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Meeting Synopsis:  
1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda  
2. Approve minutes from April 2009 FCR meeting  
3. Announcements  
4. Requests for Information and Updates  
   • Office of Research (Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, Office of Research)  
   • Reporting for Recovery Act Funding (Jonathan Nurse)  
5. Old Business  
   • Budget Cuts and Faculty Research (Haselkorn)  
6. New Business  
   • Addition of ORUs and RCR distribution to FRC Issues (Haselkorn)  
   • Draft Guidelines for Establishing ORUs (Eaton)  
   • CIA Postdoctoral Award  
7. Adjournment

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda  
Chair Mark Haselkorn called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. and asked members if there was any confusion regarding the second agenda sent out that added new business. The agenda was then approved.

2. Approve minutes from April 2009 FCR meeting  
The minutes from April 13, 2009 were approved as submitted.

3. Announcements
There were no announcements today.

4. Requests for Information and Updates

Haselkorn reported on several issues that he had asked Jonathan Nurse (on phone) to look into. The first request concerned whether to count graduate students on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) awards. Nurse explained that the Council on Government Relations (COGR) is making a recommendation that graduate students can be counted as one or one-half FTE, but that the other colleges are looking to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to get some more definitive guidance on it. Haselkorn noted the need for consistency in order to defend to auditors, and wondered if this council had any role besides making sure faculty know how to handle it. Mary Lidstrom replied that they are still getting information from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and that they just found out that the State must report all the same data for every stimulus dollar that comes into the state regardless of who receives it. She explained that this made their work much more complicated. Her office is working with the OMB to set up definitions for everyone to follow. Lidstrom explained that they have a contact in the Governor’s office who is organizing the state reporting side of it. It was pointed out that the awards must be spent quickly (“use it or lose it”) and that faculty need to know that their progress reports are due by the end of the quarter, a very condensed timeframe.  Lidstrom outlined a plan for communicating information to research faculty. Haselkorn asked about a central number that faculty could call to get help.

Haselkorn noted that the second information item was in response to the question of how faculty would cover extra administrative overhead costs. He noted that information has been sent around that explains that research faculty can charge a certain percentage of their ARRA award to administrative support.

Haselkorn addressed a third item concerning a request to Nurse for information on procedures for contacting political delegates about potential research funding. He noted that Nurse sent out guidelines that suggest a decision making process, and that the process has been typically handled in Dave Eaton’s (Associate vice Provost for Research) office. Eaton explained that he is working with the Office of Federal Relations to get more guidance. He outlined two different issues: the effort to be more proactive in the annual accumulation of ideas that go into the federal agenda and the desire to provide guidance to faculty who are contacting individual congressional offices. Haselkorn noted it might be desirable for faculty to work with the administration on this research issue. Eaton explained that he recently spoke with Christy Gullion about an idea for improving the two-way communication with the congressional offices. He suggested having her office find research issues that would be of interest to the congressional delegation instead of always the other way around.

Haselkorn introduced a New Business item concerning the list of council issues presented at the Senate Executive Committee. He suggested that they review FCR’s list to modify it by removing old items and adding new ones, such as Eaton’s suggestion to link the state delegation with research interests at the university. The idea would be to word the issue so that the council reviewed it on a regular basis. Gerald Miller stressed the importance of the issue and expressed concern for how to control faculty who independently reach out to state delegates concerning their research interests. Eaton emphasized the importance of faculty working in a coordinated way with Gullion’s office. He underscored the need for faculty to contact Gullion first before contacting a delegate, and to alert their Deans as well. Haselkorn thanked Nurse for sending something that creates a kind of standard for proceeding.
• Reporting for Recovery Act Funding (Jonathan Nurse)

Nurse reported that the FY’10 budget information from the Obama Administration is available on the UW Federal Relations website. He noted that it is useful to look at what the President and governmental agencies are proposing. He asked members to review the proposed budget plans online and let his office know if they see anything problematic in them. Eaton noted that he thought the Office of Research (OR) website had a link to the Federal Relations website. Haselkorn suggested that the FCR webpage on the Faculty Senate website should have links to both the Federal Relations website and the web page on research funding assistance.

• Office of Research (Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, Office of Research)

Lidstrom reported that the number of challenge grants submitted (306) was impressive. Lynne Chronister reported that 529 proposals are “in the hopper” and that the figure does not include adjusted pay lines. Lidstrom noted that they won’t have an exact count until awards are made, which are expected in late May or June. Chronister also reported they are expecting about 120 proposals for the Grand Opportunity (GO) grants that will be due May 29th.

5. Old Business

• Budget Cuts and Faculty Research (Haselkorn) [32:00]

Haselkorn raised the issue addressed at the last meeting about the opportunities and potential risks in the loss of State funding and the associated increase of research funding. His concern is with the fairness for research faculty, and the potential risks for the University, in how Indirect Cost funds from the influx of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) money are being applied toward core functions in colleges across the campus. Haselkorn felt that faculty should not be pitted against the administration. The focus should be on the protection of the University and the encouragement of the research enterprise to grow and flourish.

Lidstrom reported that she has looked into the issue and found out that because Research Cost Recovery (RCR) is a reimbursement for past expenses, as it is negotiated with the Government, the University is not legally constrained as to what they use it for. She explained that the University has strong guidance for its use in support of research, but that it would not be inappropriate to use it to hire an instructor. Lidstrom explained why it benefits the University to spend at least a part of the RCR funds on administrative support of research so it will receive future reimbursement of indirect costs. The cap on RCR disbursements is 26% and the University is always well beyond that limit. Lidstrom acknowledged that while that eliminates the question of an audit risk, there exists the risk of falling below the 26% cap, which would lower everyone’s RCR funds.

