Chair Cathryn Booth-LaForce called the meeting to order at 2:04 PM

Meeting Synopsis:
1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda
2. Approve minutes from 18 May 2007 FCR meeting
3. Announcements
4. Discussion
   - Classified, Proprietary, and Restricted Research Subcommittee proposal (Vogt)
5. Requests for Information and Updates
   - Update: Office of Research (Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, Office of Research.
   - Information: Computer Cluster Policy (Jeff Follman, Director of Financial Accounting and Reporting, Financial Accounting; Ann Anderson, Assist. Vice President and Controller)
   - Information: State Ethics Act amendment (Jeff Cheek, Associate Vice Provost for Research Compliance & Operations, Office of Research; Michael Corn, SOM Director of Regulatory Guidance)
6. Old Business
7. New Business
   - Developing a searchable database for collaborative research (Booth-LaForce)
8. Adjournment

1. Call to order and approval of agenda
Cathryn Booth-LaForce opened the meeting at 2:04 PM by asking for the approval of the agenda.

Agenda approved.

2. Approval of minutes from the 18 May 2007 FCR meeting
The minutes of the May meeting were approved with one minor edit regarding the time period of funding for the NEPTUNE project.

3. Announcements
Cathryn thanked everyone for their service over the past year, with recognition of Greg Benner, Francoise Haeseleer, and Asuman Kiyak, who are rotating off the committee. She also gave a special thanks to Asuman Kiyak for her service over the past six years, including a stint as FCR Chair. She also extended her appreciation and thanks to Peggy Fanning for transcribing the minutes of the council’s meetings over the past academic year.

4. Discussion
   • Classified, Proprietary, and Restricted Research Subcommittee proposal

Daniel Vogt distributed a handout regarding a request for FCR’s approval of a classified contract: “2007 ONR Joint Active/Passive Sonar Review” from the Office of Naval Research. Dan Vogt explained that this request by APL-UW is under a time crunch, since this is the last meeting of the academic year for the Faculty Council and this proposal for organizing a conference is scheduled for August. The Office of Naval Research (ONR) requested approval for a classified purchase request to APL-UW to organize and manage a classified meeting of researchers funded by the Office of Naval Research Code 321 US (Undersea Signal Processing). The Principal Investigator is Warren Fox and the amount of requested funding is $20K. The purchase request is already at OSP and awaiting FCR approval. The statement of work for this project is the following:

“The contractor shall provide the necessary security management and meeting infrastructure (including audio/video support, registration, arrange announcements, etc.) to conduct a three-day meeting to peer review and disseminate research being conducted under ONR’s Joint Active-Passive Sonar Program. Other tasks included organizing informal technical exchange for attendees to discuss meeting proceedings. Facilities should be able to accommodate discussions to the classification level of SECRET. Meeting is scheduled to occur Aug. 21-23, 2007.”

Dan went on to say that he and Mark Haselkorn met with Robert Miyamoto and Warren Fox (PI) of the “2007 ONR Joint Active/Passive Sonar Review” from the Office of Naval Research.
An emailed question to Dan Vogt from Gerald Miller (A FCR Subcommittee member) directed to APL was whether this conference would create any disruptions or impacts on campus. Robert Miyamoto assured the subcommittee that this conference would cause no disturbance on campus. Dan assured everyone that this meeting would be held in a room at South Campus HUB and would not cause any disturbance, similar to these types of meetings that they have had on campus before. All six questions to which FCR requests a response (related to “Classified, Proprietary, and Restricted Research” proposals) were answered in a straightforward way by APL-UW... Those six questions were:

1. What unique capabilities do your program and the UW bring to this proposed project?
2. Describe the scholarly, scientific, and/or educational benefits of this proposed project?
3. In what ways does the proposed project provide a public or community service?
4. In what ways, if any, will UW students (graduate and undergraduate) be involved in the project: If they participate in the research, will they require security clearance or have restrictions place on their thesis, dissertation, or other academic activities?
5. Does the proposed project engender any restrictions on publications by the PI, members of the research team, students or postdoctoral fellows?
6. Are there any 'foreign nationals' working on this project?

Mark and Dan discussed the proposal after meeting with APL-UW and concluded that they would recommend approval to the FCR. Their approval had been agreed to via email by the other subcommittee members, Asuman Kiyak and Gerald Miller. Dan Vogt moved approval to FCR, and it was seconded by David Fluharty. The request for approval of classified contract: “2007 ONR Joint Active/Passive Sonar Review” passed unanimously.

**ACTION: Approved**

Dan told the council members that there would be a second proposal coming and would probably have to be approved via email vote. Cathryn had invited Jeffrey Simmon, Director and William Bakamis, Associate Director of the Applied Physics Laboratory to come and give an update to the Faculty Council, but due to lack of available time, they plan to visit the council members this fall.

5. Request for Information and Updates

- Update: Office of Research (Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, Office of Research)

Mary Lidstrom didn’t have any new updates since the Council had just met less than a month ago. She did announce that she just received word that Safeco is giving the UW their furniture and most of their art work along with a lease on the fountain. This is a very nice gesture and a tremendous asset for the UW and the UW Towers.

- Information: Computer Cluster Policy (Jeff Follman, Director of Financial Accounting and Reporting, and Ann Anderson, Assistant Vice President and Controller)
Jeff Follman and Ann Anderson came to talk about the new computer cluster policy. This project was undertaken by the Office of Sponsored Programs and the Office of Financial Management. The new policy is that even though computer pieces may individually fall below the threshold of $2,000, by grouping them together (according to a set of criteria) they can now be considered as a computer cluster (or a single asset) and they can be purchased without indirect costs, just like any other single piece of equipment that exceeds $2,000 in cost. These clusters will be tagged and tracked as a single asset. Jeff Follman will send the link of the new policy that details the specific criteria that these purchases need to meet in order to qualify for the cluster designation to Cathryn so she can circulate it to the council members via email. This policy will be effective on July 1, 2007.

