the policy is in place.

Sanjeev Khagram wanted to know if there was an institutional mechanism for implementing the policy, particularly in regard to research oversight, as well as amending the policy if necessary. Mr. Corn explained that these responsibilities of the ESCRO Committee, which is made up of persons from a variety of academic and professional fields in order to reflect the scientific, medical, and ethical expertise necessary to carry out the committee’s work. The ESCRO Committee consists of nine voting members (designated by the Vice Provost for Research) and shall consist of:

- Chairperson
- Public member not affiliated with the UW
• Administrator or researcher experienced in the conduct and/or oversight of human subjects research
• Expert in medical ethics and/or legal matters; and
• Five researchers with terminal degrees and expertise in disciplines related to HESC research, including but not limited to, developmental biology, stem cell research, molecular biology, comparative medicine, and assisted reproduction

Michael Corn said the ESCRO committee will also have nonvoting representation from other stakeholders as well (e.g., legal counsel, Institutional Official for human subjects oversight, and other compliance offices as needed).

The FCR was asked to review the draft and forward any additional questions or concerns directly to Michael Corn at mcorn@u.washington.edu. Michael assured the council members that the committee welcomes any comments or questions they may have.

Cathryn thanked Jeff Cheek and Michael Corn for their presentation and hoped this draft could be shared with those college councils most likely impacted by the policy. She also indicated that she believed it was important that adoption of the policy not be delayed. Cathryn assured Jeff and Michael that the Council did not want to hold up the draft policy. Dr. Lidstrom assured her that the draft could be shared with college councils in the School of Medicine and Arts and Sciences.

e. Update: FEC Compliance Advisory Team

Sue Camber handed out a list of the members of the Effort Reporting Compliance Advisory Team along with highlights from a Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) paper on effort reporting. Sue was sorry that Richard Wright was called away and unable to talk about the Effort Compliance Advisory Team, since he is also a member. Sue talked about Council on Governmental Relations (COGR), which is an association of universities. Cathryn asked Sue to explain a little bit about COGR.

Sue explained that COGR’s primary function is to provide advice and information to its membership and to make certain that federal agencies understand academic operations and the impact of proposed regulations on colleges and universities. The membership of COGR consists of qualifying research universities and research foundations. COGR works closely with other university organizations including the Association of American Universities (AAU) and Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC).

One of the recent issues being raised by member institutions in response to audits and settlements is effort reporting for faculty. The underlying theme of the COGR document is to remind all parties involved of the need to restore and maintain the balance between accounting oversight and the necessary regulatory flexibility to produce good science. Among the points raised are challenges with “summer salary”, volunteer effort, supplemental pay, and the perception of over-commitment of effort. It is hoped that this paper will lead to a dialogue with appropriate officials to clarify and resolve some of the most challenging of the effort reporting guidance.

The Provost has asked each college to develop a plan to work with highly funded grant faculty to ensure compliance with current guidance. The Effort Reporting Compliance
Advisory Team will be considering additional communication with faculty and Sue sought the guidance of FCR members. Cathryn Booth-LaForce confirmed that faculty would most likely want to hear more about approaches being taken in colleges than a reiteration of the rules. Asuman Kiyak suggested that if a college contact list is developed, faculty might be more comfortable if their contact was a faculty member (College Council Chair?) than a Dean’s Office representative.

David Fluharty thought this was a useful plan but wanted to know how to get this information out to the people who really need to use it. There needs to be some type of communication plan. Sue Camber said that several areas already have plans like the School of Medicine, Arts & Sciences, Engineering and Pharmacy, just to name a few. She stated that the Effort Reporting Compliance Advisory Team would consider the input from this group and others in developing additional outreach.

5. New Business

Cathryn wanted to give a quick update on the Human Subject Policy Board. They have completed or have the following in process:

- New policy and HSD procedures for use of biological specimens (residual tissue)
- Working on policy for use of public data sets as not being human subjects research
- Working on policy about whether audiotapes disqualify studies for exempt status—are voices identifiable?
- Emergency medicine research guidelines are being addressed
- New appeals policy for IRBs has been established

Cathryn asked Jeff Cheek if he could come back in the fall to give us an update on the Human Subject Policy Board, since the bulk of work will be over the summer getting ready for the accreditation award which is due in August.

One of the faculty members was surprised of the good turnaround that she recently experienced with human subjects – only two weeks. Jeff said that the people in Human Subjects are committed and with the addition of open data sets, along with the increase in new staff by 60% has helped with the increase in their productivity.

6. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:33 AM. Minutes by Peggy Fanning.

Present: Faculty members: Fluharty, Haselkorn, Booth-LaForce, Haeseleer, Khagram, Kiyak, Miller, Stenkamp, Vogt, and Wright
President’s designee: Lidstrom
Other ex officio members: Ashby-Larrabee, Barker, Smith, Redaje for Welton
Absent:
Faculty member: Benner and Schwartz
Ex-officio members: Foster, Lovell, and Welton

Guests: Ann Anderson, Sue Camber, Jeff Cheek, Michael Corn, Peggy Fanning, and Carol Zuiches