Haselkorn insisted that the fairness issue persists however. He pointed to his situation as a director of a research center that typically uses indirect costs to pay for a grant writer as well as for research faculty. The issue is how these costs will be covered if indirect costs are being used to pay for core operations. Lidstrom suggested that the conversation needs to be elevated and the council is a good place to start it. She outlined some questions to ask of department chairs concerning distribution of indirect costs for the research enterprise.
6. New Business

- **Addition of ORUs and RCR distribution to FRC Issues (Haselkorn)**

Haselkorn asked everyone to review the list of council issues and recommend whether to modify, remove, or add issues. After some discussion the following changes will be drafted:

a. Classified, Proprietary and Restricted Research. This issue will be kept but potentially modified.

b. Faculty Effort Reporting. It was felt that this issue needs to be renamed to include the broader considerations of research faculty. “Research Faculty Issues” was suggested. Gerald Miller agreed to work on rewording the issue.

c. Senate Interdisciplinary Research Committee (SIRC). Haselkorn felt that the issue was still relevant and should be kept. He will try to reword it.

d. Royalty Research Fund (RRF). Haselkorn thanked Lidstrom for the RRF being so well done. He noted that Judy Ramey will be taking over the RRF and FCR could be useful to her. It was suggested that the council invite Ramey to report on the RRF next year.

e. Scholarly Communication Committee. Haselkorn noted that the class C legislation had been approved and it was time to pull this issue off the list, for now.


- **Draft Guidelines for Establishing ORUs (Eaton)**

Dave Eaton reported on “Guidelines for Establishing Organized Research Units,” a report drafted last October. He addressed first the issue of defining Organized Research Units (ORU). Eaton explained the usefulness in creating consistency in language to describe the various interdisciplinary units commonly identified as Centers, Institutes, Programs, Laboratories, or other terms. He noted that these are only guidelines because of the potential repercussions associated with a name change that include among other things, international reputation and costs for letterhead. They also do not want to stifle creativity.

Eaton identified a second issue in which the OR would like to encourage some structure to the accountability and reporting for those Centers that are not mandated by a funding agency. He explained that if ORUs do not receive support from OR, it should be the responsibility of the Dean or Chair of the ORU Director to conduct a periodic review. All ORUs should have some kind of performance review, and there is currently no oversight for those centers that don’t receive central funding from the OR. A point was raised about the controversy associated with “made up” centers. Lidstrom explained the distinction between getting a grant approved for a center and getting the center’s name approved. To be listed on the OR website as an official University center it is necessary to get the name approved, even if a grant has been awarded in support of it. It was noted that the title “Center” is commonly used across disciplines at the university.

The third issue involves two parts: a desire to lower the barrier to interdisciplinary research sponsored by centers, and a desire to offer guidance to center directors on how to negotiate a fair distribution of RCR funds from their dean or department chair. The guidelines are also to encourage deans and chairs to recognize the benefit of supporting interdisciplinary research with RCR funds. Eaton noted that there is no dollar amount suggested, but that there is a point of diminishing returns if the amount is too small. Eaton noted that these are guidelines, not
policy. Haselkorn suggested that the sections on RCR distribution could easily be turned into Class C legislation. A discussion began about the nature of the problem and the inconsistencies of RCR distribution across the university. Miller suggested that the issue was far broader than ORUs and should apply to all grants.

Haselkorn asked council members how they wanted to proceed on the issue and whether they wanted to pursue class C legislation on the recommended guidance for RCR distribution. Stenkamp inquired about the typical path for the guidelines. Lidstrom explained that while she has the authority to publish them as guidelines and they have been vetted quite broadly, she would prefer to get the support of key deans as well as the council’s backing, in order to provide more impetus for its acceptance. Haselkorn noted the importance of having a faculty discussion on the topic. He pointed out that Eaton has done most of the work, so that a subcommittee would only need to add the legislative language. The following members agreed to work on the subcommittee: Haselkorn, Wright, Eaton, and Miller.

- **CIA Postdoctoral Award**

Haselkorn informed members about an email he recently received regarding a postdoctoral award from the CIA. The Director of the Institute for National Security Education and Research (INSER) has asked the council to review the proposal. The issue came up earlier in the year when an INSER award that did not undergo a review (because it was not dealing with classified research) was brought to the council’s attention. Haselkorn noted that there are faculty who are more concerned about issues other than classified research. While the typical approval for the CIA postdoctoral award should come from the President or Provost, FCR has been asked to review it.

A discussion began about whether or not review of CIA funded research is the purview of the council. Haselkorn noted the value in having the council review the CIA award because he felt that an objection to it would come to the Faculty Senate if they did not address it now. He felt that the decision belongs to the faculty, who are sometimes critical to the kinds of research accepted, especially classified research. Carol Rhodes noted that if the award has any export control standards that would limit how it is disseminated, it would trigger a review as a “restricted” award. Haselkorn wondered if some people are not checking the box concerning restrictions on the award. The section asks, “Will this project require restriction on information, personnel, or security classification?” Members acknowledged that various types of common research grants would fall under that restrictive classification, and would thus require a review by the research council.

In reply to the request, Haselkorn will respond by saying that the postdoctoral award does not require the research council’s review because it is no different from other proposals on campus, and the specific requirement for acknowledgment can be handled by the Office of Sponsored Programs. The council will also revisit the language of the GC-1 form in the future.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.
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