One of the council members asked about what happens if parts get moved elsewhere? Ann answered by saying that they should be kept working together until they become obsolete. The computer’s life isn’t too long, so this shouldn’t be a problem.

Mary Lidstrom asked how they would tag these clusters of equipment. Jeff said there would be just one tag per cluster, probably on the main piece.

Mary Lidstrom commended the team for doing such a great job. She thought that it was a very thoughtful and practical way to approach the problem, since these clusters are really just one piece of equipment.

Mark Haselkorn asked a question about the issue of cluster pieces being moved and wondered how the cluster pieces can be tracked if there is only one tag per cluster. Jeff said the cluster will still be tagged as a single unit. Ideally, pieces are not removed prior to the end of their useful life (as the point of the policy is to capture items that are intended to work together for four years). The team is crafting policy around what to do when a piece of the cluster is eventually removed and will add it to the Frequently Asked Questions list.

Cathryn thanked Jeff and Ann for their time.

- Information: State Ethics Act amendment (Jeff Cheek, Associate Vice Provost for Research and Compliance and Operations, Office of Research; and, Michael Corn, SOM Director of Regulatory Guidance).

Jeff Cheek distributed two documents to the committee: a PowerPoint presentation entitled, “Ethics Act Amendment and revised UW policies,” and a separate text which provided a narrative summary and Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) related to changes in UW policies and pertinent to the State Ethics Act. Michael Corn explained that part of the purpose of the narrative summary and FAQs relating to changes in the UW policies pertinent to the State Ethics Act were to help explain how the 2005 amendment to the State Ethics Act has affected UW policies relating to research and Tech Transfer.

To provide background and context, Michael noted that with the passage of the original 1995 State Ethics law unintentionally put restraints on UW faculty related to their research and tech transfer endeavors. As a result, in 2004 the Washington Technology Alliance established a group of leaders from our state’s diverse high-tech businesses, research institutes, and the community to study this issue. The committee submitted a
report of findings and recommendations in 2005. Subsequently, the State Legislature amended the Ethics Act in 2005, which allowed the UW to revise its internal policies accordingly. Under the new law, these amended policies had to be approved by the Governor, which occurred on February 2, 2007. The resulting changes in UW policy now allow for more flexibility and permit the University to provide internal oversight of Ethics Law compliance as opposed to the State Ethics Board. The two main features of the Ethics Act amendment and revised UW policies are (1) the creation and definition of a "University Research Employee" and (2) permitted de minimis use of University resources for approved outside work were clarified. Under the revised rules, faculty are allowed to make de minimis use of phones, email, library, and computers for approved outside work. These benefits help the enhancement of the academic and technology transfer mission of the UW. They also facilitate university/industry relations and help retain and recruit faculty.

They are currently attempting to inform the University community using a number of different methods. FAQs have been posted on the Web, and Michael and Jeff are making presentations to various groups as part of a broad educational effort to inform investigators of the range of and limits on allowable activities. Besides the FAQs, they will also prepare a list of scenarios.

David Fluharty asked about whether faculty performing public service and getting paid an honorarium can use their computer and office preparing for that outside work. Dan Vogt also mentioned how he gets sent material to review and gets paid for his service. Michael responded that Vol. 4, Part 5, Chapter 6 of the University Handbook, (Outside Work Policy), identifies a number of exclusions and about seven categories of permissible used of University resources (and these are separate from those now permitted by the revised policies). FCR members may want to review these exclusions and the Outside Work Policy in the University Handbook.

Cathryn recommended that Michael and Jeff consider providing this presentation to the Faculty Affairs Council, or perhaps look into linking text about the new regulations to a web-based application for permission to conduct outside work (when available). She thanked Michael and Jeff for their presentation.

6. Old business/New Business

Cathryn was sent an email regarding developing a searchable database for faculty to find others with similar interests, or to find others with specific expertise. She forwarded this email to Mary Lidstrom and Jeff Cheek. This topic has been brought up before. One of the big concerns is who will maintain it and modify it when changes occur? It would be possible to create such a database by pulling from existing data, but updating it could require significant resources. Jeff Cheek has had some experience in trying to set up such a database in Colorado, and the idea had merit but was not pursued due to these issues. Faculty may not want to fill out another form, and do not even stay current with their Community of Science profiles.

If one could think of a way to pull existing data from abstracts of funded grants or annual reviews, the initial set-up might be possible. We need a record/form that would be easy for data-gathering. For example, we have 3-4,000 faculty yet there is no standard CV amongst them. Merit review information might be another source, if we could get departments to use a standard form or select from 3 or 4 standard forms.
Mary Lidstrom said that the OR is continuing to work on this important need, but there is no clear solution. She thought maybe a task force might be a good idea.

Cathryn again thanked everyone and reminded them that they would be working on the fall schedule soon.

6. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:20 PM. Minutes by Peggy Fanning.

Present: Faculty members: Booth-LaForce, Fluharty, Haselkorn, Schwartz, Stenkamp, Vogt, and Wright

President’s designee: Lidstrom
Other ex officio members: Redaje for Welton
Absent:
Faculty members: Benner, Haeseleer, Kiyak, and Miller,
Ex-officio members: Barker, Ashby-Larrabee, Foster, Smith, and Lovell

Guests: Ann Anderson, Jeff Cheek, Michael Corn, Peggy Fanning, Jeff Follman, and Barbara Perry